TRANSNATIONALISM AND THE STATE:
TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS THE TURKIC WORLD

A Master's Thesis

by
SEÇKİN KÖSTEM

Department of
International Relations
Bilkent University
Ankara
July 2010

TRANSNATIONALISM AND THE STATE:
TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS THE TURKIC WORLD

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

SEÇKİN KÖSTEM

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

July 2010

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assoc. Prof. Ersel AYDINLI
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Dr. Hasan Ali KARASAR
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assoc. Prof. Mitat ÇELİKPALA
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Erdal EREL
Director

ABSTRACT

TRANSNATIONALISM AND THE STATE:
TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS THE TURKIC WORLD

Köstem, Seçkin
M.A., Department of International Relations
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Ersel Aydınlı
July 2010

Transformation in world politics, which is marked by globalization, has led to the emergence of transnational actors. This on the one hand caused different forms of governance to occur and on the other hand resulted in cooperative behavior by states in their interaction with non-state units. This cooperation is a result of the necessity felt by states to incorporate normative issues in their national interests as well as changing identity perceptions of decision-makers. This study focuses on how Turkish foreign policy towards Turkic-speaking states and communities has been influenced by the transnational idea of "Turkic World" in the post-Cold War era. The explanatory factor or the independent behavior in this case study is the transnational idea of "Turkic World", which is advocated by non-state actors. Although the Turkish state distanced itself from the idea of "Turkic World" in the early Republican period and during the Cold War, it re-emerged in Turkish politics in 1991 when the Soviet Union collapsed. In the last two decades Turkish foreign policy towards the Turkic world has passed through a process evolution; in which stages were rapid entrance in the early 1990s, disappointment in the late 1990s and revision in the 2000s. This evolution includes certain patterns of behavior that indicate that the idea of "Turkic World" is institutionalizing in Turkish foreign policy. This institutionalization stages indicate that Turkish foreign policy in this case is not only influenced by the geopolitical factor, but by ideational factor, which has driven Turkish decision-makers towards closer political, economic and cultural cooperation with Turkic states.

ÖZET

ULUSÖTESİCİLİK VE DEVLET:
TÜRKİYE'NİN TÜRK DÜNYASINA YÖNELİK DIŞ POLİTİKASI

Köstem, Seçkin
Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler
Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Ersel Aydınlı
Temmuz 2010

Dünya siyasetinde küreselleşmeyle gelişen dönüşüm ulusötesi aktörlerin doğuşuna yol açmıştır. Bu bir yandan farklı yönetişim türlerinin ortaya çıkmasına sebep olmuş, öte yandan da devletlerin devlet-dışı aktörlerle olan ilişkisinde işbirliği temelli davranış biçimiyle sonuçlanmıştır. Bu işbirliğine devletlerin normatif meseleleri ulusal çıkarlarına dâhil etme gereğini hissetmeleri ve karar alıcıların değişen kimlik algılamaları sebep olmuştur. Bu çalışma Türkiye'nin Türk devlet ve topluluklarına yönelik dış politikasının ulus-ötesi "Türk Dünyası" fikrinden nasıl etkilendiğine odaklanmaktadır. Bu vaka çalışmasında açıklayıcı faktör ya da bağımsız değişken, devlet dışı aktörler tarafından savunulmakta olan ulus-ötesi "Türk Dünyası" fikridir. Türk devleti erken Cumhuriyet döneminde ve Soğuk Savaş boyunca kendisini "Türk Dünyası" fikrinden uzaklaştırmış olsa da, 1991'de Sovyetler Birliği çöktüğünde fikir Türk siyasetinde yeniden doğmuştur. Son yirmi yılda Türkiye'nin Türk dünyasına yönelik dış siyaseti, aşamaları 1990'ların başında hızlı giriş, 1990'ların sonunda hayal kırıklığı ve 2000'lerde yenileme olan bir evrim sürecinden geçmiştir. Bu evrim "Türk Dünyası" fikrinin Türk dış politikasında kurumsallaştığına işaret eden bazı belirli davranış biçimlerini içermektedir. Bu kurumsallaşma aşamaları, bu vakada Türk dış politikasının sadece jeopolitik faktörden değil, aksine, Türk karar alıcılarını Türk devletleriyle daha yakın siyasi, ekonomik ve kültürel işbirliğine yönlendiren fikri bir faktörden etkilendiğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ulusötesicilik, Devlet Dışı Aktörler, Kimlik, Türk Dış Politikası, Türk Dünyası

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The question that this thesis tries to find an answer for is; "how has the transnational idea of "Turkic World", which has been advocated by non-state actors, influenced Turkish foreign policy towards the Turkic world in the post-Soviet period?" Scholars of International Relations and Comparative Politics have paid attention to how globalization have strengthened activities and capacity to influence of non-state actors over national governments as well as how those actors help spread ideas and identities beyond borders. This made transnationalism an important topic on the scholarly study of world politics. On the other hand, studies on foreign policy have focused on the range of opportunities and possibilities of actions for states especially in the post-Cold War era. However, little has been done to explain or understand how those two – interests of non-state actors and states – may converge in specific policy areas.

This has been the case for Turkish foreign policy towards the Turkic world, which is a term used to encompass all Turkic-speaking peoples in the world. Studies on Turkey's relations with the Turkic states of the former Soviet Union and Turkic minorities in several regions such as the Caucasus and Volga-Ural region of Russia

have been studied from a geopolitical perspective, in which Turkey's efforts to acquire a regional power status in the post-Soviet space were evaluated in terms of rationality and political outcomes. Content of such studies have tended to flow in a chronological order in which Turkey's rapid reaction to the emergence of five newly independent Turkic states – Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan – in 1991 was analyzed and success and failure of Turkey to achieve several goals were discussed. On the other hand, several studies have tended to focus only on cultural relations to indicate how Turkic brotherhood speeded up social interaction and connectedness among Turks of Turkey and Turkic peoples of entire Eurasia. Such studies have tended to approach non-governmental activities among Turkic peoples as mere "cultural" activities that were carried out by pan-Turkist circles that had little contact with Turkish decision-makers and politicians. However, there is certainly a need to combine the aims and activities of both Turkish governments and non-state actors that advocate closer ties with the Turkic world.

This study takes the impact of a transnational idea on the redefinition of Turkey's national interests just during the collapse of the Soviet Union and then on how it shaped the new foreign policy toward the former Soviet space and led to an evolution of it later on. What leads to non-state actor impact and re-definition of national interest in the case analyzed in this study is the idea of "Turkic World". Because the idea has originated outside the borders of Turkey and emerged due to attempts of intellectuals and activists, it will be referred to as the transnational idea of "Turkic World" throughout the study. Besides the impact of the idea on Turkish foreign policy in the post-Cold War era its relations and interaction with the Turkish state since it was born at the turn of the 20th century will be analyzed. Within the process of the transformation of this particular idea; the Turkic World, into a norm in

Turkish foreign policy, governments' perceptions of Turkey's identity as a great nation with deep historical roots and as a bridge of civilization between the East and the West have played a considerable role. The transnational idea of bringing the Turkic-speaking peoples together culturally, economically and politically added an ideational factor based on identity perception into Turkish foreign policy and the conception of national interests. As the idea was brought into the agenda of Turkish foreign policy by non-state actors – NGOs, intellectuals and activists who advocate Turkic rapprochement – this study also tries to indicate what conditions drive states and non-state actors to interact and converge their interests. Another purpose of this study is to contribute to a theoretical debate going on in IR discipline on how and under what circumstances transnational actors influence decisions made and policies followed by states. This study argues that if the aims of the transnational – or non-state – actors overlap with the foreign policy goals of states there will be cooperation between the two, which will then pave the way for transnational impact upon the policies of the latter. Finally, this study aims to indicate the patterns of institutionalization of the idea of "Turkic World" in Turkish foreign policy behavior.

The second chapter gives an overall picture of the above-mentioned theoretical approaches and debates on the emergence and strength of transnational actors in world politics. Moreover, Constructivist literature on ideas and identities will be analyzed because ideational factors are the major driving-forces behind the incorporation of norms into national interests of states. Finally, based on the assumption that states try to utilize ideational factors to promote their national interests, the interaction between transnational ideas, identities and foreign policy formation will be discussed.

Having laid the theoretical basis, the third chapter will analyze the historical evolution of the transnational idea of "Turkic World" from its very start to the year 1991. This analysis will start with the nascent forms of the idea to indicate why it is transnational. Hence, the third chapter will include the origins of the idea outside Turkey, how it spread to Turkey as a result of the efforts of Turkic intellectuals and activists of the Russian Empire, how its relations with the Turkish state – first Ottoman Empire and then the Republic of Turkey – evolved and the impact of the nation-building process in Turkey and the Bolshevization of the regime in Russia on the idea. Finally, the influence of state policies on Turkism and Turkists during the Second World War and how it resulted in a marginalization and disappearance of the idea in Turkish political life throughout the Cold War will be analyzed.

The fourth chapter will deal with the re-emergence of the idea of "Turkic World" in Turkish foreign policy in the post-Cold War era and how it shaped the formation of an active foreign policy framework toward newly-independent Turkic states of the former Soviet Union. The fourth chapter will also analyze on the role of NGOs as norm entrepreneurs on Turkish foreign policy toward the Caucasus and Central Asia, focusing on transnational platforms that they have established in order to foster ties among Turkic peoples. The fourth chapter will also try to indicate that the perception of Turkish decision-makers regarding Turkish identity has evolved to encompass the entire Turkic world.

Having discussed the new foreign policy framework towards the Turkic world and the cooperation between non-state actors who advocate the idea and governments, the fifth chapter will focus on the patterns of institutionalization of the idea in Turkish foreign policy. This will include an analysis on the transformation of the idea of "Turkic World" into a norm in Turkish foreign policy with signs of

internalization such as special attention paid to the establishment of international platforms to increase cooperation among Turkic states, the existence of relations with the Turkic world in government and programs and deepening relations with Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan. Finally, the conclusion chapter will refer back to the theoretical debates in the second chapter to better understand the process of norm creation in Turkish foreign policy in this case study.

1.1 Methodology

This study is a single case study, which tries to analyze the impact of a transnational idea and non-state actors that advocate the idea on the foreign policy re-formation of a state. The case analyzed is therefore, Turkish foreign policy towards Turkic states and communities, which all together constitute the Turkic world, in the post-Cold War era. Since the idea of "Turkic World" has influenced Turkey's approach toward all Turkic-speaking peoples, no single country – for instance Turkey's relations with Turkmenistan or Uzbekistan – was selected, but rather an overall approach was followed. It would be indeed very difficult, if not impossible to deal with Turkish foreign policy towards each independent Turkic state and Turkic community living as a minority in a master's thesis. An overall focus on the Turkic world has also helped to understand whether there is coherence and consistency in Turkish foreign policy. In addition, following quantitative methods would have been very difficult for this study, which focuses on normative components of foreign policy behavior and national interests.

I have conducted an extensive literature review in Turkish and English both on the historical evolution of the idea of "Turkic World", principles of Turkish foreign policy and Turkish foreign policy toward the Caucasus and Central Asia in

the post-Cold War era. In addition, I have read several official and semi-official documents such as government programs, party programs, declarations and articles on official websites and international agreements. I have also included some texts in Azerbaijani language. In order to better comprehend the complexity of policy-making for this case, I have made interviews with several former activists, politicians such as an advisor to the President and former ministers of state responsible for Turkic republics and communities, and a journalist, who has been writing on Turkish politics and Turkey's relations with Turkic-speaking peoples. Furthermore, I have made references to several speeches of key Turkish decision-makers such as the Presidents and Prime Ministers in order to understand how the idea of "Turkic World" has affected their discourse and policies. Such studies can be enriched with deeper contacts with non-governmental organizations that have tried to influence governmental policies on the Turkic world. Moreover, field research would contribute to such studies to a great extent, which was impossible for me to conduct due to lack of time and resources. Finally, literature review can be expanded to include publications and reports in Russian as well as regional languages such as Kazakh and Uzbek. However, I have had limited access to such books and documents. Reading such publications might help researchers to understand the impact of the idea of "Turkic World" in foreign policies of other Turkic countries.

Consequently, this study tries to offer a new framework for understanding or explaining foreign policy. The independent variable is the transnational idea of "Turkic World" and the dependent variable is the change in Turkish foreign policy towards the Turkic world since 1991. What makes such an approach more interesting for the study of IR is that actors who promote the idea are non-state actors. Changing geopolitical context, domestic structures and international institutionalization are

accepted to be intervening variables that also have an effect on transnational relations.

CHAPTER 2

TRANSNATIONALISM MEETS NATIONAL INTERESTS:
IDEAS, IDENTITY AND NORMS

International Relations as an academic discipline has incorporated non-state actors and transnationalism into its literature increasingly for the last two decades. Such a necessity arose first and foremost as a result of the ontological shift in world politics with the end of the Cold War. The state-centric Realism and Liberalism were now questioned and challenged as the states had to share their authorities with the so-called "transnational" actors. The sudden shift in world politics with the collapse of one of the poles of the bipolar structure led scholars of the discipline to find new ways of explaining or understanding the transformation of the role of state and newly emerging non-state actors. The increasing focus on approaches to global governance, transnational social movements and international norms as well as the rise of Constructivism with its emphasis on identity and norms in world politics has been the indicators of a need for change in the discipline. On the other hand countries which had strong cultural and historical ties with their neighborhoods now had the chance to widen their scopes of foreign policy actions. The end of the Cold War offered countries with regional power aspirations to search for new foreign policy

orientations as there was no more the pressure of belonging to either side of the ideological blocs. Hence matters such as culture and identity in foreign policy analysis became quite important or no-more-repressed elements of foreign policy. One should mention here that structural change was not the only reason why there was such a shift in world politics and the academic study of it. There were indeed transnational relations, norms and ideas floating around the globe for centuries. Moreover identity and norms had always been an important aspect of both domestic politics and foreign policy. However the discipline was so focused on the rivalry between the Soviet Union and the United States that there was very little written on how transnational ideas and norms affected interstate relations or world politics in general.

2.1 Globalization, Governance and Demise of State Authority

Literature on globalization and how it transforms the nation-state constitutes a background for why non-state actors have been incorporated into the academic study of International Relations. It has been a point of debate among the scholars of International Relations and Comparative Politics whether there has been demise in state authority as new actors have emerged with substantial power to influence world politics. While some think that the state has been undergoing a process of erosion as the principle of sovereignty is challenged by non-state actors (Reinicke, 1997; Spruyt, 1994), a second group of scholars have counter-argued it claiming that states are still the major and most powerful actors in world politics that continue to shape major developments such as conflicts, wars, regional and supranational cooperation bodies and international organizations (Waltz, 1999), and a third group has argued that the state is going through a process of transformation (Held at al., 1999;

Slaughter, 2004). Hence, as Slaughter argues the state was no more a unitary actor, but rather a "disaggregated" one as it had to behave and make decisions in a web of transgovernmental relations (Slaughter, 2004: 6, 10, 15). The words globalization and governance were followed by new concepts such as "non-state actors" and "transnationalism" to better depict the newly emerging reality in the domain of intergovernmental relations. As globalization forced governments to redefine their powers within the concept of governance, the Westphalian norm of territoriality started transforming as well. The increasing interaction between the citizens of different states, the increasing level of interconnectedness among societies, transportation, communication technologies and the rapidly growing amounts of international trade were the first signs and triggers of the nascent forms of both transformation in inter-state relations and transnationalization of world politics (Keohane and Nye, 1971: 329-349).

"Global governance" was a new concept attracting attention by the scholars of the discipline as it incorporated the transformation in world politics toward a multi-centric structure. With this respect, the Fall of the Berlin Wall, the increasing degree of economic globalization and the signs of an emergence of global civil society triggered students of transnationalism to focus more on global governance (Hewson and Sinclair, 1999: 3). The reason why governance replaced government in order to better explain and understand the transformation of world politics is that the international system was moving toward a multi-centric one in which subnational, international, transnational and global had to exist together (Hewson and Sinclair, 1993: 6). Spruyt (1994: 183) wrote in 1994 that we were witnessing profound changes in the international system as we head toward the end of the millennium. Although this did not mean that the primacy of the state in international relations was

moving away, Rosenau (1999: 292) gave a clear idea of how they were losing ground:

> Yes, states retain their sovereign rights, but the realms within which these rights can be exercised has diminished as the world becomes ever more interdependent and as state boundaries become ever more porous. With the increasing diffusion of authority, states can no longer rely on their sovereignty as a basis for protecting their interests in the face of increasing global challenges.

Therefore, non-state actors and states together lead us to study governance rather than government, or a move from the study of anarchy between states to cooperation in global civil society (Barnett and Sikkink, 2008: 63). In other words "even the notion of international relations seems obsolete when so many of the interactions that presently sustain world politics do not unfold directly between states or nations" (Rosenau, 1989: 2). This meant that new actors such as International Organizations (IOs), Multi-national Corporations (MNCs), transnational social movements and transnational terrorist networks were increasingly becoming new forces that shaped international relations. Furthermore with the help of structural change in the system with the end of the Cold War transnational ideas, movements and norms were becoming quite powerful in influencing the policies and interests of both non-state actors and the states themselves.

2.2 New Actors in the International System

As the authority of the state was challenged by globalization and the need to governance in various issues occurred with utmost importance, it also became a necessity to define the new actors of world politics. Although the state continued to be the dominant actor, the sudden transformation of the system reminded many of a turn back to pre-Westphalian structure in which the Catholic Church, city states,

feudal lords and central governments existed together (See Spruyt, 1994 for a historical analysis of how the nation-state has become the major actor of world politics). This meant that post-Cold War world politics would include more space for non-state actor activities and influence. The major non-state actors were Multi-National Corporations (MNCs), on which Neo-Liberal theorist had already been writing since the early 1970s.

However non-state actors could no more be limited to MNCs as the sphere of influence of non-governmental organizations of various kinds necessitated a wider focus. With the help of the rapid developments in communication technologies and the integration of the capitalist world economy by the late 1980s NGOs have had the chance to establish networks across boundaries, which turned into pressure groups influencing governments. Ironically, even anti-globalization movements benefited from globalization in order to organize themselves in a transnational manner. Different civil society movements all over the world were pressuring on governments to adapt certain human rights norms or environmental policies. Similarly informal violent groups with transnational networking capabilities such as the al-Qaeda were starting to have bigger weight both in inter-state relations and in relations among each other. Especially, the surprising attacks on the Twin Towers on 9/11 attracted attention of decision-makers and scholars on the transnational violent character and capability of action of the global Jihadist network led by Osama bin Laden. There was already a certain trend of internationalization of terrorism with the PLO since the early 1970s, though what made the Jihadist network more formidable and powerful in the eyes of governments and citizens globally was their ability to organize transnationally without depending on the support of any government.[1]

---

[1] For an evaluation as to how transnational informal violence has changed the minds of scholars on religion as world views, see J. Ann Tickner. 2009. "On Taking Religious Worldviews Seriously". In

Consequently, the study of nongovernmental actors has been a strong element in the study of transnationalism since it is mostly non-state actors that promote and spread transnational activity. According to Khagram, Riker and Sikkink (2002: 11) the nongovernmental sector "represents a third sector distinct but interacting with government and business" – which are the two primary actors of world politics – whose members, either individuals or groups, are "primarily motivated to shape the world according to their principled beliefs". The impact of this motivation of a transnational group acting according to a certain common set of rules and behavior that are shaped by their ideology has been best witnessed by the rise of the al-Qaeda. Al-Qaeda is a terrorist organization made up of networks that could evolve its structural organization in line with globalization.

2.2.1 Micro Actors, Distant Proximities and Fragmegration

The growing ease with communication globally, the unprecedented rapidity of technological advances that enable micro actors to establish networks dramatically beyond their national borders, the rise of cross-border flow of immigrants, the necessity felt by governments to release protectionist economic policies in order to better cope with the world capitalist economy as well as the opportunities offered by the transnational economic transactions and even identities that promote the national interest have all been causing the "transnational" to be taken care of by the governments and international organizations. In other words, governments had to adapt certain policy prescriptions offered by the requirements of the age of globalization in order to cope with it. This has also resulted in a widening gap between the "international" and the "transnational" as it is easier for non-state

---

Helen V. Milner and Andrew Moravcsik (eds.). *Power, Interdependence and Nonstate Actors in World Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 223-240.

entities to achieve their goals, material or ideational, at the expanse of the state (Aydınlı, 2010: 1-4).

Rosenau (2003: 5) has helped better conceptualize the rapid change in world politics. One significant point he makes is that the approach toward domestic and international politics as two distinct areas of research is getting more and more meaningless as individuals are becoming more and more able to act in "distant proximities" (Rosenau, 2003: 5). Hence the multi-centric structure toward which world politics have been evolving offers great opportunities for micro actors such as individuals or social movements to advocate certain causes such as human rights or environmental protection. Rosenau (2003: 11) develops this line of thinking by putting forward the concept of "fragmegration", which refers to "the pervasive interaction between fragmenting and integrating dynamics unfolding at every level of community". This duality is the essence of the transformation in world affairs as well as the root cause of the emergence of non-state actors as important actors. "Fragmegration" is the basis as a result of which micro – or non-state – actors such as individuals, activists and leaders/elite of macro collectivities make distant developments proximate (Rosenau, 2003: 27-37).

As the world has been becoming more like a single globe in which distant places were getting proximate, governments had to cope with and adapt to the emergence of micro actors suggested by Rosenau and moreover had to learn sacrificing sovereignty to some extent and even incorporate the identities and norms advocated by non-state actors into their own policies. Cases in which a state aspires for regional power or tries to gain international prestige non-state actors may even become attractive for governments as cooperating with them will further contribute to what the state seeks. In such cases, what is advocated by transnational actors may

become state policy and transnational relations may flourish with the help of the state.

Consequently, globalization has been the background for the transformation in world politics to incorporate non-state actors alongside national governments and international organizations. This was mainly because globalization was a stimulating factor to spread ideas beyond national borders, re-awake transnational identities and put the issues that are advocated by transnational activist networks into the policy agendas of governments. The increasing ease with global communication, rapidly developing technological systems and media facilities made national borders more penetrable to transnational ideas, sometimes even those with violent character. Hence the need for governance became more evident as the national interest started to be defined beyond pure national security analyses. Finally, as a result of globalization, IR scholars have paid more and more attention to the role of ideas and identity in foreign policies of national governments as well as how they are promoted by transnational actors.

2.3 The Study of Transnationalism

2.3.1 Defining Transnationalism

The case of al-Qaeda and "the fourth wave of terrorism" justified that there was more than an international character in certain trends of world politics. The term "international" belonged to the modern times in world politics when it was only national governments and decision-makers who could have the last say on the fate of their citizens. However as distances became more proximate and non-state actors of various types have day-by-day had bigger opportunities to become autonomous

actors to shape world politics, the term "international" was no more an adequate one to cover all what was happening across national borders. Therefore, "transnational", "transnationalism", "transnational actors" and "transnational relations" started to be used especially by those scholars of International Relations who wanted to show that Neo-Realist focus on states as the sole units in the international system was deemed to be wrong.

The term "Transnational Relations" was first used by Neo-Liberal scholars Keohane and Nye in 1971. Keohane and Nye (1971: 330) were the first scholars of International Relations who recognized the fact that inter-societal relations were taking place in world politics without necessarily being controlled or directed by governments. Although this article published in 1971 and the special issue of the journal "International Organization" titled "Transnational Relations and World Politics" of the same year did not alter the dominance of state-centrism in both Realism and Liberalism of the Cold War, they at least started a new wave of studying non-state actors that operated across the globe (Keohane and Nye, 1976). Keohane and Nye (1971: 331) defined transnational relations as "contacts, coalitions, and interactions across state boundaries that are not controlled by the central foreign policy organs of governments". Four major types of transnational interactions mentioned in the article were communication, transportation, finance and travel, which all had global power to influence non-governmental relations (Keohane and Nye, 1971: 332). Based on this definition, Keohane and Nye (1971: 335-336) state that multinational business enterprises, international trade union secretariats, global religious organizations and far-flung foundations were some of transnational actors.

Building on the earlier work of the Neo-Liberals, Rosenau wrote on transnationalization of world affairs in a book of his first published in 1980. Rosenau

(1980: 11) went as far as arguing that the world was no longer organized along international lines as non-governmental organizations and the activities of micro actors were leading the a restructuring of world politics. Accordingly, the new era has been marked by strengthening of network-based relations beyond borders among social movements and terrorist organizations. Finally, spread of information technologies has enabled non-state actors to organize and operate globally in informal networks.

Keohane and Nye's attempt to conceptualize transnationalism attracted criticism from scholars who wished to better uncover relationships with transnational character. Sidney Tarrow, a sociologist who studied the globalization of social movements and identities, was a prominent critique of the Neo-Liberal conceptualization. According to Tarrow (2001: 4), Keohane and Nye's studies of transnational relations in the early 1970s had three narrowing effects. Firstly, Tarrow (2001: 4) mentioned that the work of these scholars attracted attention mostly to the field of international political economy. Therefore studies on transnational relations focused mostly on MNCs and global economic transactions, which ignored types of transnational action such as civil society activism, migration and terrorism. Secondly, Tarrow (2001: 5) argued that Keohane and Nye's definition ignored the activities of global social movements and hence did not recognize the integration of the fields of transnational politics and contentious politics. Thirdly, and most importantly for the purpose of this study, Tarrow (2001: 5) put forward the idea that Keohane and Nye's Neo-Liberal approach "left the impression that transnational activity occurs at the cost of the states". Therefore, the question of how and why the state got involved in or became a part of transnational relations remained unanswered. What was even more important in Tarrow's (2001: 3) study was that he argued that states are also

transnational actors as their activities have reached beyond borders and played a key transnational role.

Risse-Kappen and a group of scholars made a serious attempt to redefine transnational relations in a book in 1995 as they thought there were certain gaps in the way Keohane and Nye used the term "transnational". Risse-Kappen (1995:8) divided transnational actors into two; "those motivated primarily by instrumental, mainly economic gains and those promoting principled ideas as well as knowledge". The first group includes multinational corporations that operate transnationally and that aim economic benefits in their target states, whereas the second group advocate certain causes such as human rights or environmental protection and hence try to influence state policies on a normative base. According to Risse-Kappen (1995: 3), transnational relations were "regular interactions across national boundaries when at least one actor is a non-state agent or does not operate on behalf of a national government or an intergovernmental organization". The main question Risse-Kappen (1995: 5) and his colleagues tried to understand in the book was under what domestic and international circumstances non-state actors who can be titled as transnational ones could manage or fail to achieve their goals. What made this book a turning point for the study of transnationalism was, as stated by its editor, that it was an attempt to understand how the state and non-state actors needed each other to achieve their interests (Risse-Kappen: 281). In other words this meant that there was not necessarily a clash between "the state world" and "the society world" as there was some kind of interdependence among each other (Risse-Kappen: 310).

Making this statement was of invaluable significance for the discipline as the early works on transnationalism relied heavily on the assumption that the rise of non-state actors worked against the national interests and sovereignty of the state.

"Success or failure of transnational coalitions" according to Risse-Kappen (1995: 13) "would depend on their ability to persuade or line up with domestic and/or governmental actors". Accordingly, transnational impact upon governments increases to the extent that states are responsive to their demands, pressures or advice. By combining Tarrow's and Risse-Kappen's assumptions on transnational actors and relations, one can reach the conclusion that transnationalism does not necessarily function at the expense of states as states are also transnational actors, which have comprehended the transformation of world politics and the need for governance in certain issues of foreign policy.

Political scientists who have tried to define transnationalism and explain or understand what kind of an impact they have had on governmental decisions aside, the second group of scholars who has studied the topic is migration and diaspora scholars.[2] Unlike political scientists or IR theorists, this field of study has got less to do with the role of non-state actors – in this case transnational migrants and the diasporas they form most commonly in Western liberal-democratic countries – in world politics. It is rather a way of studying transnational relations through matters of identity and culture from a rather societal perspective such as collective memory and group behavior (Basch, 1993; Vertovec, 2010). Thirdly, Sociology has been an academic field which has contributed to the study of transnationalism in parallel with the IR theorists, even filling an analytical gap by introducing the impact of "transnational social movements" on the transformation of world politics into the topic, which will be covered in the next sub-chapter.

---

[2] Scholars of transnationalism such as Tarrow in his book *The New Transnational Activism*, Khagram, Riker and Sikkink in their book *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks and Norms* think that transnationalism studies are mainly directed by IR theorists and Sociologists. This is true to the extent that it is only those two field of study which focus on the issue within the transformation of world politics, state sovereignty and non-state actors. However, there is a huge literature on transnational immigration activities and diaspora identities which are shaped as a result of the former. See Vertovec. 2010. *Transnationalism*. New York: Routledge. Eva Østegaard-Nielsen. 2003. *Transnational Politics: Turks and Kurds in Germany*. New York: Routledge.

2.3.2 Transnational Social Movements and Contentious Politics

Though not yet integrated into the IR discipline and IR theoretical studies, the contemporary literature on global social movements that emerged from Sociology has been another very important component of the study of transnationalism. By the mid-1990s this group of scholars who studied globalizing social movements started to have a bigger say in the literature concerning transnational relations and non-state actors. Social movements such as human rights groups, environmental organizations, women's associations and anti-globalization activists have acted transnationally thanks to the growing ease with worldwide communication and transportation. Even loosely connected networks of a certain cause can unite easily and rapidly in distant parts of the globe in order to protest against governments, businessmen or international organizations.

The global capacity that social movements has reached and their impact on national and international decision-making in several issue areas are clear indicators of how multi-centric world politics have become. As Tarrow (2007: 21-23) pointed out besides the scholars of International Relations who analyzed systemic change in world politics sociologists were the second important group who put emphasis on transnational actors and relations. Hence "Social Movement Theory" established a basis for sociologists who studied globalization to enhance their studies to include transnational identities, cultures and movements. According to a Sociological perspective on the transformation of world politics, "Globalization is a fashionable term which has been used to refer to different things" and "the underlying idea – for sociologists – is that, in the contemporary world, social action in a given time and place is increasingly conditioned by social actions in very distant places" (Della

Porta, Kriesi and Rucht, 2009: 3). This definition of Della Porta, Kriesi and Rucht is indeed very close to that of Rosenau who claims in the various works of his that the process of globalization makes domestic and international spheres fuse with each other and that even the most distant geographies, peoples and activities become proximate consequently, making it easier for micro actors to organize transnationally.

At this point "Contentious Politics" came out as a field of study among the scholars of transnational social movements (Tarrow, 1998, Sikkink and Keck, 1998) as contentious political action directed against governments and international organizations such as the IMF and the G-8 was a strong motivation for social movements to organize in a transnational manner. According to Tarrow contentious character of social mobilization was the key to understanding how NGOs moved beyond national boundaries and governmental control toward transnational networks (2007: 24). In other words, by building their arguments on contentious politics, sociologists put emphasis on the role of non-state actors as forces that undermined state sovereignty and hence their work was of great significance for the study of transnationalism as a relatively new sub-field of International Relations.

Tarrow defined three actors of transnational action in a 2001 article of him. According to Tarrow (2001) the three major actors that operated transnationally are Transnational Social Movements, International Nongovernmental Organizations (INGOs) and Transnational Activist Networks. Transnational Social Movements were defined as "socially mobilized groups with constituents in at least two states, engaged in sustained contentious interaction with power-holders in at least one state other than their own, or against an international institution, or a multinational economic actor" (Tarrow: 2001, 11). Whereas Transnational Social Movements are

engaged in contentious action with governments, multinational actors or international institutions, INGOs are more formally oriented bodies that interact with the above mentioned actors on a service basis (Tarrow: 2001, 12). Transnational Activist Networks are those groups who advocate certain issues such as human rights or environmental protection, and therefore are the representatives of the "normative turn" in the study of transnationalism in International Relations (Tarrow: 2001, 13).

According to Khagram, Sikkink and Riker (2002: 4) "One of the primary goals of transnational advocacy is to create, strengthen, implement, and monitor international norms". One needs to look further in detail into how international norms, whether they are promoted solely by social movements or not, play roles in the transforming structure of world politics. This is because norms are the main factors why and how the interests of non-state actors and those of states converge in certain issue areas and foreign policy domains. Besides material interests of states, ideational and normative factors influence foreign policy formation and national interest definition. This study will focus more on the role of norms in world politics in next pages. However in one of the next chapters it will be referred back to transnational social movements and their impact of the redefinition of state interests in the case of Turkey's foreign policy toward the Turkic world.

2.3.3 Prerequisites for Transnational Impact: Domestic Structures and Internationalization

Political conditions that determine the success of transnational action has been another important issue concerning the academic study of transnationalism. Various scholars of the topic have asked the question "when and under what conditions do transnational ideas/actors influence governmental policies most?" This

question is quite a valid and relevant one for the case being studied here as Turkey was going through a simultaneous period of democratization and foreign policy activism. According to Aydınlı (2008: 904), transnational relations of both peaceful and violent characters are easier to be established when confrontations between states ease up. Major examples for such easing up of tensions among major powers are the Concert of Europe, the Interwar Period or the most recent post-Cold War era, which has given non-state actors wider spheres of influence and the capability to act transnationally (Aydınlı, 2008: 904).

On the other hand, Risse-Kappen (1995: 6) argues in his prominent book on transnationalism that domestic structure has got a lot to do with the interaction between non-state actors and the state as well as the outcomes of the interaction as understood from state policies. According to Risse-Kappen (1995: 20) "the notion of domestic structures refers to the political institutions of the state, to societal structures, and to the policy networks linking the two." What is deferred out of the connection between those three is that transnational actors and the ideas that they promote tend to penetrate into the target state more easily if state control over the society is weaker. On the contrary, if there is a strong central-state operating in an undemocratic structure transnational influence will get harder. According to Risse-Kappen (1995: 7, 28-32) international institutionalization is the second pillar of the power of transnational activity. Accordingly, "the more regulated the inter-state relationship by cooperative international institutions in the particular issue-area, the more are transnational activities expected to flourish" (Risse-Kappen: 32).

Evangelista (1995: 1-38) more or less opposing to the the domestic structures approach of Risse-Kappen argues that transnational actors not necessarily have bigger impacts on open societies with democratically-elected governments.

Evangelista argues that transnational actors played a crucial role in the Soviet security policy under Gorbachev. Opposing also the mainstream Neo-Liberal assumption of Keohane and Nye that transnational relations affect governments' policies if the latter is democratic and free enough to accept the impact of the former, Evangelista (1995: 1-38) claims that even Soviet type regimes can be influenced by transnational actors depending on several circumstances. Unlike Risse-Kappen as Evangelista argues that authoritarian regimes can be open to transnational influence as the case of Gorbachev's policy on strategic arms and defense policy justifies. Moreover, Evangelista (1995: 34) states that although non-state actors with transnational ties flourished in Russia just after collapse of the Soviet Union as a result of the power vacuum, they could not be as effective as before in affecting Yeltsin's security policy.

Both Risse-Kappen's and Evangelista's approaches to the relation between domestic structures and transnational relations are quite helpful in order to understand Turkey's evolving attitude towards the transnational Turkic identity and its evolving foreign policy toward the five newly independent Turkic post-Soviet countries. This study will focus on how a transnational idea and transnational advocacy networks met the Turkish State. One reason for this is that it was Turkey who initiated the rapid interaction process with Turkic peoples in 1991. But more important than that, authoritarian domestic structures in Azerbaijan, four Central Asian countries and Russia – where a considerable number of Turkic peoples live in major cities such as St. Petersburg and Moscow and in separate autonomous republics such as Tatarstan, Bashkortostan and Chuvashia – prevented the activities of NGOs promoting the pan-Turkic identity and closer ties with Turkey. Moreover, pan-Turkist intellectuals and activists have found closer and stronger connections to

penetrate into Turkish political system, making the transnational idea of "Turkic World" more comprehendible for politicians and decision-makers. Consequently, global conjuncture, domestic structures and international institutionalization are key elements for transnational impact changing the possibilities of non-state actors to lobby on, pressurize upon and inform governmental bodies.

2.4 Norms in World Politics: Redefinition of National Interests

A significant concept in explaining and understanding how transnationalism meets the state is norms and processes of norm creation in international relations (see Finnemore, 1996; Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998; Katzenstein, 1996; Khagram, Riker and Sikkink, 2002 for detailed analysis of the interaction between norms and foreign policy). This study will try to show with a case study that the transformation of a transnational idea into a norm in foreign policy may be the real reason why the interests of non-state actors and a state can converge and lead to political change. Within the process the state's perception of its identity and re-determining its position regarding the transnational idea and helping it to transform into a norm in its foreign policy behavior will be explained in a case study.

The above mentioned transformation and ontological shift in world politics has inevitably led to a re-conceptualization of national interests of states. The Westphalian principles of defining national interests (for an in-depth analysis see Spruyt, 1994) based on sovereignty, territoriality and non-intervention dominated inter-state relations for more than three centuries and still constitute an important portion of the relationship. However the post-Cold War era and the rise of the non-state actors have led to such an innovation in defining the national interest that the concept is no more limited to territoriality. In other words according to the new

understanding of foreign policy and national interest sovereignty and national territories are not necessarily two unquestionable holy principles. In contrast, as put forward by Finnemore and Sikkink (1998: 888), who are two prominent scholars of the Constructivist approach to the study of International Relations, normative and ideational concerns are considered when states define their national interests as norms and rationality are "intimately connected".

As opposed to the dominance of Realism in explaining international relations throughout the Cold War Finnemore and Sikkink (1998: 887) argue that decolonization of the post-World War II era was a normative effort of changing the status of some peoples as opposed to some other governments. Hence the end of the Cold War was only a reminder of how important norms, culture and ideas were in defining national interests and how rational it was for a national government to follow transnational norms such as the rights of women, minority rights, democratization or environmental protection as they were also supposed to be promoting the national interest alongside increasing material capabilities.[3] Therefore, adapting transnational norms on the hand led to domestic change and on the other hand led to a redefinition of national interests; or of the way how they were pursued. As conceptualized by Finnemore and Sikkink (1998: 891) a norm is standard of appropriate behavior for actors with a given identity. Similarly Katzenstein (1996: 5) defines a norm as "collective expectations for the proper behavior of actors with a given identity".

---

[3] For a detailed study of how "human rights" as a norm leads to domestic change in different regions of the world, see. Thomas Risse, Stephen C. Ropp and Kathryn Sikkink (eds.). 1999. *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. The book includes a theoretical chapter on "the socialization of human rights norms in the domestic practices" and case studies including Kenya, Uganda, South Africa, Tunisia, Morocco, Indonesia, the Philippines, Chile, Guatemala and Eastern Europe.

2.4.1 The Norm "Life Cycle"

Before arguing how norms influence national interest one should address what the "life cycle" of a norm is according to Finnemore and Sikkink (1998: 888). The Norm "Life Cycle" process has three stages. The first is "norm emergence" when norm entrepreneurs and organizational platforms from which the promoters of the norm act. There is a tipping or a threshold point to be reached when a critical mass of states adopts the norm before they get ready to change their policies (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998: 901). The second stage is "norm cascades" when more countries adopt the norm within a process of "socialization". Socialization is the mechanism through which norm leaders persuade others to adhere (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998: 902). Motivations for a state to socialize are legitimation, conformity and esteem. The third and final stage is "internalization" when "norms become so widely accepted that they are internalized by actors and achieve a taken-for-granted quality that makes conformance with the norm almost automatic" (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998: 904). Finnemore and Sikkink's study takes European integration, decolonization, women's rights and the international protection of human rights as some examples of how transnational norms lead to political change once the norm "life cycle" is completed.

Risse and Sikkink (1998) state that scholars of International Relations have been increasingly focusing on norms and ideas, though few have yet demonstrated their impact on domestic politics. They try to contribute to this gap by establishing an analytical framework for how human rights as an international norm affect policies of states. Similar to the attempt of Finnemore and Sikkink, Risse and Sikkink (1999: 1-39) try to explain how transnational norms are internalized as a process of "socialization" and with this conceptual tool they theorize the impact of norms on

domestic change focusing on the relationship between the state, society and the international/transnational.

There are three stages of the socialization process at the end of which the transnational norm is internalized. The first stage is the process of instrumental adaptation and strategic bargaining, in which the norm is accepted by the state as a way of promoting the national interest in material terms. The second stage is the process of moral-consciousness raising, in which argumentative discourses play a crucial role concerning argumentation, dialogue and persuasion. The final stage is the process of institutionalization, in which the norm becomes a habit in the policies of a country (Risse and Sikkink, 1999: 11-17). Once norms are institutionalized, "changes in government and in individual leaders matter less and less" as norms are implemented independently from the ideological side of the politicians and are simply "taken for granted" (Risse and Sikkink, 1999: 17).

2.5 Transnational Meets the State: Ideas, Identity and National Interest

Rosenau (1980: 2) predicted quite correctly in 1980 that although non-governmental organizations may never become as powerful as national governments, their attempts to move toward their goals would somehow force the governments to interact with them. Now in a world of globalization, it is clearer how non-state actors interact with governments and vice versa. The role of norms and the relationship between ideas, identity and norms in world politics is the key to understanding how the interests of transnational actors intersect with those of states. Finnemore (1996: 2) argues that state interests are defined in the context of internationally held norms and understandings about what is good and appropriate. In parallel with the rapid transformation in world politics mentioned above, states started to recognize the need

to act together with non-state actors. Such a necessity was not only a matter of increasing pressure from the international society to comply with certain norms such as human rights and liberal democracy but also a new understanding of foreign policy based on promoting national interests through the expertise, power and mobility of transnational actors. Moreover adapting transnational ideas to foreign policy options offered a serious opportunity of achieving better results in foreign policy moves toward several target countries with which there is a room for transnational ties.

Drawing on social Constructivism it can be argued that identities of actors shape the interests and behaviors of those actors to a certain extent. What one state wants depends to a large degree on who that state is and how that states perceives its role within a cultural, historical and sometimes even civilizational context (Risse and Sikkink, 1999: 9). Therefore there may be cases with no problems for a state to combine its interest with a transnational idea/norm and non-state actors that act to promote the idea/norm in order for that state to promote its own national interests.

The question why norms are of key importance in understanding policy change should be better addressed. Norms have had critical significance in the above-mentioned transformation of world politics as governments have felt the necessity to comply with international norms in order to promote their national interest by acquire prestige or legitimacy or materializing ideational or normative factors such as identity or humanitarian aid (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998: 894). In other words, norms lead to the convergence of rationality and strategic calculations of national interests, which together constitute the material side of the issue, and identity or culture. This process is called by Finnemore and Sikkink (1998: 888, 909) as "strategic social construction".

One should pay special attention to the role of Social Constructivism in the study of theories of International Relations in order to understand the growing focus on transnational relations, identity, norms and political change. With the help of increasing Social Constructivist studies on international relations, the interaction between material and ideational elements in the redefinition of national interests and formulation of foreign policy options have become important issues at stake (Risse and Sikkink, 1999: 6). Similarly, it has been understood that ideas and perceptions on identity have a certain impact on foreign policy goals of states as well as material aims such as economic and military superiority over rivals. According to Finnemore and Sikkink (1998: 894) although both Constructivism and Neo-Realism try to explain change in state behavior and in the international system, the former argues that "idea shifts and norm shifts are the main vehicles" for change as opposed to the assumption of the latter that systemic transformation occurs only as a consequence of a change in the distribution of power among states. Social Constructivism in International Relations has tried to explain why it is not only material interests of utility maximization that states seek to achieve (see Finnemore, 1996: 1-34; 128-151 for a detailed theoretical discussion).

2.5.1 Ideas and Foreign Policy: An Alternative Framework

An alternative explanation on the impact of ideas on foreign policy is offered by Goldstein and Keohane (1993), who try to establish a causal relationship with the former and the latter. Goldstein and Keohane (1993) separate ideas into three major groups; world views, principled beliefs and causal beliefs. No matter in which category an idea is, there are three causal pathways, according to these scholars, for that idea to make an influence on the foreign policy of a state. Accordingly, the first

pathway is that ideas serve as "roadmaps" (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993: 12) to define the interests of an actor and to guide the foreign policy direction on a certain issue. Secondly, ideas may contribute to "outcomes in the absence of a unique equilibrium" (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993: 12), which means that they can act as consensus-providers for decision-makers on certain unclear foreign policy directions. Thirdly, "Once ideas become embedded in rules and norms – that is, once they become institutionalized – they constrain public policy", which means that "policy would have been different in the absence of the idea in question" (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993: 12-13). This third pathway of Goldstein and Keohane can be valid for foreign policy cases in which the idea or the norm which has the impact over the decision-makers has been "internalized" as Finnemore and Sikkink (1998), or "socialized" as Risse and Sikkink (1999) argue. This study will try to understand how the transnational idea of "Turkic World" has guided the actions of Turkish decision-makers and governments regarding Turkey's relations with the Turkic world and hence try to see whether the idea has worked as a "roadmap" or "causal belief".

Katzenstein and several Constructivist scholars such as Wendt and Finnemore collected their essays concerning the social construction of states' interests in a book titled *The Culture of National Security* in 1996. The analytical tools on which this book rest, namely norms, identity and culture are very important to understand how transnational meets the state; in other words how the non-state world and the state-world intersect. Katzenstein et al. take national security as one of the most important conceptual tools in the study of International Relations and examine it with a Constructivist approach referring to norms, identity and culture. Such an approach can be easily taken to the study of foreign policy and national interest as two other

important analytical concepts since the theoretical approach of Katzenstein et al regarding national security can easily fit into the study of these two sub-fields of the academic study of International Relations. Moreover, thanks to the end of the Cold War and the ease with international connectedness and transnational relations national security is not necessarily the dominant element of states' interests and policies. According to Katzenstein (1996: 6) norms have two impacts on the policies of states. These impacts are closely related to the identity of an actor, which he defines as "a shorthand label for varying constructions of nation and statehood". Firstly, norms may have a "constitutive effect" (Katzenstein, 1996: 5) by defining the identity of the state and hence lead to the definition of national state for that state based on its identity. Secondly, norms may work somewhat like reminders of the identity of the state; leading to proper behavior (foreign policy formulation) accordingly (Katzenstein, 1996: 5). This indicated that norms either "Norms thus either define (or constitute) identities or prescribe (or regulate) behavior, or they do both" (Katzenstein, 1996: 5).

In this case, it would not be odd to argue that the transnational idea of "Turkic World" may have led to a redefinition of Turkishness – the very identity of the Turkish state – in terms of foreign policy actions to incorporate the once forgotten "Outside Turks" into its agenda.[4] Hence, Turkish nationhood with which the Turkish nation-state had been associated with somehow enlarged in definition in the eyes and minds of the Turkish decision-makers just during the collapse of the Soviet Union. Identity and Culture became two important concepts in Turkish foreign policy especially with the end of the Cold War. This was not only the case for Turkey but

---

[4] "Outside Turks" or "Dış Türkler" in Turkish was the term used for the Turkish minorities of the Balkans, the Middle East and the Caucasus as well as the Turkic-speaking peoples of the Soviet Union which included the Norhern Black Sea steps, Central Asia and the Volga basin. The term started to be used in the first years of the Republic of Turkey.

for various states and non-state actors as they had a freer hand to redefine their interests.

2.5.2 Transnational Identities

As identities matter for the making of foreign policy and definition of national interests, transnational identities matter for how transnational actors meet states. Concerning identity as a transnational element that shapes states' policies, cases of religious belonging are the prominent examples. Hundreds of millions of citizens of national governments feel loyal to religious authorities in different parts of the world, which is the very identity of those millions; and this connects individuals and peoples across boundaries with same feelings of identity. Roman Catholic Church and the Pope, and the idea of being a part of the Muslim Umma are the two strongest identity-constructers that tie Catholic and Muslims globally (Haynes, 2001; Vallier, 1971). Louër's (2008) study on transnational Shia politics is an important study combining the theoretical study of transnationalism with the transnational identity of the Shiite population of several Muslim peoples ranging from Afghanistan in the East to Lebanon in the West. In her own words, "the case of the Shia Islamic movements offers a perfect empirical illustration to some key findings of the sociology of transnational social movements" (Louër, 2008: 3) that has been developed by scholars such as Tarrow (2007), Della Porta, Kriesi and Rucht (2009) and Sikkink and Keck (1998).

Regarding the relationship between transnational networks of Shia movements and the Muslim states of the Middle East, Louër (2008: 297-298) argues that the state cannot be excluded from the analysis of transnational political practices and movements as the former gives the impetus to the latter on their ways to

transnationalize themselves. Iran is a typical example of how a state utilizes a transnational identity – the Shia identity – in order to promote its national interest in its backyard to increase its influence wherever a Shiite population with loyalty to the Marja' (the religious highest authority) lives. Therefore, the case of transnational Shiite identity indicates that the "state world" and the "society world" as Risse-Kappen argues, are not necessarily separate from, and opposite-in-nature to each other.

Secondly, governments try to keep in touch and even take the support of lobbying activities of diasporas that are formed as a result of decades of immigration from the homeland to host countries that in time become the second homeland. As a transnational extension of national identity beyond borders diasporas might contribute foreign policy formations of nation-states and promote the national interests of their homelands, for which Jewish, Greek and Armenian cases are prominent examples (Guarnizo and Smith, 1998: 7). There may be a third element of identity, which includes ethnicity or cultural-linguistic ties, and which keeps an understanding of brotherhood across national boundaries alive although policies based on such ethno-linguistic brethren are not necessarily followed by governments. Hispanic Latin America, Slavic peoples of Eastern Europe, Greek populations in Greece and Cyprus (Hellenic civilization), Arabic-dominated North Africa and the Middle East – except for the Persians and Kurds – and finally Turkic-speaking peoples of roughly what is called Eurasia are the major cases of identity with a transnational character.

In all these cases peoples with same ethnic origins, and close or almost the same languages live as citizens of various nation states. Although they make references to their historical identities in their official texts, but are supposed to

establish relations based on Realist conceptions of national interest with their "brother" governments and peoples. Compared with transnational Shiite identity, it is impossible to claim that Turks of the Balkans, Anatolia, the Crimea, the Caucasus, Volga-Ural region, Siberia and Central Asia have a commonly shared understanding of "Turkishness" or belonging to the same ancestry going back to the Huns or the Göktürks (the Turkic Khaganate). However there is a considerable degree of intellectual and non-governmental activism since the late 19th century, when the Turkic intellectuals in İstanbul, Bakhchisaray, Kazan, Baku and Bukhara started sharing their views on the need to unite culturally and politically as the Ottoman and Russian Empires were being shaken by domestic and international factors.

2.6 Conclusion

Goldstein and Keohane (1993: 26) "recognize that ideas and interests are not phenomenologically separate and that all interests involve beliefs, and therefore ideas" as decision-makers understand them. Similarly, Risse and Sikkink (1999: 2) argue that scholars of International Relations are increasingly interested in studying norms and ideas though very few of them have yet made it clear how and what kind of an effect they make on the policies of a state. This builds on the earlier argument of Risse-Kappen (1995: 3-36) that there is a need to demonstrate how the "state world" and the "society world", which are the domain of national interests of states and interests and goals of non-state actors, intersect. This study aims to contribute to Risse-Kappen's argument by trying to demonstrate how and under what circumstances transnational ideas/norms influence the foreign policy of a state. Contrary to the assumption of the scholarly literature on the "counter-hegemonic" (Guarnizo and Smith, 1998: 5) nature of transnational actors and relations on the

power and interests of the nation-states, there can be cases that are closely related to ideas and identities that are perceived to be promoting the national interest by national decision-makers.

This study is an attempt to explain how a transnational idea may have led to a redefinition and formulation of foreign policy of a state toward a particular issue area. The transnational idea is the idea of "Turkic World", which incorporates the brotherhood and cultural integrity of Turkic-speaking peoples that live in a wide geography stretching from the Balkans to Eastern Turkestan in China, and from Siberia in Russia to Kirkuk in Iraq. The foreign policy case is Turkey's active foreign policy toward the five newly independent republics of the Former Soviet Union, whose population are ethnic cousins of the Turks of Anatolia and who speak a Turkic dialect as well as other Turkic-speaking peoples such as the Crimean Tatars of the Ukraine and the Gagauz of Moldova, who live as minorities in their countries.[5] The case study may seem to be a very big one with numerous countries and peoples to be examined. However, all these peoples are incorporated into Turkish foreign policy as the branches of a uniform fraternity. Therefore in order to examine how "transnational meets the state" theoretically our case has to include all the components of a certain issue of foreign policy. Although Finnemore, Sikkink, Risse-Kappen and Katzenstein have accepted to demonstrate the impact of international norms such as human rights on political change this study tries to incorporate a somehow regional-and at the same time- transnational idea and its process of becoming a norm – though not yet internalized – in Turkish foreign policy into the theoretical frameworks constructed by these scholars.

---

[5] These five republics are in alphabetical order Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

This study, moreover tries to see whether there has been a "socialization" of the "Turkic World" in Turkish foreign policy as conceptualized by Risse and Sikkink on the case of human rights. This means that the evolution of the idea's status in Turkish politics and whether it has been consolidated with the help of the Turkish state will be analyzed. In order to understand this, this study will follow a chronological order to examine the initial impact of the idea, how it led to a reconfiguration of national interests and whether it has led to the internalization of a certain behavior in Turkish foreign policy. Finally, this study will also focus on how the process of incorporation of the norm into Turkish foreign policy, in other words the norm "life cycle" has paved the way for increasing transnational ties and non-governmental activities among Turkic-speaking peoples. The earlier studies on the impact of human rights as a transnational norm will be very helpful for this study as they offer sound theoretical frameworks such as the norm "life cycle" of Finnemore and Sikkink, and the norm "socialization" of Risse and Sikkink.

CHAPTER 3

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF THE TRANSNATIONAL IDEA OF "TURKIC WORLD"

3.1 "Outside Turks" and the Emergence of Turkic Intellectual Movement and Activism

3.1.1 Turkic Peoples of the Russian Empire and Muslim Awakening

Before addressing the chronological development of the transnational idea of the Turkic World one has to say that it was the "Outside Turks" rather than the Turks of Turkey, or the Ottoman Empire, who led to the emergence of this idea. Hence for the purpose of this study Turkish foreign policy has been shaped by an idea which is closely connected with Turkish identity but which has its roots outside Turkey. The emergence of the idea that Turkic-speaking peoples should get closer in cultural, economic and political terms with a transnational character dates back to the late 19th century when the Turkic-Muslim intelligentsia of the Russian Empire started a campaign to claim the rights of their people. The effort was a counter-move against the chauvinistic identity policies of the Tsarist regime and at the same time a struggle for improving the socio-economic and political status of Turkic peoples as subjects

of the Russian Empire. What turned the efforts of the Turkic intelligentsia to protect the rights of their peoples into a transnational movement was that they united their opinions through several publications and meetings in several cities such as Kazan, Bakhchisaray, and Baku[6]. It must be stressed that these cities, where books and journals promoting the culture and political rights of the Turkic peoples were published and meetings among the intelligentsia was summoned, all belonged to a single state – the Russian Empire, and later on the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, their impact reached beyond borders very soon as people in İstanbul, which was the capital of the Ottoman Empire and even in Kashgar, which was a part of China since 1877 and the home of Uighurs for centuries read those books and journals, and were informed about the meetings taking place in several parts of the Russian Empire.

According to Landau (1995: 7), the census of 1897 indicated that the number of Turks living in the Russian Empire was 13,600,000 out of a total population of 125,600,000, which constituted almost 11 per cent. It was the Tatars of Kazan, which is today the capital of the autonomous Republic of Tatarstan within the Russia, whose intellectuals first spread the idea that the Turkic peoples of the Russian Empire should unite politically in order to have a representation in the *Duma* and hence protect the rights of their peoples. The Tatar intellectuals found out that common roots had to be discovered in order to re-connect the geographically and politically separated cousins of the Russian Empire such as the Kazan Tatars, Crimean Tatars, Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Turkmens and Azerbaijanis. The most common point was with no doubts religion; they were all Muslims as opposed to the official Orthodox Christianity of the Tsar and the Russian majority. However, the wave of nationalism was dominant in Europe and there were other non-Turkic Muslim

---

[6] Today Kazan is the capital of the autonomous Republic of Tatarstan in the Russian Federation, Bakhchisaray is a small town in the Crimea, Ukraine, and Baku is the capital of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

peoples within the Empire, whit which it was more difficult to establish a unity. As Landau (1995: 9) puts forward "the linguistic element was obviously the first choice, as languages were similar, although not identical, among these groups, and intellectuals could communicate in a sort of 'High Turkish'". Besides intellectuals, it was not too difficult for different Turkic societies to understand each other after learning about the basics of grammatical change among dialects. This meant that Turkic cultural integration was quite easy especially in prominent Turkic cities such as İstanbul, Baku, Kazan and Bukhara due first and foremost to linguistic affinity.

3.1.2 Unity in Language, Thought and Action: Basis for Turkic Activism

Ismail Gasprinskiy, or Gaspıralı in Turkish, was the prominent intellectual who raised the consciousness among the intelligentsia of the Turkic peoples that the only way to prevent assimilation and achieve social, political and economic development was unity. Hence his famous words "unity in language, thought and action" became the motto of contemporary politicians, NGOs, activists and intellectuals who have dealt with and supported closer relations among the Turkic World. Gasprinskiy had a triggering impact in various parts of the Russian Empire where Turkic peoples lived. His method of modern education, which he titled *Usul-ü Cedid*, "the new method" became quite popular in the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Volga-Ural region; and the schools he opened in the Crimea became a model for the hundreds of new schools opened for the Turkic students throughout the Russian Empire, in which native tongues were the medium of education (see Kırımlı 2004 for detailed information on Gasprinsky's life). What was important about Gasprinskiy concerning the emergence of a transnational Turkic higher identity was that his schools promoted the same ideas among the new generations of the Turkic peoples of

the Russian Empire. What was even more important was that his journal titled *Tercüman* – the interpreter – was published deliberately in a common Turkic language which could be understood in Kashgar (Eastern Turkestan), İstanbul, Baku, Kazan and Bukhara. Gasprinskiy consciously used a language of common Turkic – in which his native Crimean Tatar was very useful as this dialect is a form of transition between the two major branches of contemporary Turkic languages; Oghuz and Kipchak – and insisted on the idea that a language of communication had to be adopted by the Turkic intelligentsia in order to have a united political and cultural position. As the impact of *Tercüman* and Gasprinskiy were growing bigger and bigger, schools based on "the new method", which educated new generations of Turkic students with the idea that their future is brighter as long as they come closer with their ethnic cousins living under the hegemony of the Tsar, flourished in Central Asia, the Caucasus and the Volga-Ural region.

Gasprinskiy's journal *Tercüman* was first published in 1883 in the Crimea and readers and reached thousands of readers all over the Turkic-speaking lands until 1918 when it was published for the last time (Kırımlı, 2007: 155-176). In three decades Gasprinskiy's *Tercüman* and modern schools created an atmosphere of rapprochement and even a re-discovery of a common identity, which as a transnational phenomenon, have had an impact on contemporary politics of various countries including Turkey, Russia and the Caucasus and Central Asia regionally. The movement's attraction and popularity strengthened enormously during the upheaval going on within the Russian Empire at the turn of the 20th century. As Landau (1995: 12) indicates, the number of periodicals published by Turkic groups in the Russian Empire rose impressively to 250 between 1905 and 1917. The new generation of Turkic intellectuals all over the Russian Empire, who were supporting

the modernization of the education systems of Turkic peoples and making them more active in the political life of the Empire would be called as the *Jadid*s. From the early 1900s until the establishment of Bolshevik rule in the regions where Turkic peoples form the majority, *Jadid*s would be the major figures of Turkic nationalist activism.

3.1.3 Turkic Activism in the Russian Empire: "Norm Entrepreneurs"

Turkic intellectuals and activists of the Russian Empire are the architects of the transnational idea of "Turkic World". In this sense, they have played the role of "norm entrepreneurs" (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998) and therefore, have tried to influence state policies. Having reached a consensus on the future of their oppressed peoples, Turkic intellectuals from the Crimea, Kazan and Baku agreed to gather All-Russia Muslim congresses in major cities of the Empire (Bennigsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay, 1967: 43-45). This was also a move to transform the modernist movement of education and culture into a political one by penetrating into the political life in St. Petersburg. Hence, leading Turkic intellectuals of the Russian Empire such as Gasprinskiy from the Crimea, Akçuraoğlu Yusuf – later Yusuf Akçura, famous historian and politician of the Republican period – from Kazan and Akhmet Agayev – later famous Turkish politician Ağaoğlu of the Republican period – from Azerbaijan acted together to summon an all-Russian Turkic-Muslim Congress in 1905 in the city of Nizhniy-Novgorod. The Congress was titled *Russiya Musulmanlarinin Kongresi* – Congress of the Muslims of Russia – as Islam was still the predominant identity among the rural populations and moreover supporting a pan-Turkic identity would provoke the Russian authorities at the very start. The second Congress was held in 1906 in the capital of the Empire, St. Petersburg, with Gasprinskiy as the chairman. After the third Congres, which was organized in the

same year, the movement became one of political activism as Turkic leaders established a party named *Ittifak-ı Müslimin* – Union of Muslims – and sided with the liberal Cadet Party in the *Duma*. After the February Revolution in 1917 Turkic-Muslim delegates of the *Duma* convened another All-Russia Muslim Congress in St. Petersburg with the hope of agreeing on the future of the political life of the Turkic-Muslim peoples of the collapsing Empire. However their hopes were deemed to fail soon after the Bolshevik Revolution of November 1917 as the Soviets took control of the country totally in 1921 and changed the fate of the Turks as well as that of Russians, Ukrainians and all the other peoples of the former Empire.

3.2 Turkic World in Turkey: Immigration and Turkism

There was certainly a normative side of the struggle of Turks of the Russian Empire for the Turkish intelligentsia centered in İstanbul. There were several reasons for that. Firstly, there is no doubt that the Tatar, Azerbaijani and Turkestani intellectuals of the Russian Empire had great sympathy toward the Ottoman Empire as the Sultan was at the same time the Caliph of all the Muslims in the world and the Turks of Turkey were an independent Turkic nation whose very independence was threatened by the Russian Empire. Moreover, Gasprinskiy as the intellectual and activist who spread the idea of unity among all the Turkic peoples was from Crimea and his native Crimean Tatar was very close to the İstanbul Turkish. Hence his *Tercüman* could easily be followed in İstanbul causing the newly emerging Turkish nationalism to acquire a Pan-Turkic character. One obstacle to the popularity and strength of the idea of bringing Turkic peoples closer was the Pan-Islamist foreign policy of the Sultan Abdülhamid II, who was famous for his authoritarian rule. However Turkish intellectuals, namely the Young Turks, had already met one of the

most important ideological outcomes of the French Revolution; nationalism. By the late 19th century Ottoman intellectuals in İstanbul started publishing books, journals and pamphlets on the might of the Turkish ethnicity and its great role in the evolution of world history. Akçuraoğlu Yusuf, a Kazan Tatar intellectual and activist, has been accepted to be the first to conceptualize the ideological debate going on İstanbul in order to find a solution for the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. In 1904 Akçuraoğlu Yusuf published an article titled *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* – Three Models of Politics – in which he compared Ottomanism, Islamism and Turkism as the correct way to prevent the collapse of the Empire and bring the glorious days back (see Akçura, 2005).

Hence the term "Turkism" to include Turkish nationalism entered Turkish intellectual and political agenda. Turkism was a political option to unite the Turks of Turkey with their ethnic brothers in Iran, the Russian Empire and China under the rule of the Ottoman Sultan as it was the only possible way to guarantee the survival of the Empire and the Turkish nation. According to Landau (1995: 36), there were two major reasons why Turkism or Turkish nationalism became the only political option by eradicating Ottomanism and Islamism. The first reason was the end of Abdulhamid II's reign in 1908 as a result of the coup committed by the Committee of Union and Progress and the second reason was the increasing number and activity of émigrés leaving the Russian Empire for Turkey by the same year.

Immigration from the Russian Empire to the Ottoman Empire has paved the way for transnationalization of activism among Turkic intellectuals. Émigré intellectuals of Kazan Tatar, Crimean Tatar and Azerbaijani origin continued their activism in İstanbul. They, on the one hand tried to influence nationalist circles in İstanbul and on the other hand established transnational contacts that would lay the

basis of advocacy networks with the Russian Empire. The NGOs they established in İstanbul strongly propagated for the protection of the rights of Tatars, Uzbeks, Azerbaijanis or any other Turkic groups living under the rule of the Tsar. Later on these intellectuals such as Ahmet Ağaoğlu and Yusuf Akçura would contribute to the official state ideology of the young Republic of Turkey regarding Turkish nationalism, historical studies, cultural politics and even party politics. Consequently, immigration of Turkic "norm entrepreneurs" who came to live under the Ottoman rule from the Russian Empire made a big impact during the ideological upheaval going on in İstanbul when both Empires were about to collapse and established the future patterns of transnational Turkic activism.

Prominent Turkish intellectuals such as Ömer Seyfeddin, Halide Edip (Adıvar), Mehmet Emin (Yurdakul) and Ziya Gökalp responded to the call of émigrés from the Crimea, Kazan and Baku by strongly supporting Turkism as the only available, practical and also honorable political action. Besides the associations formed by Turkic intellectuals, Turkist literary circles and academics established Pan-Turkist associations soon after the Committee of Union and Progress took control of the country in 1908. *Türk Derneği* (Turkish Association) was the first to be established in 1908. The association collected intellectuals and promoted the rights of Turks all over the world with a transnational understanding. The establishment of the *Türk Ocağı* (Turkish Hearth) in 1912 was a turning point for Turkish nationalism as well as the institutionalization of the idea that Turkic peoples should get closer in cultural, economic and political terms among Turkish intellectuals and politicians (see Sarınay, 2005 for an historical overview of the Turkish Hearth). *Türk Ocağı* became a gathering point for nationalist intellectuals such as Ziya Gökalp, Halide Edip, Ahmet Ferit and Hamdullah Suphi as well as émigré activists such as Ahmet

Ağaoğlu and Yusuf Akçura. The establishment of *Türk Ocağı* was a turning point for Turkish nationalism as well as for the impact of the "Outside Turks" and their idea of saving the brother peoples from Russian imperialism within the Ottoman political domain. At the same time the nationalist Young Turks held control of the country and opened rooms for the penetration of the Turkist ideology into the political agenda of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP). Ziya Gökalp, a prominent Turkish nationalist and pan-Turkist who wrote that "homeland is neither Turkey for Turks nor Turkestan, homeland is a great and eternal country; Turan"[7] was a member of the Central Commission of the CUP and had a certain influence on the nationalist policies of the government. Moreover, one of the three leaders of the CUP, Enver, was a leading Turkist. As Enver Pasha became the Minister of War in 1914 it was becoming clearer that the Ottomanist foreign policy of the CUP would evolve into a pan-Turkist one although the remaining two leaders of the party, Talat and Cemal Pashas were not Turkists (see Hanioğlu, 2008: 150-202 for detailed information).

Consequently, Turkist intellectuals and civil society movements in İstanbul were connected to the ones in the Crimea, Kazan, Baku and Central Asia thanks to the transnational impact of émigré activists coming to Turkey from the Russian Empire and journals published in prominent cultural centers of the Turkic-speaking world. These cities were aware of the intellectual and political struggle going on in each other as both the Ottoman and the Russian Empires were about to collapse and new windows of opportunities were opening for a rapprochement among the Turkic cousins. This very first step taken by the intellectuals at the turn of the 20th century was the cornerstone of the transnationalization of the idea of "Turkic World" as well as the transnationalization of civic activism among the Turkic peoples.

---

[7] Ziya Gokalp's poem titled "Turan" first appeared in Turkist circles in 1911 in the prominent nationalist journal *Genç Kalemler* (Young Pens); see Sarınay, 2005: 116.

46

3.3 The First World War, the Bolshevik Revolution and the New Republic of Turkey

3.3.1 The First World War: CUP and Turkism as a State Ideology

The First World War inevitably transformed the Turkist movement into an irredentist one as uniting with the brothers in the Caucasus and Central Asia was the only hopeful action to awake the collapsing Empire. Due to war conditions intellectual efforts for protecting the rights of the Turkic peoples of the Russian Empire were curbed by enmity and the desire to enlarge by military terms at the expanse of the Tsar. What made the World War I a turning point for the transnational idea of "Turkic World" was that it met the state seriously for the first time, as the leaders of the Union and Progress tried to utilize Turkism as a means of resurrecting the collapsing Empire. This meant that the state needed the transnational idea of the Turkic World and the intellectual and political activism that had been going on in major cities with significant Turkic-speaking populations in order to promote the national interest.

Hence the Committee of Union and Progress relied heavily upon the views of the Turkist intellectuals and the Turkic émigré activists in İstanbul. Some examples were the Turkist sociologist Ziya Gökalp and the Azerbaijani émigré intellectual and activist Hüseyinzade Ali Bey who became the members of the Central Commission – the Executive Board – of the CUP (Sarınay, 2005: 158-159). Nevertheless, Turkism was not the only political tool used by the Committee of Union and Progress as Ottomanism was followed as a way of uniting the non-Turkic Muslim peoples of the Balkans against the increasing Slavic aggression, and Islamism was used to a great extent – because of the German insistence benefiting from the authority of the Caliph on Muslim peoples all over the world – in order to re-ally the Arabs with İstanbul

against British imperialism. Enver Pasha, who died in a battle against the Bolshevik forces in today's Tajikistan in 1922, was the primary actor behind İstanbul's search for Turkic-Muslim revolts in Afghanistan and Iran; as well as sending troops to Baku in 1918 to save it from allied Armenian and Russian invasion (see Andican, 2009: 306-321; 329-341 for wider information on relations between the Ottoman Empire and Central Asia during the First World War).

The First World War brought about a serious dilemma for the Turkic intellectuals of the Russian Empire, who supported unification and closer ties with the Turks of the Ottoman territories. In November 1914 the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed V declared a "Great Jihad" to call the Muslim subjects of the Ottoman, Russian and British Empires for a religious war against the "infidel". However, not much could be done by the Turks of the Russian Empire as the War put an end to the liberalizing political climate in Russia. Although Turkic activists of Central Asia organized aid campaigns for the Ottoman armies since the First Balkan War of 1912, their efforts came to a halt as two Empires were bitter enemies during the Great War (Andican, 2009: 308-309). The aid campaigns organized by the activists in Central Asia would later become a turning point for the transnational connection between the region and Anatolia as all these efforts were carried by what we today tend to title as "advocacy networks". Despite all kinds of difficulties related to the war, journals that promoted Turkic rapprochement continued to be published and political groups such as the Young Bukharans or the Young Khivans[8] in Central Asia continued to struggle for the rights of their peoples (d'Encausse, 1994a: 241-249).

---

[8] These "Young" movements in the Russian Empire were all ideologically inspired by the "Young Turks" and organized according to the principles of the Committee of Union and Progress. In 1917 the Committee of Union and Progress was established in Tashkent by Ottoman officers who were sent by the government in İstanbul in order to organize a rebellion against the Russians.

Russian Empire was in a turmoil in 1917 when two revolutions, the former in February and the latter in November shook and finally destroyed the more-than-two hundred years old Empire. Turkic intellectuals and activists such as the Bashkir Zeki Velidov[9], Kazak Mustafa Chokayev, Tatar Mirseyid Sultangaliyev[10], Azerbaijani Nariman Narimanov, Uzbek Feyzullah Khojayev and many others took active roles in the establishment of the new regime in their regions in order to make the Turkic peoples have greater say in the newly emerging political system. Resistance of several Tatar and Central Asian activists against the Sovietization of the new regime could not help much and the Bolsheviks took control of the entire boundaries of the former Russian Empire in 1921.

3.3.2 Mustafa Kemal, Turkish War of Independence and Turkism

The leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress, Enver, Cemal and Talat Pashas all had to leave Turkey as the Ottoman Empire lost the war and the Turkish armies in Azerbaijan had to retreat as a result of the Armistice of Mudros signed in 1918. Although the independence movement and the anti-imperialist struggle led by Mustafa Kemal was Turkish nationalist and Mustafa Kemal himself was influenced by the ideas of Turkist intellectuals such as Ziya Gökalp and Yusuf Akçura to a great extent, the nationalist war of independence aimed to save the territories declared in *Misak-ı Millî* (the National Oath) including Anatolia, Thrace and the Mosul province – roughly today's Northern Iraq – to sustain a Muslim-Turkish homogeneity (see Hale, 2000: 44-78 on Ankara's foreign policy during the Turkish War of

---

[9] Zeki Velidi Togan of the Turkish Republican period.

[10] Sultangaliyev, a socialist pan-Turkist who allied with the Bolsheviks in the Revolution, has attracted utmost attention from Turkish left-wing intellectuals since the last decade in parallel with the search for new foreign policy options. Some of the works on Sultangaliyev in Turkish are, Halit Kakınç. 2003. *Sultangaliyev ve Milli Komünizm* (Sulyangaliyev and National Communism). İstanbul: Bulut Yayınları; Halit Kakınç. 2004. *Destansı Kuramcı Sultangaliyev* (Legendary Theoretician Sultangaliyev). İstanbul: Bulut Yayınları; Attila İlhan. 2006. *Sultangaliyev: Avrasya'da Dolaşan Hayalet* (Sulangaliyev: The Ghost that Roams in Eurasia). İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları.

Independence). On the other hand, the Bolsheviks were the only option to ally against the British and the Greek in terms of money and arms supply. Throughout the war, a great majority of the pan-Turkist intellectuals, who gathered together under the umbrella of the above mentioned *Türk Ocağı*, moved to Ankara, the center of the national independence struggle, in order to support Mustafa Kemal and the Grand National Assembly. They had to sacrifice their focus and emphasis on the "Outside Turks" although several of them were from the Crimea, Azerbaijan or Kazan, because the last independent Turkish land, Turkey, was under invasion.

At the same time, Enver Pasha was continuing his struggle in Turkestan as the leader of the *Basmachi*[11] movement, which was a major Turkic uprising against the Soviet rule in Central Asia that lasted in 1931 (see Olcott, 1981; Hayit, 1997 for detailed information on the *Basmachi* uprising in Turkestan). According to d'Encause (1994a: 252) Enver Pasha was using the Turkic uprising in Central Asia as a stepping stone to fulfill his political ambition of become the leader of the Turkish War of Independence. This was also the perception related to Enver Pasha in Ankara. Pan-Turkism was not only associated with Enver Pasha and the CUP, but also impossible to be implemented as the new government in Ankara had to fight its own war against the Greek invasion by conducting successful battles and following a rational and anti-imperialist foreign policy simultaneously. It can be seen that Mustafa Kemal himself dismissed pan-Turkism as a foreign policy option several times and stressed the importance of establishing an independent state only including the Turks of Thrace, Anatolia and the Mosul district (Atatürk, 2005: 310-311).[12]

---

[11] Although the uprising was called by Russian authorities as *Basmachi*, which means "bandit" in Uzbek, the movement was a national liberation struggle of the Turkic peoples of Turkestan.
[12] In his Great Speech he made in the Turkish Grand National Assembly, Atatürk dismissed pan-Islamism and pan-Turkism as two irredentist and imperialistic political moves; see Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. 2005. *Nutuk* (The Speech). (Reprint). İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları, 310. For Ataturk's speeches on the "Outside Turks" see Utkan Kocatürk. 1999. *Atatürk'ün Fikir ve Düşünceleri* (Ataturk's Ideas

Mustafa Kemal's government signed the Moscow Treaty, which started the official alliance between the two countries during the Turkish War of Independence, with the Soviet Union in March 1921 and Enver Pasha died in a battle against the Bolshevik armies in today's Tajikistan while he was commanding the *Basmachi* uprising in August 1922. Moreover, Ankara had to overlook the collapse of the Turkish nationalist Azerbaijan Democratic Republic in April 1920, and the establishment of Bolshevik rule in the country (Swietochowski, 1995: 86-87). Consequently, although Turkish nationalism was the dominant ideology of the commanders of the Turkish War of Independence, it was much more narrowly defined as pan-Turkism was perceived to be an irrational as well as an irredentist foreign policy option that would curb the international reputation of Ankara.

3.3.3 Bolshevik Revolution and Changing Fate of Turkic Activism

Although Mustafa Kemal did not follow a pan-Turkist foreign policy agenda, relations between Turkey and the Caucasus and Central Asia were quite dense and strong. The Turkic intellectuals − generally of Kazak or Uzbek origin − of the Turkestan region continued to publish journals and newspapers with great emphasis on the Turkish War of Independence (see Andican, 2009: 399-405 for the impact of the Turkish War of Independence in Central Asia). Mustafa Kemal was a legendary leader in the eyes of the Central Asian activists and his anti-imperialist ideology was a popular one as the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution had offered a temporary liberal atmosphere for the Turkic peoples of the former Russian Empire. Today it is no secret that a great portion of the money that was given by Lenin to Ankara in 1921

---

and Thoughts). Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 219. It can be seen in Atatürk's speeches that he makes reference to Turkish history including Turkic emperors such as Attila, Timur and Suleiman the Magnificent. He refers to the "greatness" of Turkish history and Turkish nation as a symbol of civilization since they first appeared on the scene of humanity in Central Asia. Despite his romantic views on Turkish history, Atatürk followed constitutionalist nationalism.

for its war against the Greek invasion came from the People's Republic of Bukhara. The president of the Bukharan Republic, Osman Khojaev, who would later join Enver Pasha's revolt against the Bolsheviks, and Feyzullah Khojaev, who was a prominent Uzbek socialist-nationalist were the main actors behind the 11 million Rubles sent to Ankara by Lenin (Andican, 2009: 396-397). Moreover Ankara's victory in the Battle of Sakarya against the Greek armies was celebrated by thousands of demonstrators in Tashkent, which was then a part of the Turkistan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (Andican, 2009: 402). The Moscow Treaty signed by the Grand National Assembly and the Soviet Union in March 1921 paved the way for establishing closer ties with the Caucasus and Central Asia, which were then ruled by socialist leaders with pan-Turkist backgrounds. The first diplomatic relations between Ankara and the People's Republic of Bukhara were established in January 1922 with an official visit paid by the Bukharan envoys to Mustafa Kemal. Soon after the visit, in April 1922, the Grand National Assembly sent Turkish representatives to Bukhara, Galip Pasha and Ruşen Eşref (Ünaydın), as counselor and undersecretary of the consulate. However, Enver Pasha's active role in the *Basmachi* revolt stopped Moscow from letting the Turkish delegation reach Bukhara and hence the diplomatic relations were broken.

3.4 New Turkish Identity in Turkey and Turkish-Soviet Relations: the Idea of "Turkic World" Weakens

3.4.1 Turkey under Nation-Building: "Turkishness" Re-defined

The transnational character of Turkey's relations with the Turkic peoples continued in the early years of the foundation of the Republic of Turkey. This was because Turkic intellectuals who were either in exile in European capitals or who

fled Bolshevik repression came to Turkey, mostly under protection of Mustafa Kemal, in order to contribute to the state-building process in Turkey. Just like the émigré community, which emerged in the early 1910s in İstanbul, now in Ankara, there were various intellectuals and former activists of Azerbaijani, Crimean Tatar, Kazan Tatar and Uzbek origin. The most prominent several among them were Mehmed Emin Resulzade, former president of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, Sadri Maksudov[13], former Member of Parliament of the Russian *Duma*, Zeki Velidov[14], former president of the stillborn Republic of Bashkortostan, Crimean Tatar politician Cafer Seydahmet Kırımer, who would be the major figure behind the reorganization of Crimean Tatar diaspora in Turkey by the early 1950s and Osman Khojayev[15], former president of the Bukhara People's Republic. Among the "Outside Turks" in Turkey several of them such as Yusuf Akçura and Sadri Maksudi Arsal, who were both Kazan Tatars, became close friends and consultants of Atatürk, but had to withdraw their pan-Turkist ideologies in favor of the official Turkish nationalism. Therefore, even if there were émigré Turkic leaders inside Turkey, they did not have a transnational capacity of activity.

Transnational character of the idea of rapprochement among the Turkic peoples came to a halt by the 1920s to be awakened decades later, due to the simultaneous political developments in Turkey and the Soviet Union. After Enver Pasha's death, former-Ottoman soldiers who were still active in Central Asia were sent out of the region. Moreover, Moscow's stance against pan-Turkism got fierce,

---

[13] Sadri Maksudov took the surname Arsal as a citizen of Turkey. As a consultant to Atatürk, he contributed to the higher education and legal system in Turkey. He was a professor of law at Ankara Law School and a Member of Parliament.
[14] Zeki Velidov, later Zeki Velidi Togan as a citizen of Turkey, was a world-wide prestigious professor of Turkic peoples and Turkic history.
[15] Osman Khojayev took the surname Kocaoğlu as a citizen of Turkey. As a policy of appeasing the Soviet Union just before the Second World War broke out, Kocaoğlu was dismissed from Turkish citizenship. Similarly, several other Turkic activists were released from Turkish citizenship due to Soviet pressure in the 1930s.

which led to the cancellation of the plans of Turkic activists to unite all Central Asian peoples under a socialist state, part of but autonomous from Moscow. At the same time Turkish War of Independence resulted in the foundation of the Republic of Turkey, in which the main focus would be on creating a nation-state inside the national borders without causing problems for the neighborhood (see Sander, 1993: 34-37 for Atatürk's legacy on Turkish foreign policy). It was hence considered by the rulers of the new regime that dealing with the problems of the "Outside Turks" would be both impossible and irrational as the country itself was war-torn and had to be reconstructed in a peaceful atmosphere. Although the new regime established in Turkey was based on a nationalist understanding, Turkish identity was defined within constitutional boundaries eliminating references to ethnicity (Yeğen, 2004: 51-66). According to Heper (2007: 85), there was a strong tendency to define a Turk based the history and traditions of Anatolia only. Arguing that pan-Islamism and pan-Turkism have never been policies that can be implemented, Mustafa Kemal told in his Great Speech that "national policy" means depending on one's own power and resources inside national borders and hence preventing the nation from impossible dreams (Atatürk, 2005: 311). Hence, even the hundreds of thousands of Turks in today's Northern Iraq, or the Mosul district in Ottoman terms, had to remain outside the definition of Turkishness although the *Misak-ı Milli* encompassed the region as a legitimate land of Turkey and Turks.

3.4.2 Turkish-Soviet Alliance

The Treaty of Friendship and Neutrality signed in December 1925 between Turkey and the Soviet Union further assured the Bolsheviks that Turkey would not interfere with the protection of the rights of the Turkic peoples of the Crimea,

Caucasus, Central Asia and the Volga-Ural regions in return for economic and political support for the young Republic of Turkey. On the other hand Bolshevik rule in the Crimea, Caucasus and the Volga-Ural regions was firmly established by the early 1920s as a result of the Red victory in the Civil War. The only remaining part with serious problems related to pan-Turkism was Turkestan, which was divided into different autonomous republics in 1924 thanks to the policies of prominent Bolshevik figures such as Chicherin, the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the USSR between 1923 and 1930, and Stalin, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union between 1922 and 1953 (see d'Encausse, 1994b: 254-266; Karasar, 2002: 199-209 for detailed information on the delimitation of Central Asia).

It appears in the official Soviet documents that Turkestan region, which literally means the land of Turks, was named as *Srednyaya Aziya*, Middle Asia, which would later evolve into *Tsentralnaya Aziya*, Central Asia as more frequently used in English, by the early 1920s. This was a clear manifestation of the policy of dividing Turkestan into different autonomous republics based on different branches of Turkic peoples and the Tajiks, the only Persian-speaking people of Central Asia. Hence was founded the Uzbek and Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republics in 1924. Tajikistan was made an autonomous republic in 1929, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan followed in 1938. Finally, in 1938 Central Asia comprised of five autonomous republics. At the same time Stalin's totalitarian rule in the country made it impossible for Turkic intellectuals and activists of the Soviet Union to establish contacts with their fellows in Turkey, and vice versa.

According to Andican, the Treaty of Neutrality and Friendship signed in 1925 between Ankara and Moscow was a turning point for Turkey's attitude toward the Turkic world. As the young republic needed Soviet diplomatic support in the

international arena, it had to sacrifice all its attention paid to the Turks of the former Russian Empire and restrict Turkist activities – publications and civic activism – in order not to harm the pragmatic relationship with the Soviet Union (see Andican, 2009: 438-442 for political pressures on Turkic intellectuals living in Turkey in the 1920s). In 1927, *Türk Ocağı*, which had established the intellectual basis of Turkish nationalism as well as the transnational character of the Turkic advocacy networks, was forced by the Republican People's Party (RPP) to replace the phrase "Turks all over the world" with "the territory of the Republic of Turkey" to address its area of interest. *Türk Ocağı* was finally closed in 1931 mainly because it did not fit into the official nationalist ideology and was transformed into the *Halkevleri* (People's Houses), which made it impossible to sustain the transnational connection (see Sarınay, 2005: 251-359 on the official nationalism policy of the Republic of Turkey, the place of the "Outside Turks" in the official policy, and transformation of *Türk Ocağı* into *Halkevleri*).

On the other hand, things were not going well for the Turkic intellectuals as the Soviet Union allowed no opinion to be expressed other than the propaganda of the official socialism. "Outside Turks" who had been promoting Turkic rapprochement were titled as spies of Mustafa Kemal and pan-Turkists and hence were eliminated through means of political repression (Andican, 2009: 449). The demarcation of Turkestan reached its final stage in 1936 with the foundation of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan as two distinct autonomous republics, and Stalin's Great Purge ended the lives of national intellectuals in 1938. Hence by 1940 there was an "iron curtain" between Turkey and the Turkic peoples of the Soviet Union, which made both inter-state and transnational contact impossible. Finally, Moscow changed the alphabet used by Turkic – and Muslim – peoples of the Soviet Union from Arabic

to Latin between by 1930 and from Latin to Cyrillic by 1942. This inevitably made all kinds of publications made by the Turkic peoples of the Soviet Union illegible in Turkey and vice versa, and hence further limited transnational connections and activities.

3.5 The Second World War, the Cold War and Turkish Nationalists

3.5.1 The Second World War: Pan-Turkism in Jail

While The Second World War was a nightmare for İnönü and Turkey, it was seen as an opportunity to overthrow communist rule over the Turkic peoples of the Soviet Union by pan-Turkist activists. Therefore, the idea of "Turkic World" had the chance to be re-awakened. Turkic leaders, who were either Soviet citizens or in exile in European cities, reorganized within the Nazi Army to fight against the Soviet Army. In December 1942, upon the request of Von Pappen, the German ambassador in Ankara, the leader of the "Turkestan Legions", which fought alongside the Nazis against the Bolsheviks, Veli Kajum Khan[16] visited Turkey to conduct talks with Turkish security establishment and politicians in order to find support for the Turkic war against the Soviet Union (Andican, 2007: 473, 520-524; see Deringil, 2004: 129-132 for detailed information on the official attitude of the Turkish government on the German offer of liberating the Turkic lands of the Soviet Union in the Caucasus and Central Asia as puppet states for Turkey).

However İnönü was quite determined not to make Turkey, an active participant of the War. It was quite surprising that in order to make the increasing

---

[16] Veli Kajum Khan was a Turkestani activist supported by the Nazis against the Soviet Union. He was the chairman of the *Milli Türkistan Birlik Komitesi* (Turkestan National Unity Committee), which was a diaspora organization of Central Asians aiming to overthrow the Soviet rule in Central Asia. The Committee coordinated the activities of Turkestan Legions that was formed by the Nazi Army against the Soviet Union.

nationalist public opinion in Turkey in the early 1940s, Prime Minister Şükrü Saraçoğlu said "we are Turks, Turkists and shall remain Turkists forever" right after he presented the government program to the Turkish Grand National Assembly in August 1942 (quoted in Heper, 2007: 104). Besides Saraçoğlu, prominent figures of Turkish politics such as Mahmut Şevket Esendal, secretary-general of the RPP, Fevzi Çakmak, Chief of General Staff and Suat Hayri Ürgüplü, Minister of Customs and Monopolies were known to have sympathy toward and contacts with pan-Turkist circles (Heper, 2007: 102). However, their personal attitude never turned into official state ideology and policy. It was Numan Menemencioğlu, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who had to correct Saraçoğlu politically by assuring the Soviet officials in Ankara that Turkism was only a matter of domestic affairs in Turkey and that they only wanted the Turks of the Soviet Union to live in peace and welfare (Andican, 2009: 485). Consequently, Veli Kajum Khan and the Turkestan legions could find neither political nor economic support in Turkey, and by the end of 1942 Turkey began to follow a strict policy against Turkism and its followers as the war turned against the Nazi armies.

The fate of the idea of "Turkic World" changed dramatically as soon as it was no secret that the Soviet armies would defeat the Nazis. This resulted in a fear of pan-Turkism as Turkey had to keep its borders intact and free from Soviet aggression. The famous "Turkism-Turanism trials" of 1944 were a turning point for the attitude of the Turkish state toward the Outside Turks and they established a pattern to be followed throughout the Cold War (Landau, 1995: 111-135). A huge propaganda campaign was launched by the government and the RPP to denounce pan-Turkism and indicate its negative consequences for Turkey's security (Landau, 1995: 117). There were also Turkic émigré intellectuals who had been following

peaceful methods of promoting Turkic fraternity through journals. For instance among those trialed and jailed one of them was former anti-Soviet leader of Bashkirs and a professor of History Zeki Velidi Togan. Furthermore, prominent Turkic émigré activists were sent out of Turkey and Soviet citizens of Turkic origin who fled to Turkey during the war were turned over to Moscow as a result of Soviet pressure on Ankara (Andican, 2009: 488).

3.5.2 The Cold War and the idea of "Turkic World"

Throughout the Cold War the idea of "Turkic World" could have no influence in Turkish foreign policy as Turkey had a limited scope of foreign relations based primarily on an anti-Soviet transatlantic security alliance, NATO. The 1944 trials pushed pan-Turkism and people who tried to sustain their ties with the Turkic peoples of the Soviet Union into marginal and sometimes radical positions, which would lead finally to the establishment of a pan-Turkist nationalist party in 1969. During the internal bloodshed of the 1970s in Turkey, the Idealists of the Nationalist Action Party (NAP) tried to bring the "Imprisoned Turks" of the "Soviet Empire" into the political agenda of Turkey. However, issues related to the "Outside Turks" were perceived by decision-makers and left-wing politicians as well as intellectuals to be closely related to racism and fascism. It has to be said here that National Action Party had little or no contact with the "Outside Turks". This meant that there was no more a transnational network advocating the Turkic cause throughout the Cold War. This would be of critical importance for the future of transnational activism in the Turkic World as Turkish nationalists, whose leader was prominent pan-Turkist politician Alparslan Türkeş, would be the only "norm entrepreneurs" keeping Gasprinsky's ideal of "unity in language, thought and action" alive.

It should not be surprising that Turkish public opinion had no idea as to when and under what conditions several Turkic peoples such as the Crimean Tatars, Balkars, Karachais and Ahiska Turks were deported to Siberia and Central Asia in 1944 by Stalin as they were accused of cooperating with Germany and/or Turkey against the "Homeland" in the Second World War. Although the Turkish Hearths were allowed to re-open in 1949 it could not be as active and influential over politicians and intellectuals during the Cold War. Several diaspora associations such as the *Kırım Türkleri Kültür ve Yardımlaşma Derneği* (Crimean Turks' Culture and Solidarity Association) was established in 1955 and *Irak Türkleri Kültür ve Yardımlaşma Derneği* (Iraqi Turks' Culture and Solidarity Association) was established in 1959. However, those organizations could not act like pressure groups making demands related to change in Turkish foreign policy toward Iraq and the Soviet Union. Several hundreds of Kazakh and Uighur immigrants fled Eastern Turkestan in China for Turkey starting from 1952 to the 1980s (see memoirs of Uighur leader Alptekin, 1985 for Kazakh and Uighur immigrations to Turkey). Uighur diaspora in Turkey would be quite active politically though it could not find popular support from political groups except the pan-Turkist Idealists. Finally, almost a thousand Kyrgyz of Afghanistan immigrated to Turkey in 1982 and settled in the Ulupamir village of Van. Consequently, during the Cold War diaspora associations tried to sustain their activities in Turkey and immigration from the Turkic world continued. However, they could not contribute to transnational Turkic activism. Their contribution to the consolidation of the idea of "Turkic World" would be on Turkish nationalists, who as the only "norm entrepreneurs" in the Cold War era had contacts with Turkic diasporas in Turkey.

It was indeed only several left-wing intellectuals such as İlhan Selçuk and Aziz Nesin who could visit the Soviet Union and have observations about the Turkic peoples of Azerbaijan and Central Asia. It was the first time in Turkish history that the head of government in Turkey visited Central Asia, when Prime Minister Demirel included the region in his official visit to the Soviet Union in 1967 (see Tellal, 2006 for detailed information on Turkish-Soviet relations during the Cold War). Although Turks of Azerbaijan SSR and Uzbekistan SSR welcomed Turkish Prime Minister with cheers the visit firstly aimed to develop Turkish-Soviet relations (Milliyet, 25 September 1967). Turkish daily *Milliyet* (26-27 September 1967) newspaper wrote that Demirel's visit to Baku looked just like a demonstration of Justice Party in Turkey, but Demirel had to praise "Turkish-Russian friendship" before the media. Therefore, the visit meant very little, if not nothing concerning transnational connection among Turkic peoples and the promotion of the idea of the "Turkic World" as Turkish foreign policy during the Cold War focused highly on keeping Russian aggression at a distance. Repressive policies and massacres conducted by Greek Cypriots to Turkish Cypriots as well as the Cyprus Operation of July 1974 would be the only case, in which Turkey followed an active foreign policy towards a Turkish community living outside the borders of Turkey. But still, Turkic peoples of the Soviet Union were not in the agendas of Turkish diplomats and decision-makers.

3.6 Conclusion: Changing Fate of Turkic Activism and its Relations with the Turkish State

According to Finnemore and Sikkink (1998: 898) "ideational commitment is the main motivation when entrepreneurs promote norms or ideas because they believe in the ideals and values embedded in the norms". Intellectuals of the Turkic

world in the early 20th century turned their ideational commitment to civic and political activism and have established the patterns of transnationalism among Turkic-speaking peoples. This historical survey of the idea of "Turkic World" and the intellectual and political activism that has shaped it was an effort to indicate the transnational character of the idea. This chapter has tried to make an analysis of how intellectuals and activists of Turkic unity or rapprochement, who in theoretical terms constitute "norm entrepreneurs" of the idea of "Turkic World", were connected to each other and acted in a transnational manner. The fact that Turks also lived outside of the Ottoman Empire or Turkey was firstly promoted by Crimean Tatar, Kazan Tatar, Azerbaijani and Central Asian Turkic intellectuals, who waged a campaign of modernizing the Turkic subjects of the Russian Empire for developing their socio-economic conditions and protecting their political rights. The impact of the idea of "unity in language, thought and action" soon reached İstanbul as Turkish intellectuals considered Turkism as the only available political option to save the homeland. The civic activism within the Russian and Ottoman Empires has contributed to the transnational character of the idea of "Turkic World" and gave it a feature, which is still evident today. This feature is that the idea and activism related it have evolved around the efforts of intellectuals, activists, advocacy networks and non-governmental organizations, who in other words have been the "norm entrepreneurs". For the contemporary literature of International Relations, this means that it was the non-state actors that promoted the idea and established its contact with governmental authorities.

The concept of statehood in Turkey confined to the borders of nation-statehood and the foreign policy framework developed accordingly limited the transnational capacity of the idea of "Turkic World" and distanced it from Turkish

political life. Mustafa Kemal's project of establishing a Turkish nation-state with Turkishness limited only inside the territories of the Republic of Turkey and the Bolshevik repression on national intelligentsia developed a pattern for the future of the idea of "Turkic World". These together limited the transnational capacity of Turkic activism and decreased cross-border contacts to very low levels. Friendly relations between the new Republic of Turkey and the Soviet Union contributed to the disappearing of transnational networks among the Turkic World. Moreover, throughout the Cold War dealing with the Turkic peoples, or the "Outside Turks", was understood as a means of irredentism and a kind of the continuation of imperialistic foreign policy vision, which contradicted with the peaceful principles of the Republican regime. According to Andican (2009: 489), who was one of the main figures behind the re-formation of Turkey's relations with the Turkic peoples in the 1990s as Minister of State, İnönü's efforts to curb Turkish nationalism and the "Turkism-Turanism trials" of 1944 pushed the idea of "Turkic World" into a marginal and romantic line, which has been associated with irredentism. It had a certain impact on Turkish foreign policy as all the political and bureaucratic elements related to the "Outside Turks" were eliminated as Turkey was preparing itself for the post-war period in the mid-1940s.

The attitude of the Turkish state towards the idea was negative during the Cold War as well. The idea would be only supported politically by the NAP in Turkey and the "Idealist" Turkish nationalists who tried to keep the issue alive with the "imprisoned Turks" discourse, though in a quite anti-communist and irredentist line. As the bloody and civil war-like struggle between left wing groups and the right wing nationalists resulted with deep social and socio-psychological outcomes, Turkism and the idea of "Turkic World" was associated with racism and a fascistic

line of imperialist-nationalism. The idea would be re-visited by politicians and social groups of various ideologies in the Cyprus operation of 1974, which aimed to protect the rights of the Cypriot Turks who were massacred by the Cypriot Greek terrorist actions.

Consequently, entrepreneurs of the transnational idea of "Turkic World" were unable to influence the new ideology and nationhood defined in Turkey, which resulted in the disappearance of a Turkic concept in Turkish foreign policy. Besides such an inability to influence state policies, pan-Turkist intellectuals and activists were regarded as dissidents and problematic figures for the Turkish state. Having lost their contact with the Turkic peoples of the Soviet Union, entrepreneurs of the idea of "Turkic World" had to wait until the Cold War ended. It would be until the late 1980s, when Turkey rediscovered its ethno-linguistic ties with the Balkans, the Crimea, Volga-Ural region, the Caucasus and Central Asia as a result of the end of the Cold War that the transnational idea of "Turkic World" met the Turkish state and started to make an impact on Turkish foreign policy. This would also be a new era in which the Turkish governments and decision-makers tolerated and even promoted the idea themselves in order to achieve certain foreign policy goals. The next chapter will continue with how Turkish governments responded to the newly emerging independent Turkic World within the activist foreign policy framework of the post-Cold War era and hence how the idea of "Turkic World" re-appeared in Turkish political life.

CHAPTER 4

TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS THE TURKIC WORLD: THE IDEA, NON-STATE ACTORS AND GEOPOLITICS

4.1 The End of the Cold War and New Activism in Turkish Foreign Policy

Inherited from the experiences of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire after the First World War, the Allied invasion in Anatolia, the War of Independence and the need to sustain territorial integrity during both the early Republican period and the Second World War, Turkish foreign policy was based on Ataturk's words; "peace at home, peace in the world". According to Aydın (1999: 162), Turkish diplomats were "famous … among other things, for being skeptical and cautious". During the Cold War Turkey positioned itself as a staunch member of NATO and its foreign policy behavior was shaped primarily by a security-dominant approach of the civilian and military bureaucratic elite. Turkey's Western direction and its search for becoming a modern European nation was the second most important factor that shaped Turkish foreign policy. However Cold War conditions and lack of democratization inside the country made it almost impossible for transnational actors

and relations to flourish to have a say in Turkey's foreign relations. Not surprisingly, Turkey's relations with the Turkic World were out of the agenda of Turkish decision-makers and diplomats for a very long time since it was supposed to be the remnants of an adventuristic and irredentist policy (Rubin, 2002:2).

The end of the Cold War offered new windows of opportunity for Turkish decision-makers, who now had the chance to re-interpret the traditional official version of the above-mentioned Kemalist motto to incorporate regional activism. As the three centuries old Russian threat was moving away, Turkey could rediscover what was left behind when the Ottoman Empire was collapsing eight decades ago. This especially made the Balkans, the Middle East and the Caucasus three important regions with historical significance for Turkish foreign policy. Added to this was the fear among Turkish diplomats and decision-makers that Turkey would no more be as strategically important for the Atlantic Alliance and especially the US as it used to be throughout the Cold War. Turkey's strategic location in the Cold War was based on its neighborhood with the Soviet Union and the elimination of the threat for the Atlantic World might very well end Turkey's strategic value for the West. As important as that, the hesitance of European states to accept Turkish accession into the European Community was a strong motive for Turkish decision-makers to feel isolated at a time when world politics was going through a systemic transformation. Hence Turkey's doubts about getting lonely in international platforms contributed to the emergence of the new activism in Turkish foreign policy.

Within its new foreign policy paradigm, which was also related to the economic transformation toward a liberal order inside the country, Turkey started to act as an assertive actor with regional power inspirations in its near neighborhood. The most important policy change within this context was toward the Middle Eastern

or southern neighborhood of Turkey, in which an active foreign policy composed of both security and economic aspects. Relations with Iraq, Syria and Israel have marked this new activism in Turkish foreign policy (Sayarı, 2000: 172). Similarly, Turkey kept an assertive position toward the tragic developments in the Balkans, first in Bosnia and then in Kosovo, by supporting the Western-led international community to stop the bloodshed and engage in post-conflict peace building (Sayarı, 2000: 178). As a "kin-state" Turkey was very rapid to respond to recognize and establish political, economic and military relations with the Muslim Albania and Bosnia as well as Bulgaria, Macedonia and Romania, where Turkish minorities live. Under such a political atmosphere made up of post-Cold War freedom and assertiveness Turkish foreign policy started to move away from its cautious and skeptical attitude toward regional and global developments. It was with the help of such a conjuncture and eagerness by Turkish decision-makers that the idea of the "Turkic World" entered Turkish foreign policy agenda.

4.2 Turkey Re-discovers the Turkic World: Transnationalism Revisited

4.2.1 NGOs and the Idea of "Turkic World"

The "Outside Turks" was first remembered by a huge number of Turkish citizens with the repression directed by Zhivkov of Bulgaria towards its Turkish minority, which was the remnant of the Ottoman Empire and made-up around 10 % percent of the population of the country. Turkish state and public opinion "reacted with outrage" to Zhivkov's policy of ethnic assimilation in Bulgaria that started in 1984 and "mass rallies were allowed for the first time since the military coup of 1980 and huge crowds filled Taksim Square in İstanbul" (Poulton, 1997: 208). Tens of

67

thousands of Turkish citizens attended the meeting to condemn the "Bulgarian cruelty" (Milliyet, 25 June 1989) in Istanbul in June 1989, which was an event coordinated by pan-Turkist activist and politician Namık Kemal Zeybek. As a result of international pressure and increasing warning from the Turkish government Zhivkov allowed the Turks of Bulgaria to immigrate to Turkey in 1989. Following that, some 300,000 Turks came to Turkey. It was especially the ongoing Armenian aggression and human rights violations over the Azerbaijani territory of Nogorno-Karabakh that made Turkish media and public opinion develop ethnic Turkic consciousness and internalize the idea of the Turkic World (Cumhuriyet, 5 April 1993). Hence Turkish public opinion was ready and sensitive towards any development related to Turkish or Turkic minorities as well as the independence of brother nations in the Caucasus and Central Asia. It was under such an atmosphere of sensitivity that Turkey discovered its common ethno-linguistic ties with the Turks of the former Soviet Union and started to incorporate the transnational idea of the "Turkic World" into its foreign policy and national interest.

It would be a role for NGOs as norm entrepreneurs to promote the idea of "Turkic World" by pressuring upon and informing governments and key decision-makers to benefit from the opportunity offered by geopolitical change in Eurasia. The simultaneous processes of the collapse of the Soviet Union and globalization enabled Turkish non-state actors who were either advocating the Turkic cause or trying to develop economic ties with the newly independent Turkic republics to establish relations with the Caucasus and Central Asia. As Turkey, with its recent aspiration for becoming a regional power was trying to respond to the newly emerging reality in the East several Turkish non-governmental groups were ready to re-awake the forgotten and once-punished idea of "Turkic World" by re-establishing

a relationship similar to the one realized by Turkic intellectuals and activists almost eight decades ago. Prominent nationalist NGOs such as *Türk Ocakları* (Turkish Hearths), *Aydınlar Ocağı* (Intellectuals' Hearths), *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı* (Turkic World Research Foundation), and *Türkiye Milli Kültür Vakfı* (Turkey National Culture Foundation) rapidly established personal as well as organizational ties with the intellectuals and NGOs of the newly independent republics. As Andican (2010) mentions it was nationalist NGOs in Turkey that established the first ties between Turkey and the Turkic world by organizing visits and transnational meetings almost immediately after the Soviet Union disintegrated. Similarly, Kavuncu (2009), general secretary of the Turkish Hearths, argues that efforts of several nationalist individuals were quite effective in directing Turkish decision-makers towards the Turkic world[17].

As Karasar (2007: 151) mentions, by the turn of 1993, just one year after the former Soviet republics declared their independence, "dozens of Turkish NGOs were active", which were nationalistically or religiously motivated, in the Caucasus and Central Asia. Similarly, NAP and its leader Alparslan Türkeş had a high reputation in the newly independent republics due to the party's traditional anti-communist policy emphasizing on the freedom and independence of "imprisoned Turks". In his first visit to Azerbaijan and Central Asia in April-May 1992 Prime Minister Demirel included Türkeş alongside a large group of intellectuals, businessmen and journalists. Robins (2003: 277) argues that Türkeş was consulted by the Turkish government on the new policy toward the Turkic states. Relations between Türkeş and NAP and Elçibey, the President of Azerbaijan between June 1992 and September 1993, and *Halk Cephesi*, the Popular Front, which he was leading, were quite dense and strong

---

[17] Kavuncu lists Namık Kemal Zeybek, Umut Arık, Köksal Toptan, Ayvaz Gökdemir and Enver Altaylı among those nationalist individuals who influenced Turkish decision-makers.

signaling future transnational coalition among pan-Turkist political parties. During Pime Minister Demirel's first visit to the Turkic republics in April-May 1992 hundreds of thousands of Azerbaijanis gathered in the *Azadlıq*, Independence Square in Baku. The crowd welcomed Türkeş and Elçibey as two pan-Turkists on May 3, which is the celebration day for Turkists in Turkey dating back to the "Turkism-Turanism trials" of 1944. Periodicals of such nationalist or pan-Turkist associations flourished in the early 1990s and they paid special attention to the Turkic world as they were now freed from the pressures of the 1980 coup. Just like the followers of Ismail Gasprinsky in the late 19th and early 20th centuries pan-Turkist intellectuals of Turkey, the Caucasus, Central Asia and Russia re-started to share their views on media, scholarly journals and NGO publications.

Islamist or conservative NGOs and communities were as rapid as Turkish nationalists to open up to the Caucasus and Central Asia as well as the Balkans and the Muslim Middle East, which were their natural zones of interest. The *Nurcu* community led by Fethullah Gülen was the strongest in Turkic republics, which opened schools in each Turkic Capital as well as in the autonomous Turkic republics of Russia in the early 1990s.[18] *Zaman* newspaper, which is the media branch of the Gülen movement opened offices throughout the Turkic world from the Balkans to Central Asia in the early stages of the post-Cold War era. Ironically, even the leader of the NAP Türkeş, whose political life was one of a struggle to make the Turkish state recognize the "Outside Turks", would defend and support the activities of Fethullah Gülen's Islamic movement in the Turkic world.[19] Several other Islamist or

---

[18] Schools of *Nurcu* community would later be closed down and banned in the Russian Federation and Uzbekistan as they were connected by official authorities with pan-Turkism and pan-Islamism. See Yanık, 2004: 301-302.
[19] When Gülen was associated with Turkish mafia who had connections with the so-called Turkish deep state during the Susurluk Crisis in 1997, Alparslan Türkeş defended Gülen publicly in a press-conference organized by the Nationalist Action Party.

conservative NGOs such as *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı* (Turkey Foundation for Religious Affairs), *İslami İlimler Araştırma Vakfı* (Islamic Sciences Research Foundation) and *Ilim Yayma Vakfı* (Foundation for Spreading (Islamic) Science) also started their activities in the Turkic states mainly in order to develop Islamic consciousness among brother peoples, upon which atheism was imposed by the Soviet Union for decades (Karasar, 2007: 151). As Fuller (1993: 68) mentions nationalist and conservative – Islamic oriented – press has devoted serious attention to events in Central Asia and Azerbaijan. Nationalist newspapers such as *Yeni Düşünce* (the New Thought) – media branch of NAP – *Türkiye* (Turkey) and Islamist newspapers such as the above mentioned *Zaman* and *Milli Gazete* (National Newspaper) were cited by Fuller (1993: 68) as the ones with the "heaviest coverage and an editorial policy strongly in support of" unity among the Turkic world.

4.2.2 Turkish Business Community in the Turkic Republics

Turkish business community was another strong non-state entity that has contributed to the relationship between Turkey and the Turkic world. The place of Turkish business community in Turkey's relations with the Caucasus and Central Asia has been a neglected but an essential one. In order to "fill a gap" and focus more on micro actors rather than macro politics in Turkey's relations with Turkic republics, Şen (2007: 110) in his own words questions top-down perspectives that overlook the role of increasing levels of economic activities of small and middle-range Turkish entrepreneurs in Central Asia. Both Özal and Demirel took ambitious and willing entrepreneurs alongside them and introduced them to regional leaders during official visits. Having taken state support from both Ankara and Turkic Capitals hundreds of Turkish businessmen flew to Azerbaijan and Central Asia in the

early 1990s. Besides Turkish big business entities such as Koç, Anadolu, Çukurova, Rumeli, Okan and Çalık Holdings small and medium-range Turkish entrepreneurs have contributed to the emergence of a free market economy in the Turkic republics (Şen, 2007: 120).

What is more interesting and important concerning Turkish entrepreneurs in Central Asia was that they were motivated either with Islamic or pan-Turkist feelings and hence they perceived their activities in the region as helping their brothers on their ways for Islamic and/or national awakening (Şen, 2007: 130). Therefore, as Şen (2007: 141) mentions, Turkish business community in Central Asia have not regarded themselves as immigrants but rather "relatives" or brothers of the peoples of the region. Finally, within fifteen years time from the opening-up of the Central Asian markets to Turkish businessmen, a dynamic Turkish community has emerged in the region, which pays great significance to Turkic-Muslim identity as a bridge for promoting multilateral relations (See Şen, 2007: 109-142 for a detailed analysis of how such a dynamic Turkish community has emerged in Central Asia).

4.3 Perceptional Change: Re-integration of the Turkic World in Turkish Intellectual and Political life

According to Çay (2010), a pan-Turkist activist, professor of History and former Minister of State responsible for coordination between Turkey and Turkic states and relative communities, Turkey's perception about the Turkic world used to be limited to the Turkish diaspora in European countries and issues of conflict such as Turks of former Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Western Thrace in Greece and Northern Cyprus until 1991. Therefore, the collapse of the Soviet Union opened a new era in which cooperation would be dominant over conflict in the minds of Turkish

decision-makers concerning the Turkic world. Within the newly emerging post-Cold War international environment, Turkey "found itself at the center of Eurasian region that has become the focal point of global geopolitics" (Aydın, 2003: 139). Although the Balkans, the Middle East and the Caucasus were all in Turkey's neighborhood, Turkey engaged in a redefinition of its national interest to also include Central Asia within its new foreign policy formulation. The focus on Central Asia and especially on the newly independent Turkic-speaking countries of the former Soviet Union including Azerbaijan in Transcaucasia – the remaining four are Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan in Central Asia – was so dense that it soon reached a status similar that of Iraq, Cyprus and European Community membership.

Soon Turkish Prime Minister Demirel would define the "Turkic World from the Adriatic Sea to the Chinese Wall" in his speeches before the media. Aydın (2003: 139) defines the situation regarding Turkey's potential activism toward the Turkic republics as follows:

> The emergence of eight independent states to Turkey's northeast at the end of the Cold War, arguably enlarged Turkey's role in the world, and made Turkey deeply aware of a vast territory inhabited largely by fellow Muslim, Turkic-speakers. This presented Turkey with a historical opportunity, ending years of introversion, and emphasizing Turkey's common cultural, linguistic, and religious bonds with the Newly Independent States of Central Asia and the Caucasus.

It was the fact that Turkey discovered its "fellow" countries, in other words "ethnic cousins" in its Eastern neighborhood that made it develop a particular foreign policy toward the Caucasus and Central Asia. However, what was lacking in Aydın's picture was the actors who helped Turkish decision-makers comprehend and feel the need to act according to the new geopolitical situation. This re-discovery owed very much to efforts of micro actors such as former nationalist activists who now had

73

higher positions in Turkish politics and non-governmental organizations, which had been waiting for the collapse of the Soviet Union to meet the "imprisoned Turks". As Zeybek (2009), former Chief Advisor to the President Özal and a prominent pan-Turkist argues, it was the efforts of nationalist NGOs and both official and non-official individuals – micro actors – that lobbied for the entrance of the Turkic world as a concept into Turkish foreign policy. In this study, those nationalist NGOs, groups and individuals that advocate the Turkic cause similar to the activists of the early 20th century, are all together accepted to be the new "norm entrepreneurs" in the post-Cold War era.

Consequently, Turkish decision-makers were very rapid to respond to the emergence of five newly independent Turkic republics as well as the relative liberalization of the political situation in countries such as Russia, the Ukraine and the Balkan countries where significant numbers of Turkic minorities resided. Simultaneously Turkish public opinion realized that brother nations were going upwards in the agenda of Turkish politicians and media. Socio-psychological impact of the crises of Turks of Bulgaria in the 1980s further deepened with Armenian invasion of Azerbaijan and hence Turkish public opinion became quite sensitive towards the Turkic world.

4.3.1 Lack of Expertise: Turkish Nationalists Come In

According to Karasar (2007: 147), a Turkish expert on Central Asia as well as a political activist of Turkic rapprochement, neither Turkish academia nor bureaucracy was ready to conceive of and prepared to respond to the new situation. Cold War tensions between Turkey and the Soviet Union and Turkey's cautious and skeptic foreign policy behavior had prevented Turkish diplomats and politicians from

developing connections with Turkic peoples of the Soviet Union, Iran and even the Turks of the Balkans. It was a common point made by scholars who studied Turkish foreign policy toward the Turkic world that Turkish politicians and Ministry of Foreign Affairs were indeed "unprepared" for the newly emerging reality (Bal, 2000; Aydın, 2004; Karasar, 2007). It was only a group of Turkish nationalists, who had a political and ideological desire to unite with the Turks outside of Turkey. Moreover it was only Turkish nationalists, who had developed certain focus on Turkic peoples – despite their limits of knowledge and connection – and hence carried the idea of "Turkic World" until the end of the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The sudden collapse of the Soviet Union and the supposed unpreparedness of Turkish politicians and diplomats for the newly emerging Turkic reality have clearly indicated that non-governmental actors were behind the state in a certain issue area. Moreover, those non-governmental actors – NGOs and individuals – had the ideational power and political will to establish contacts with the Turkic world immediately. Therefore, Turkish policy makers and bureaucrats tried to consult the knowledge of the nationalist elite in order take the first steps of a well-established and institutionalized foreign policy toward the Caucasus and Central Asia (Karasar, 2007: 147). This consultation process was a key-point for Turkey's relations with the Turkic world for several reasons. Firstly, it paved the way for the influence of the transnational idea of "Turkic World" in Turkish foreign policy as well as to its process of becoming a norm as a result of the incorporation of the idea into the Turkish political system Secondly, it resulted in flourishing of transnational ties, contacts and networks among the Turks of Turkey and Turkic-speaking peoples because it was supposed to be not only legitimate but also beneficial for Turkish foreign policy to act as an element of "Soft Power" of Turkey. Finally, this process

constituted the very basis of the interaction between the Turkish state and nationalist NGOs promoting the idea of "Turkic World". The interaction started as a win-win situation for both non-state actors advocating the idea and governments that have been desiring to utilize the post-Soviet geopolitical power vacuum.

Pan-Turkist figures such as Namık Kemal Zeybek as the Minister of Culture in Özal's and Akbulut's cabinets and chief advisor to President Özal played a major role in the formation of Turkish foreign policy toward Turkic-speaking peoples. With the help of Turkish nationalists, who were now free to propagate their publicly, Turkish media developed a consciousness toward the five newly-independent Turkic republics. Moreover, it was the nationalist NGOs, activists and intellectuals, who first organized visits to the Caucasus and Central Asia as well as to the autonomous Turkic republics of the Russian Federation, and established cross-national ties with regional journalists, intellectuals and pan-Turkist politicians and political parties such as the *Halk Cephesi* (Popular Front) in Azerbaijan, *Birlik* (Unity Party) and later on *Erk* (Freedom Party) in Uzbekistan and the *Ağızbirlik* (United Voice) movement in Turkmenistan.

4.3.2 Changing Turkish Identity and the Turkic World

Rosenau's argument on "fragmegration" in world politics seemed to be true concerning Turkish identity just as the Cold War ended and a new epoch of foreign relations started for Turkish policy makers. Turkish political life was shaken by the fragmentation of constitutional Turkish identity based on the common bond of citizenship as the PKK intensified its violent terrorist campaign based on a Marxist ideology mixed heavily with Kurdish nationalism. With the Özal period ethnic identities other than the upper Turkish identity were publicized and started to be

discussed seriously among intellectuals and activists. Despite this fragmenting side to Turkish identity one opposite trend, an integrating one, was emerging which enlarged the definition of "Turkishness" to a wide geography stretching from "the Adriatic Sea to the Chinese Wall" in President Demirel's own words. The re-discovery of transnational Turkic identity was indeed a turning point for the formation of Turkish foreign policy toward the post-Soviet space with a strong emphasis on the five Turkic states.[20]

As mentioned in Chapter 3 of this study, republican definition of Turkishness made a considerable limiting impact on the transnational idea of "Turkic World" as being a Turk was confined to the borders of the Republic of Turkey. According to Fidan (2010: 110), one reason why Turkey's foreign policy elite would attribute special significance to the region was because "the region is perceived as the original land of ethnic Turkic populations" as well as that of the Turks of modern Turkey. The roots of this perception go back to the 1930s as the "Turkish Historical Thesis" suggested by the Turkish Historical Society argue that the fatherland of Turkish nation and civilization is Central Asia. However, although Pan-Turkism meant an adventuristic and dangerous policy that could annoy the Soviet Union, the idea remained the logical outcome of the deliberate process of nation-building through glorification of Turkish history and culture, including the pre-Islamic times (Kushner, 1997: 226). For the intellectuals and bureaucrats of the Republican era the idea of "Outside Turks" mainly included the remnants of the Ottoman Empire who

---

[20] One clear example of how Turkish policy makers tried to utilize the newly emerging Turkic World was the official backing for the celebration of *Nevruz*, 21st of March, as the mythological day for the freedom of ancient Turks as well as a welcome for spring. *Nevruz* has been celebrated by most of the Turkic peoples of the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Russian Federation though it is not the case for Anatolian Turks. In contemporary Turkey *Nevruz* has been celebrated by Kurds as the day is a common Turco-Persian tradition of the Middle East and Eurasia. More seriously, *Nevruz* celebrations of several Kurdish-origin Turkish citizens have got involved in PKK propaganda, and hence the day has been perceived to be a dangerous and illegal one by the Public. Within the new "Turkishness" Turkish governments have been organizing official celebrations with huge media coverage on each March 21 in order to justify that *Nevruz* belongs to Turks rather than Kurds.

were the extensions of the Anatolian Turks such as the Turks of Bulgaria, Western Thrace, Cyprus and Iraq. Nevertheless, the Turkish elite knew since primary school education that Turks spread to Anatolia, the Balkans, the Middle East, Siberia and Russia from Central Asia, which was now to be rediscovered.

The perceptional change related to Turkish history and identity was the key for Turkish decision-makers to engage in active relations and open-up a new agenda for Turkish foreign policy. What reminded Turkish decision-makers of history and identity would be the entrepreneurs of the idea of "Turkic World", who managed to established channels with them. The end of the Cold War offered Turkish intellectual, academics and media to discuss about various ethnic identities in Turkey such as those of Kurds, Bosnians, Albanians, Circassians and Chechens. This courage to move away from the Kemalist definition of Turkish nation inevitably paved the way for searching for Turks outside Turkey, or the "Turkic World" as the term started to be frequently used by highest level of statesmen including the President Özal and Prime Minister Demirel (Ataman, 2002: 128).

According to Fidan (2010: 120), who as a high level bureaucrat has played a major role in the institutionalization process of Turkey's policy toward the Turkic-speaking peoples, "a common historical heritage between Turkey and Central Asia" was a "great motive" for developing good relations with that region and moreover ethno-linguistic and religious commonalities have paved the way for searching for various areas to develop relations with the region. Similarly, Bal (2000: 43) argues that Turkey would not be "so interested" in developing relations with the Caucasus and Central Asia if five of the newly independent former Soviet republics were not Muslim in origin and Turkic in origin. According to Ersanlı (2001: 117-122), it was Turkism as one of the most dynamic foreign policy incentives in the 1990s, which

was the major factor behind Turkey's rapid opening to Turkic states as soon as the Soviet Union collapsed.[21] This study not only agrees with the statement – that Turkey's relations with these two regions were primarily motivated by ethnic consciousness – but moreover suggests that it was the existence of a transnational idea – the idea of the "Turkic World" – which was based on an eight decades-years old ideological debate that made Turkish policy makers so willing and rapid to establish strong relations with the Turkic states as well as non-independent Turkic peoples.

4.4 Turkish Foreign Policy toward the Turkic World in the early 1990s

Transnational relations and ties flourished between Turkey and newly-independent Turkic republics in the early 1990s because both the conjuncture and ethnic affinity – especially the similarity of languages – made it possible for such rapprochement. Although there has been nationalist and Islamist networks active in the Turkic world besides a dynamic business community, it has been the first group of non-governmental actors as the entrepreneurs of the idea of "Turkic World" – read pan-Turkists – that have pushed Turkish decision-makers towards developing an ambitious and all-encompassing foreign policy toward Turkic states. It was now time for Turkish decision-makers and diplomats to take the idea seriously on the one hand and try to utilize the geopolitical opportunities that made it possible for Turkey to emerge as a regional leader.

---

[21] In this chapter, Ersanlı examines Turkish foreign policy toward Turkic republics as an example of how Constructivism, with its focus on culture and identity in foreign policy, is becoming more important in the study of IR.

4.4.1 First Diplomatic Efforts to Develop Relations

Turkey was the first in the international community to recognize the independence of all the five Turkic republics in November 1991. Regional leaders Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan, Saparmurat Niyazov – later Turkmenbashi – of Turkmenistan, Askar Akayev of Kyrgyzstan and Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan visited Ankara respectively in September and December 1991 in order to gain Turkish support for independence as well political and economic development. In return, Turkish leaders engaged in a massive diplomatic effort to increase dialogue with Azerbaijan and Central Asia. Minister of Foreign Affairs Hikmet Çetin opened the floor for future Turkish official visits to Turkic states as he went to all the five Central Asian republics – including Persian-speaking Tajikistan – in February 1992 (Robins, 2003: 277). Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel followed suit in April and May 1992 as he visited the newly-independent brothers with a huge number of businessman and academics alongside him in order to trigger multilateral relations in various fields. As Robins (2003: 277) mentions, Çetin's entourage was 140 men strong, while Demirel's was much larger. Such kinds of official visits at the top levels would in the coming years be important symbols between Turkey and Turkic states as important figures from all sides including Presidents and Prime Ministers would call each other "my brother" during all kinds of official talks. Finally, by spring of 1992, all the Turkic leaders of the former Soviet states had paid official visits to Ankara (Fuller, 1993: 68). President Özal would pay hist first official visits to Turkic capitals in April 1993.

4.4.2 Turkey's "Responsibilities"

As a result of the strong entry of the idea of "Turkic World" into Turkish politics with the efforts of "norm entrepreneurs" Turkish decision-makers rapidly started to talk about the "responsibilities" of Turkey regarding the newly independent Turkic states (Aydın, 2003: 141). According to the foreign policy agenda developed toward the Turkic states of the former Soviet Union, Turkey would firstly help these countries to establish their state structures in a way that they would consolidate their independence. This aim has continued to be the major official aim of Turkey toward these "brother" countries (see Ministry of Foreign Affairs website for Turkey's official foreign policy priorities in Central Asia). For this aim, Turkey has sent military, academic and administrative personnel to offer bureaucratic and technical help in various fields of governance such as security affairs, national education and economic re-organization.

Furthermore, Turkey signed "Friendship and Cooperation Agreements" with all the regional leaders who were eager to visit Turkey in order to receive full support for their independence by early 1992 (Aydın, 2004: 4). Secondly, since their independence Turkey has helped the Turkic states of the former Soviet Union to represent themselves in international organizations, and hence acquire prestigious positions in the international community. Aydın (2004: 4) quotes then Prime Minister Demirel saying that Turkey should have a dynamic and active role in connecting the newly independent brother countries to the developed world. This active "bridge" role of Turkey helped Azerbaijan to become a member of the Council of Europe, and all the five Turkic states to become members of the OSCE. Moreover, Turkey has made serious efforts to integrate these countries into regional cooperation organizations such as the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization (BSEC)

and the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) as well as NATO's Partnership for Peace program in order to help transform the Soviet-type armies into Western-type ones.

According to Fidan (2010: 114), Turkey "undertook the diplomatic function of 'door-opener' and 'right advocator'" as it contributed to establishing a strong relationship between the newly-independent Turkic states and Western organizations. By acting as a bridge Turkey was on the one hand trying to build a constructive image in the eyes of the regional leaders, and on the other hand expecting to receive the support of "the brothers" in the international platforms. One has to mention here that this rather brave behavior was a first-time activity in Turkish foreign policy and therefore it was a manifestation that Turkey no more wanted to follow its traditional "cautious" and "skeptical" foreign policy.

4.4.3 A New Institutional Framework: Re-structuring of Turkish Bureaucracy

Besides responsibilities, Turkey has tried to develop an institutional framework to coordinate its relations with the newly-independent Turkic states as well as other Turkic peoples such as the Gagauz of Moldova, Crimean Tatars of Ukraine and Turkic minorities – Uzbek and Turkmen – in Afghanistan. For this purpose Turkish state bureaucracy was reorganized in order to meet the requirements of the new agenda of Turkish foreign policy. In several ministries and undersecretariats such as the one responsible for Foreign Trade branches responsible for the Caucasus and Central Asia were established. In Robins' (2003: 279) words, this was an attempt "made to expand the capacity of the Turkish state to manage these newly emerging relationships". Accordingly, the existing directorate general

within the Minister of Foreign Affairs dealing with Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union and Asia was divided into two, one of which was responsible for the relations with the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) (Robins, 2003: 279). The new directorate general dealing with the CIS was then divided into two departments, one responsible for the Slavic republics, the other responsible for Turkic republics (Robins, 2003: 279).

The fact that Ambassador Bilal Şimşir, who was known for his nationalistic background, was appointed as the head of the directorate general responsible for CIS indicates that Turkey's relations with the Turkic states was shaped according to ideational factors such as common identity and kinship (see Hunter, 2001: 8 for Şimşir's views on the issue). The establishment of the Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency (TIKA) in January 1992 was a clear manifestation that Turkey's neighborhood was "expanded to encompass the Caucasus and Central Asia" (Fidan, 2010: 113). The establishment of TIKA as a branch of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs revealed how significant Turkey's position regarding its ethnic cousins was perceived by Turkish decision-makers. It indicated that a new assertive instrument was incorporated into Turkish foreign policy with normative purposes. The establishment of TIKA sent a strong message to regional leaders who wondered what kind of a policy Turkey would follow toward them, that it would support the reorganization of their state structures. TIKA supported and coordinated hundreds of projects through the program coordination offices established in all the capitals during the 1990s. These projects and programs have concentrated on issues such as education, agriculture, health and water infrastructure, cultural cooperation, training of civil servants, administrative help, assistance in

banking, insurance, foreign trade and other infrastructure required for transition to market economies.

Turkey's attempt to develop an active and multi-faceted regional policy led more state institutions to develop relations with the Caucasus and Central Asia. Turkish state banks established cooperation mechanisms with regional banks and opened branches in Turkic Capitals. Turkish Standards Institute (TSE) and State Statistics Institute (DIE) began to develop bilateral and multilateral projects to help the modernization of bureaucratic and technocratic structures of Turkic republics (Bal, 2000: 82). Moreover, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs organized training programs for the diplomats of the newly-independent Turkic states.

4.4.4 Turkish Presidents and Turkic Summits

Turkish presidents were active figures in the formation of Turkish foreign policy toward the Turkic states in the initial phase. Özal was an active supporter of close personal relations with regional leaders. He initiated the "Turkic-speaking Countries Heads of States Summits", or the "Turkic Summits" to establish a platform for increasing cooperation and possible future integration among Turkey and the Turkic states. The first of these summits summoned in Ankara in October 1992 and the famous "Ankara Declaration" that was signed there included issues on economic cooperation, free trade, free movement of goods, people and services, developing an integrated transport system, telecommunications, banking and energy cooperation (Robins, 2003: 285). In the first summit Turkish President Özal argued that the "Turkic World" now had a "historic opportunity, which was very rare in history" (quoted in Robins, 2003: 285). In the summit Özal would also claim that the 21st century would belong to Turks once the Turkic World cooperated with each other.

The first "Turkic Summit" was also a clear indicator that Turkey had adapted "Turkic World" officially as a term to be used to refer to Turkic-speaking peoples at the highest level. Since October 1992 nine such "Turkic Summits" have been held.[22] Çaman (2006: 194) argues that the "Turkic Summits" has been the most prestigious and assertive diplomatic project developed by Turkey, which showed the ultimate aim of Turkish decision-makers toward supranational integration.

4.4.5 Cultural and Educational Cooperation as an Element of Foreign Policy

Turkey's relations with the Turkic-speaking peoples were highly motivated by ethno-linguistic ties, which were glorified by common a history. As Fidan (2010: 120) argues "common history, language, religion, tradition and lifestyle have engendered potential areas for facilitating bilateral and multilateral relations". Hence Turkey also attempted to take steps on cultural and educational cooperation in order to have various channels through which relations would be sustained. In 1992, TÜRKSOY – Joint Administration of Turkic Cultures and Arts – was established as a transgovernmental body of ministries of culture and it has accepted both newly independent Turkic states and autonomous Turkic republics – Republic of Tatarstan, Republic of Bashkortostan, Republic of Altai, Republic of Tuva and Republic of Yakutistan in Russia and Gagauiza in Moldova – as its members.

Education has become another important tool for Turkish foreign policy toward the region. Turkey has officially opened up two universities in Central Asia; the Turkish-Kazak International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi University in Kazakhstan and the Turkish-Kyrgyz Manas University in Kyrgyzstan. On the other hand Turkish

---

[22] Further evaluation will be made in Chapter 6 on the importance of Turkic Summits on the institutionalization of Turkey's relations with the Turkic-speaking peoples.

Ministry of National Education has coordinated the Great Student Project; one of the biggest projects of Turkey concerning the Turkic World and brother communities. Since the 1992-93 academic year, when the project was put into effect more than 25840 thousand students have studied in Turkish state universities with scholarship opportunities (see Özkan, 2007 for the exact figures between 1992 and 2007). The Great Student Project was a policy tool of Turkey which indicated that the end of the Cold War and the emergence of five independent nations in Eurasia meant more than a foreign policy in the traditional/Realist sense. According to Yanık (2004: 293-307) the Project looked very similar to the national educational campaign of the first republican years. Just as the young Republic embarked upon consolidating a national identity for the citizens, the project aimed to create a stratum of people in the Turkic states and communities who would be sympathetic toward Turkey and Turkish culture. In addition the project has aimed to contribute to the national goals of the newly independent countries to transform their economic and administrative structures in line with the Western-developed world. The idea of "Turkic World" was so strong in the formation of the Great Student Project that former Minister of National Education, Köksal Toptan, argued that students involved in this project would be the "architects of a common future" in the Turkic world (quoted in Yanık, 2004: 294).

In line with Turkey's policy of accepting different ethnic groups in Eurasia which have relatives inside Turkey, the Project was extended to include students from a wide range of countries including the Balkan countries, Turkic-Muslim autonomous republics of Russia, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan and Tajikistan as well the five Turkic republics. The Great Student Project has been a clear indicator of how Turkey's responsibilities and capabilities regarding the Turkic world have been

perceived by Turkish decision-makers. This project alongside other initiatives of Turkey has also indicated that the idea of "Turkic World" has led to concrete policy outcomes.

4.4.6 Economic and Administrative Aid

In order to make the Turkic states of Central Asia and Azerbaijan attractive for Turkish businessman and to help these countries speed up the process of transforming into liberalized economies Turkish Eximbank "extended loans totaling $ 1.2 billion" for companies active in the region (Arım, 2001: 75). Economic and business councils were established right after Turkey opened up embassies in the Turkic capitals and Turkish businessmen doing business in the Caucasus and Central Asia were supported by Turkish leaders. Economic relations further strengthened as Turkey started to endeavor to be an energy corridor between European markets and the Caspian natural resources. As a result of such a US-backed energy policy Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline started to take Caspian oil to the Mediterranean. Turkish Airlines was the first international company to organize direct flights from İstanbul to the capitals in Central Asia – firstly to Tashkent and Almaty in 1992 – and Turkish official media organization TRT opened its *Avrasya*, Eurasia channel to link Turkish citizens directly to their brothers in the Caucasus and Central Asia and vice versa.

Turkish PTT opened several branches in the newly independent states and Turkey supported these countries in developing their telecommunication sectors (Robins, 2003: 301). As Robins (2003: 302) mentions PTT, "Turkish public sector telecommunications giant" provided equipment to the Turkic states, relative to whom it had a great comparative technological superiority, which was worth around $ 25 million. As a result of these economic and infrastructural attempts, it became easier

for micro actors such as NGOs advocating Turkic rapprochement to follow the activities of each other, organize transnational congresses, attract media attention and create consciousness in the public opinion especially in Turkey for integration among Turkic-speaking peoples.

4.4.7 Search for a "Turkish Model"

Another newness concerning Turkish foreign policy goals was Turkey's search for becoming a model for the newly independent Turkic states. Secular Turkey with its predominantly Muslim population would supposedly become an attractive regime type for the leaders of the brother states. Hence the "Turkish Model" was also encouraged by the US and European states as it would curb possible influence of Iran with its Islamic regime in the Caucasus and Central Asia. In addition, Turkey was a good example of cooperation of Islam and democracy and it also had an aspiring newly-transformed liberal economy. As stated by Karasar (2007: 156), Turkish decision-makers thought that the "Turkish Model" was the right option for regional leaders who aimed first and foremost a wise developmental and civilizational strategy. This line of thought was indeed consistent with the changing perception of identity in Turkey, which was influenced to a certain extent by the idea of "Turkic World". Consequently, it was for the first time in Turkish foreign policy that Turkey was taking the role of being a model for other countries. Though this leadership and role model did not take long and left itself to a more modest approach in the mid-1990s it was particularly important for Turkey's foreign policy attitude toward the Turkic states. Consequently, the "Turkish Model" which was a strong motivation for the relations in the early 1990s was a clear manifestation of the perception of Turkish policy makers and diplomats about the newly-independent

Turkic states and the euphoria marked with the re-discovery of the transnational Turkic identity. This perception was one based on the earlier theoretical suggestion of Turkish political philosophy that Turkey is a bridge between the developed Western and the developing Eastern world. Now Turkish decision-makers felt the responsibility on their shoulders to help the brother countries to become secular democracies while on the other hand transforming their economies for socio-economic development.

4.4.8 Turkey and Non-Independent Turkic Communities

Turkey's courageous new foreign policy toward the Turkic World not only included the newly independent states but also those non-independent Turkic peoples. Although the term "Turkic World" first brings five independent Turkic states to one's mind – six if the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is included – it has also officially included Turkish and Turkic minorities who either has autonomous republics or live merely as citizens of a country which is defined by its majority. Turkey has tried to protect the rights and develop the socio-economic conditions of the Turkish minorities of the Balkan countries. The Gagauz of Moldova, Crimean Tatars of Ukraine and Tatars and Bashkirs of Russia have four such Turkic peoples with whom Turkish politicians have tried to develop relations. For instance, the rights of Crimean Tatars and Turkey's involvement on the issue of the return of Crimean Tatars to their homeland were put on the "Cooperation Agreement" signed by Turkish and Ukrainian officials in 1996 (Oylupınar, 2008: 87). Tatarstan and Bashkortostan as two autonomous republics of the Russian Federation, who have the right to establish relations with foreign countries, opened representative offices that represent these republics in İstanbul. Turkey's relations

with Tatarstan have become especially important with the agreement signed between Farid Mukhamedshin, the Head of the Parliament of Tatarstan and Hikmet Çetin, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey in May 1995. In September 1996, Turkey opened a consulate in Kazan, the capital of the Republic of Tatarstan, which had a strong autonomy acquired from Yeltsin's Moscow according to the agreement signed in 1994, and in return Tatarstan opened its diplomatic office in İstanbul in September 1997 (Kamalov, 2008: 82).

4.5 "Norm Entrepreneurs" in Action: Non-governmental Activism throughout the 1990s and the 2000s

Non-state actors that made the initial impact on bringing the idea of "Turkic World" into Turkish politics and public opinion had a freer hand to operate in Turkey and express their views in various transnational meetings in the post-Cold War era. This was related to both relatively faster democratization of Turkey and the rise of NGOs in numbers and activities and also to how Turkish decision-makers perceived the activities of non-state actors that advocated the idea of "Turkic World". Accordingly, the perception has been quite positive in total contrast to Cold War attitude. As world politics has been going through a transformation such that non-state actors of various kinds – micro actors such as individuals and/or macro actors such as companies or transnational advocacy networks – have been influential in states' policies, Turkish context has also been transformed to incorporate this multi-centric structure.

This process of admitting the wisdom and capacity of activity of non-governmental bodies such as social movements, associations and foundations advocating certain causes such as ethno-linguistic rights and compliance with the

Copenhagen criteria for EU affairs, think-tanks that produce thoughts on especially regional politics and diasporas pressuring and lobbying over governments for a certain ethnic group has had both a contentious and a cooperative impact. It is especially politicians and civic activists of Kurdish ethnic origin that have chosen contentious politics as both a feasible and an influential method to pressure upon governments, opposition parties, Turkish Armed Forces, intellectuals of various political wings, the media and the public opinion to advocate for improving the rights of Kurdish-origin citizens of Turkey. Kurdish NGOs directed by the PKK and its leader Abdullah Öcalan formed a transnational network quite active in terms of human resources and financial mobility across the European Union members, Russia, Syria and Iraq besides the major big cities of Turkey (Østegaard-Nielsen, 2003). Kurdish example might be taken as the most serious non-state challenge to the Turkish state as it was based on an identity issue − which is key for understanding transformation of world politics towards a multi-centric structure − and it included both an armed struggle and social activism, which are very difficult to exist in a single body, directed by a terrorist organization. Hence, authority and sovereignty of the Turkish state was challenged seriously throughout the 1990s by a collection of non-state entities acting transnationally and gathering around a single cause.

4.5.1 Diaspora Organizations

Despite the negative perception on NGOs caused by Kurdish separatism, not every issue related to identity and non-state actors advocating matters of identity have become threatening for the Turkish state. Several of such pressure groups, which started to act louder due to the end of the Cold War, were quite successful in talking to and pressuring on key decision-makers such as the President, the Prime

Minister, Foreign and Interior Ministers and diplomats of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as the leaders of major political parties such as the Homeland Party, True Path Party, Welfare Party, Republican People's Party, Democratic Left Party and NAP. Turkey's active policy to protect the rights and lives of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria as a result of increasing assimilation policies of the Zhivkov government starting from 1984 was a turning point on that. Crises in Yugoslavia in the 1990s triggered Balkans immigrants' solidarity associations to establish transnational ties rapidly and keep the Bosnian tragedy alive in Turkish media and public opinion. Besides Turkish NGOs of Bosnian origin, Balkans associations advocating the rights of the Turks in Western Thrace – such as the *Batı Trakya Türkleri Dayanışma Derneği* (Western Thrace Turks Solidarity Association) – were quite active and had close ties with politicians and diplomats. Moreover, as the "Iron Curtain" no more existed, Turkish citizens of Caucasian, Crimean Tatar and Central Asian origin were now free to visit their homelands, establish business relations and organize reciprocal cultural events and diaspora congresses. As one of the strongest diaspora groups in Turkey, Caucasian solidarity associations, which mainly included Turkish citizens of Circassian, Abkhazian, Chechen and Dagestani origins, reacted in an organized manner to the Georgia-Abkhazia War of 1991-1993 and Russo-Chechen War of 1994-1996 (Celikpala, 2007: 58-70). Caucasus-Abkhazia Solidarity Committee and Caucasus-Chechnya Solidarity Committee were the platforms through which major associations advocating Caucasian identity came together to have a united and stronger voice (Celikpala, 2007: 58-65). Caucasian diaspora not only had contacts with prominent Turkish decision-makers but also organized huge humanitarian aid campaigns for Abkhazia and Chechnya. As a result of their ongoing pressure upon politicians, Çelikpala (2007: 59) mentions that leaders of Caucasian

associations in Turkey had the chance to talk to Prime Minister Demirel in October 1992 on the ongoing war in Abkhazia and made the TGNA hold a session on this issue on October 13, 1992.

As for Turkic diasporas in Turkey, it can easily be argued that they were not as active and influential as the Balkans and Caucasian diasporas. Azerbaijani diaspora, whose origins went back to the early 1920s as the Turkist *Müsavat* Party moved its political center to Turkey in April 1920 and later continued its political and cultural activities within different NGOs, was the most active Turkic diaspora in Turkey in the early 1990s (Çelikpala, 2007: 53). Having taken support of nationalist NGOs in Turkey, Azerbaijani diaspora pressured on governments to take an active position to support the presidency of pan-Turkist Elchibey and to help Azerbaijan in its resistance against the Armenian invasion of Nagorno-Karabakh. However, soon after Azerbaijan declared its independence, in November 1992 Azerbaijani diaspora in Turkey led by the *Müsavat* movement moved its center back to Baku and hence Azerbaijani struggle inside Turkey ended (Çelikpala, 2007: 53). Turkestani, or Central Asian diaspora in Turkey was even weaker than the Azerbaijanis. Turkish citizens of Central Asian origins, some of which were descendants of the émigré activists and intellectuals of the late Ottoman and early Republican period, had already been representing themselves in different associations first of which – Turkestan Cultural Association – was established by prominent Bashkir pan-Turkist Zeki Velidi Togan in 1952. However, Cold War conjuncture and Turkey's relations with the Soviet Union did not let Turkestani diaspora in Turkey to act like a pressure group. Turkestanis in Turkey could be re-active only in 1984 as they established the *Türkistanlılar Kültür ve Sosyal Yardım Derneği* (Turkestanis Culture and Social Aid Association) (Andican, 2007: 615). The Association organized the First International

Turkestanis Congress in İstanbul in 1989 in order to bring together immigrant Central Asians from all-over the world. The Association acquired a status of "Non-Profit Public Association" from the state in 1991 and paved the way for state support for the establishment of the "Federation of Eurasia" in 1995, which included Uighur and Iraqi Turkmen Associations in Turkey (Andican, 2007: 625).

Besides the efforts of Azerbaijani, Crimean Tatar and Central Asian diaspora, advocating the Turkic cause inside the borders of Turkey remained primarily a mission of Turkish nationalists and pan-Turkists. Hence nationalist NGOs acted as "norm entrepreneurs", who kept the Turkic world alive in Turkish media, public opinion as well as in the agendas of political leaders. Besides the country-wide warm welcome for the independence of five Turkic republics, Armenian invasion of Nagorno-Karabakh and the Khojaly Massacre of 26 February 1992 made Turkic fraternity a topic that could not be ignored in Turkish politics (Milliyet, 28 February 1992). Finally, Nagorno-Karabakh became an issue of central importance for Turkey's neighborhood policy. By 1993 Turkish foreign policy toward Armenia changed significantly as Turkey decided to close the borderline and not to open it unless Armenian invasion ended in Nagorno-Karabakh.

4.5.2 A Transnational Platform: Turkic *Kurultay*s

Starting from 1991various pan-Turkist conferences and congresses have been held in major cities of Turkey, which has brought together activists, intellectuals, artists, politicians and bureaucrats from all over the Turkic world. Such congresses touched upon various topics such as cooperation in fields of education, transportation and broadcasting, unity in alphabet, Turkic arts and cultures, history, architecture, city planning, women's rights and sports as means of speeding up integration both

between Turkey and the Turkic republics and among Turkic republics themselves. More importantly, pan-Turkic meetings, which were held in Turkey called Turkish leaders and the leaders of the newly independent Turkic states to take measures in order to have a united voice in the international arena. For such a broad purpose of increasing contacts and cooperation in the Turkic world, *Türk Devlet ve Toplulukları Dostluk, Kardeşlik ve İşbirliği Kurultayları* (Turkic States and Communities Friendship, Brotherhood and Cooperation Congresses) has had a special place as they constituted both a platform of pan-Turkists all over the world to gather in annual meetings and Turkish officials to justify the significance they pay for Turkey's relations with the Turkic world. Among the tens of conferences, congresses and meetings held in order to promote Turkic rapprochement Turkic *Kurultay*s has constituted the broadest platform that incorporated pan-Turkist NGOs and individuals from Turkey, Azerbaijan, Central Asia, Crimea and Russia.

As Çay (2010), chief organizer of such congresses from the very beginning mentions, it was Alparslan Türkeş, the leader of the NAP and prominent pan-Turkist politician, who was among the Turkists jailed in the "Turkism-Turanism" trials of 1944. Türkeş proposed establishing a foundation or an NGO, which would be responsible for holding the Turkic *Kurultay*s every year and which would establish ties with Turkish decision-makers to make it an efficient body. The organization committee of the first *Kurultay*, Çay (2010) mentions, first visited the President Özal aiming to receive his support for the first congress. However, Özal hesitated to support such an initiative. Then, the committee visited Demirel, who willingly accepted to support the gathering of the first *Kurultay* by political means (Çay, 2010). This support would continue in the rest of such transnational congresses and make him a symbolic figure for pan-Turkic gatherings. Çay (2010) further says that

the attraction of and popular support for the first *Kurultay* made the President Özal, despite his initial hesitance, to attend it on its final day and make a speech. This first contact between "norm entrepreneurs" and key Turkish decision-makers affected the interaction between non-governmental bodies and the Turkish state to a great extent as it legitimized lobbying activities and pressures of the former on the latter.

Legitimacy of *Kurultay*s in the eyes of the organizers and participants was based on their connection with the earliest Turkists. Hence, the motto of *Kurultay*s has been "Unity in Language, Thought and Action" of Crimean Tatar intellectual Gasprinsky, whose works have become widespread in the last two decades and transnational activities have attracted increasing attention from Turkish intellectuals. Çay (2010), chief organizer of the congresses, argues that *Kurultay*s took the All-Russia Muslim Congresses of the early 20th century in the Tsarist Russia as an example as to what the format and spirit of the congresses should look like. Hence, organizers of the *Kurultay*s tried to establish a forum of free thought and a "think-tank-like" platform to offer advices for Turkish and Turkic policy-makers (Çay, 2010).

First of the Turkic *Kurultay*s was held in March 1993, in Antalya. The first and the rest of all such pan-Turkic gatherings were organized by *Türk Devlet ve Toplulukları Dostluk, Kardeşlik ve İşbirliği Vakfı* (TUDEV), Turkic States and Communities Friendship, Brotherhood and Cooperation Foundation and were sponsored by TIKA, which was established a year ago as part of Turkey's active foreign policy towards the Turkic world. The first head of TUDEV was Alparslan Türkeş and remained so until he died in 1997. The first meeting summoned under the auspices of Prime Minister Demirel and President Turgut Özal made the opening speech. The opening ceremony was held on March 21, which is traditionally a

festival day of Turkic and Persian peoples celebrated throughout Eurasia and the Middle East named *Nevruz*, The New Day in Persian. Up until Turkey re-discovered the Turkic world *Nevruz* used to be celebrated only by Kurds in Turkey and it had already become a symbol of popular support for the PKK in Turkey's southeastern cities. Hence, the Turkish state elite wanted to utilize *Nevruz* as a festival also celebrated in the rest of the Turkic world. In his speech, President Özal told that the star of Turkishness was shining as Turks met their brothers (BYEGM, March 1993).

Prime Minister Demirel argued that Turks were experiencing a "second *Ergenekon*" as the Soviet Union collapsed two years ago (BYEGM, March 1993). Moreover, social democrat deputy Prime Minister Erdal İnönü told in the Congress that "no one should be afraid of the togetherness of Turks as our common culture will make contributions to the peace all-over the world" (BYEGM, March 1993). Hundreds of delegates and guests from all over the Turkic world – including minority groups who either had their autonomous republics or lived directly as citizens of different countries – attended the *Kurultay*, among whom there were ministers, diplomats, bureaucrats and dominantly academics and activists. Following the patterns of the first *Kurultay*, ten other pan-Turkis gatherings were held in the last nineteen years since the collapse of the Soviet Union; the second *Kurultay* in October 1994 in İzmir, the third in September – October 1995 in İzmir, the fourth in March 1996 in Ankara, the fifth in April 1997 in İstanbul, the sixth in March 1998 in Bursa, the seventh in July 1999 in Denizli, the eighth in March 2000 in Samsun, the ninth in December 2001 in İstanbul, the tenth in September 2006 in Antalya and finally the eleventh in November 2007 in Baku, Azerbaijan.

A common pattern for the *Kurultay*s was that the first eight of them summoned under the auspices of Turkey's former prime minister and then ninth

president Demirel. Moreover, former President of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus Denktas attended all the first nine *Kurultay*s. Tenth President Sezer hesitated to take part in such congresses due to his bureaucratic attitude and efforts to remain objective in domestic politics. Finally, because of the hesitance of Sezer, disputes between the NAP and the organization committee and later the election of Justice and Development Party (JDP) in 2002 led to a break in *Kurultay*s between 2001 and 2006, until TUDEV and TIKA cooperated again to summon the tenth congress.

The aims of Turkic *Kurultay*s are well-defined in each of the books prepared annually after the meetings. From the very start Turkic congresses have had goals such as increasing ties among Turkic peoples, sustaining cooperation in international relations, economic as well as technological development, finding solutions for the common problems of the Turkic world, speeding up cultural exchange, finding common grounds for the peaceful resolution of disputes between Turkic states and other states, contributing to the establishment and strengthening of rule of law, multi-party democracy, secularism and respect for human rights in the Turkic world, reciprocal respect for the independence, sovereignty and internal affairs of each Turkic state, developing friendly relations with major powers of world politics such as Russia, the US, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, China and Japan and emphasizing that relations should be based on equality (Çay, 1995: 3-4).

As a final goal, *Kurultay*s have aimed to institutionalize relations among Turkic countries in such a way that all the above mentioned goals could be realized and friendship, brotherhood and cooperation in the Turkic world is sustained (Çay, 1995: 3-4). In all the *Kurultay*s, representatives from more than thirty Turkic peoples including independent states, autonomous republics and minority groups were present and given a chance to present their views before Turkish officials and media.

Despite warnings from the Chinese embassy in Ankara, Uighurs attended the *Kurultay*s to represent "Eastern Turkestan" rather than the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region as it is the official name of the region. Turks of Iran were also present to represent "Southern Azerbaijan". This indicates that the congresses offered non-official positions to be supported freely although Turkey officially did not have a policy concerning Eastern Turkestan or the Turkic population of Iran. In contrast, Turkish diplomacy has supported non-interference with domestic politics of China and Iran.

In line with the central argument of this study, Turkish foreign policy toward Turkic peoples has been shaped to a certain extent according to what has been suggested by the final declarations of the *Kurultay*s. Final declarations of Turkic *Kurultay*s have included different points related to the goals of the congresses. As *Kurultay*s had several different commissions such as language and alphabet commission, education, science and technology commission, international law and relations commission, economics and trade relations commission and youth commission, tens of suggestions have been made for the consideration of Turkish and Turkic decision-makers in all the eleven congresses (Çay, 2006). Each commission, chaired by a professor, presented its suggestions for both Turkish and Turkic policy-makers as policy options that could be implemented to increase integration among Turkic peoples. Commission reports aside, "final declarations" have been regarded as the most serious pieces of work that have come out of the *Kurultay*s.

Türkeş, leader of NAP and chair of TUDEV, told in the opening speech of the second *Kurultay* in 1994 that a Turkic Council and a Turkic Parliamentarians Assembly should be established in order to institutionalize the relationship (Çay,

1995: 35). Türkeş also argued that Turkey had to act like a bridge in order to help the newly-independent brothers to represent themselves in major international organizations (Çay, 1995: 34). Such proposals already existed in the first *Kurultay* of 1993 alongside other points inviting Turkey and Turkic republics to search for a common alphabet, developing human rights and multi-party democracy, protecting environment and increasing cooperation in science and technology sharing (Çay, 2006: 26-27). This indeed became a foreign policy goal of Turkey in the Turkic world as mentioned in the third chapter of this study. Furthermore, the proposals of these "norm entrepreneurs" were realized in October 2009 in Nakhchevan, Azerbaijan and both Turkic Council centered in İstanbul and Turkic Parliamentarians Assembly centered in Baku was established.[23] *Kurultay*s have also been platforms, where prominent Turkish politicians have made courageous and ambitious statements about Turkey's relations with the Turkic world. One such instance was Prime Minister Çiller arguing in the second *Kurultay* in 1994 that the cooperation of North American nations in NAFTA and the regional economic integration attempts in the Asia-Pacific region such as APEC should have been taken as models for Turkic integration (Çay, 1995: 22).

Finally, two points emphasized by the participants of the *Kurultay*s are worth mentioning concerning the state's position toward pan-Turkism. Firstly, commission reports and final declarations have emphasized that the aim of the Turkic congresses is not pan-Turkism or pan-Turanism in the sense that these gatherings will be the stepping stones of an aggressive policy toward creating a single Turkic state (Çay, 2006: 213). Rather than that, great emphasis was put on human rights and contributing to justice and world peace. Secondly, although participants denied pan-

---

[23] This process as part of the institutionalization of Turkey's foreign policy toward the Turkic world will be discussed in the next chapter.

Turanism they have declared, especially in the congresses of the 1990s, that unifying essence of the *Kurultay*s is Turkish/Turkic nationalism (Çay, 2006: 130). Although officially Turkey has not pursued a policy of Turkic nationalism, governments of various political wings have continued to support the activities and congresses of TUDEV.

4.5.3 *Kurultay*s in 2006 and 2007: Erdoğan and Aliyev

After five years of break for the *Kurultay*s tenth of them summoned in Antalya in September 2006, this time without any active support from the NAP and under the auspices of Prime Minister Erdoğan. Twelve years after the suggestion of Çiller, current Prime Minister Erdoğan, who does not belong to a nationalist and pan-Turkist political tradition, argued that Turks, in a unified manner, should be actors rather than subjects of the emerging world order (Hürriyet, 19 September 2006). Hence, he proposed that Turkic states should establish a "Commonwealth of Turkic-Speaking States". There may be several explanations as to why Erdoğan made such a pan-Turkist-looking statement in the tenth congress. Firstly, he might have wanted to utilize the nationalist public opinion for popular support. The second reason might be that he really wanted to establish a common future for the Turkic states because it is a matter of identity and civilization. He might also have desired for Turkey to act as the leader of such a Commonwealth that would automatically make Erdoğan a regional leader. Any of the possibilities justify that the idea of "Turkic World" is undeniable in Turkish politics. The idea, which tells that Turks and Turkic peoples all over the world are brothers and should act together in cultural, economic and political terms, has made a former political Islamist Turkish leader cooperate with a pan-Turkist NGO and develop a pan-Turkist-like discourse.

1500 participants attended the tenth *Kurultay* including ministers, bureaucrats, academics, representatives of NGOs, think-tanks, chambers of trade and industry, and media people (Çay, 2006: 265). Final declaration of the tenth Turkic *Kurultay*, which summoned in Antalya in September 2006, was presented by former Minister of State and current Minister of Interior Beşir Atalay. The final declaration included 35 points such as immediate establishment of a Union of Turkic-speaking States, condemnation of political and economic isolation toward the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, call for Armenia to withdraw its armed forces from Azerbaijan and warning the international community and Iraqi authorities to stop illegal destruction of the demographic structure of Kirkuk at the expanse of Iraqi Turks (Çay, 2006: 265-270).

The eleventh *Kurultay* summoned a year later on 17-19 November 2007 for the first time outside Turkey, in Baku, Azerbaijan under the auspices of the Azerbaijani President Aliyev. TIKA's and TUDEV's involvement in the organization of the *Kurultay* continued, but this time with strong contribution from the Azerbaijani bureaucracy. Consistent with the tradition, Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan and President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus Talat, were also present in the *Kurultay*. It was now Azerbaijan, a second Turkic state, which tried to utilize transnational Turkic identity and support Turkic activism in order to promote its national interests and especially find support from Turkic NGOs, media organs and public opinions in its struggle against the Armenian invasion of Nagorno-Karabakh. Speaking in front of the Grey Wolf figure as the symbol of the *Kurultay*s and a banner on which "unity in language, thought and action" of Gasprinsky was written, President Aliyev touched upon various fields of cooperation among Turkic states and communities such as energy transportation routes, economic development,

investment and multilateral trade opportunities and said that common history, culture, language and ethnic ties are what unite Turkic peoples (quoted in Qurbanov and Miralem: 9-12).

What was the most important in Aliyev's speech for the purpose of this study was his words on the role of non-governmental bodies in developing strong bonds in the Turkic world. Aliyev said that close ties among non-state actors, Turkic intellectuals and scholars further strengthened Turkic unity and that he looked at the *Kurultay* from such a perspective (quoted in Qurbanov and Miralem: 11). 1150 participants from all over the Turkic world attended the eleventh pan-Turkic congress in Baku and Turkmens of Iraq, Turks of Western Thrace, Uighurs of Eastern Turkestan and Tatars of Russia all had chance to raise their views as was the case in the former *Kurultay*s summoned in Turkey. Final Declaration of the Baku *Kurultay* suggested forty policy initiatives such as the rapid establishment of a Union of Turkic-speaking States and Union of Turkic Parliamentarians, cooperation among Turkic states in Azerbaijan's struggle against Armenian invasion, establishment of economic, cultural and political ties with the TRNC, support for Turkic diasporas that are actively organized in Europe and helping Turks and Turkic peoples, which live as minorities to acquire political and cultural rights.

4.5.4 Turkic *Kurultay*s and the Idea of "Turkic World"

Consequently, The *Kurultay*s have been symbolically important as they were quite prestigious in the eyes of Turkish politicians. Moreover, they have contributed to the consolidation of the idea of "Turkic World" in the public opinion, media and Turkish politics in general. Although they were organized by an NGO, *Kurultay*s acquired "semi-official status" in Hale's words (Hale: 2000, 292). Either Prime

Ministers or Ministers of Interior and Foreign Affairs, regardless of their political parties, attended all the *Kurultay*s and state sponsorship through TIKA has remained constant. As the content of the speeches of Özal, Demirel, İnönü, Çiller and Erdoğan indicate the idea of "Turkic World" is well-established in the discourse of key Turkish politicians. It was the strength of the idea of "Turkic World" that made these leaders, who come from different but definitely not pan-Turkist backgrounds, make bold statements about the future of the Turkic world and that pushed them towards cooperation with intellectuals and activists advocating the Turkic cause. It is, however, still debatable whether these leaders have really internalized the idea of "Turkic World", which indicates whether the idea has transformed into a norm.

Attention paid by the national media contributed to the excitement of the public and *Kurultay*s became important symbols through which Turkish citizens learned about Turkic-speaking peoples. Abdülhalûk Çay, became the chair of TUDEV and acted as the organizer of the *Kurultay*s after Türkeş died in 1997. In the general elections of 1999 he was elected as a member of parliament from NAP and held the position of Minister of State responsible for coordination between Turkey and Turkic states and relative communities. Most importantly for the purpose of this study, Turkish governments have given priority to the views, suggestions and demands of the participants of the *Kurultay*s and have implemented many of the points made in the final declarations of those congresses as Turkish policy toward both independent Turkic republics and Turkish/Turkic minorities. Opening of a new TRT Channel, TRT Avrasya and later on TRT Türk that could easily broadcast in the Balkans, Azerbaijan and Central Asia, the establishment of Turkic Council to act as a secretariat for the coordination of Turkic Summits, Turkic Parliamentarians Assembly (Turk-Pa) to foster intra-parliamentary cooperation among Turkic states

and Turkic Academy to conduct research on common Turkic history, cultures and languages were the most important implementations of *Kurultay* decisions. But it should also be noted that many of the demands made by participants of these congresses in commission reports and final declarations have not been realized. Creation of a Turkic customs union and establishing visa-free regimes among the six independent Turkic states have been such goals which require strong political will and commitment to be realized in the future.

In this sense, Turkic advocacy networks that support Turkic rapprochement have played the role of "norm entrepreneurs" (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998: 891) as they were supposed to be "epistemic communities" (Haas, 1992) and hence carried the transnational idea of "Turkic World" into Turkish foreign policy agenda. It is no secret that Turkish political elite and foreign policy bureaucracy had very little if no knowledge about Turkic-speaking peoples of the former Soviet Union in 1991. Similarly, Turkish political scientists and IR scholars did not have a "Eurasian" or "Turkic" concept and very few of them knew Russian or any Turkic dialects when the Cold War ended. In such an atmosphere, Turkic *Kurultay*s as well as many other congresses and meetings among Turkic peoples have reduced uncertainty for Turkish decision-makers as suggested by Haas (1992: 3-4). Acting like an epistemic community pan-Turkist activists and intellectuals, who have used non-governmental platforms such as the *Kurultay*s have brought together hundreds of people – politicians, bureaucrats, intellectuals, artists, students – from the Turkic world and introduced them to Turkish decision-makers, diplomats, media and public opinion.

Hence was the idea of "Turkic World" so widely accepted by different segments of the Turkish elite. In other words the efforts of Turkish/Turkic nationalist politicians, academics and intellectuals led to the "norm emergence" (Finnemore &

Sikkink, 1998: 891) stage in Turkish foreign policy. In response to such an effort, Turkish presidents, governments and diplomats have regarded Turkic activism as a means to carry Turkey into the Turkic world and vice versa. Moreover, pan-Turkists in Turkey and the rapidity with which they established transnational networks in the Turkic world have been perceived by Turkish decision-makers as a contribution to Turkey's efforts of opening up to the newly independent Turkic republics of the Caucasus and Central Asia. Eleven Turkic *Kurultay*s and similar pan-Turkist congresses have also triggered the establishment of networks throughout the Turkic world, which were connected to each other in ideational terms – as they all advocated the idea of "Turkic World" – and which could communicate easily thanks to technological developments. Although the last *Kurultay* summoned in Baku, the fact that the first ten congresses were organized in Turkey made it a familiar country for NGOs operating in the Balkans, Azerbaijan, Russia and Central Asia. Finally, that the last congress was organized in Baku under the auspices of Aliyev indicates that the transnational idea of "Turkic World" is also getting stronger in countries other than Turkey.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the entrance of the Turkic-speaking peoples – both independent states and non-independent peoples – into Turkish foreign policy in the early years of the post-Cold War era as well as the efforts to sustain a policy framework during the 1990s. As the end of the Cold War opened windows of opportunity for Turkish decision-makers, a new active foreign policy framework was developed that reshaped Turkey's position in its neighborhood. Within this active foreign policy framework, special attention was paid for the emergence of Turkic

world as the definition of Turkish identity was enlarged and traditional feeling of Turkish loneliness was replaced by a new world of "brothers". This activeness towards the Turkic world owed much to the efforts of non-governmental organizations and individuals – mainly pan-Turkist figures – to bring the idea of "Turkic World" into Turkish politics. Perception of Turkish intellectuals and decision-makers regarding Turkish identity was also going through transformation as the Cold War was ending. Now, Turkishness was being connected to the wider Turkic world just like it was the case during the latest period of the Ottoman Empire. Hence, "society world" had a significant say in the re-definition of Turkish national interests as the issue was strongly related to identity.

Ideational factors were cooperating with geopolitical ones as Turkey was developing an active foreign policy framework toward Turkic-speaking peoples as a whole. Otherwise, geopolitical factors are not sufficient to explain such an active foreign policy move of Turkey towards the Caucasus and Central Asia. Accordingly, Turkey followed various policy moves such as offering political, administrative and technical aid to the newly-independent countries, establishing a new organization – TIKA – to coordinate the aids, starting an unprecedented student exchange project and bringing Turkic leaders together in annual summits. In all those policy areas Turkicness has been embedded as an identity and Turkish decision-makers have kept in mind that Turkey is a part of the entire "Turkic World". The framework developed for Turkey's relations with Turkic states, which was highly influenced by the transnational idea of "Turkic World", have remained more or less the same in the 2000s, when strong steps have been taken concerning the institutionalization of Turkish foreign policy. The next chapter will focus on this process and patterns of institutionalization.

CHAPTER 5

TURKIC WORLD IN TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY: PATTERNS OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION

5.1 Disappointment in Relations

The excitement of Turkey's rapprochement with the Turkic world and the foreign policy framework developed accordingly left itself to a more rational and pragmatic one as of the late 1990s. This process went hand in hand with the assumption that Turkish foreign policy goals toward the Caucasus and Central Asia had been unsuccessful and hence had to be reformed. As of the late 1990s Turkish decision-makers were aware that it was very difficult to establish a "Union of Turkic States" stretching from the "Adriatic Sea to the Chinese Wall" and creating a Turkic customs union. According to some authors (Erol, 2007: 44-45, Karasar, 2007: 160, Torbakov, 2005: 119-120, Tworkowski, 2008: 44, Winrow, 2003: 100-101), who study Turkey's relations with the post-Soviet space, several domestic and international reasons were explanatory for such a policy change. Firstly, Turkey's struggle against PKK terrorism and Kurdish question was a major factor, which diverted Turkey's regional focus to a more security-oriented foreign policy approach

that focused more on territorial integrity. Secondly, Turkey's economic crises in the mid-1990s and 2001, combined with huge amounts of financial resources devoted to counter-terrorism made Turkey's attempts to create a common Turkic market and Turkish investment plans in the Turkic states impossible to be realized.

Thirdly, although Turkish politicians and public opinion were eager to develop ties with Turkic peoples and Turkish bureaucracy was reorganized to incorporate the Caucasus and Central Asia, there was a certain lack of knowledge and expertise regarding the Turkic world. Winrow (2002: 159) quotes Andican, former government spokesperson, complaining about the attitude of Turkish officials towards Central Asia saying that they could not comprehend the level of higher education and scientific expertise reached by Turkic republics during the Soviet period. As the initial excitement could not be supported by regional expertise, Turkish diplomats, politicians and public opinion lost their belief in a common Turkic future by the late 1990s. This was evident from the loss of attention paid by national media to the Turkic *Kurultay*s and Presidential Summits. Çay (2010) depicts the situation as follows: "We used to think it was a love like *Leyla* and *Mecnun*. Within a few years after independence, it was understood that neither *Leyla* was so beautiful, nor *Mecnun* was so courageous to meet *Leyla*."

Fourthly, by the late 1990s Turkey focused more on EU integration, Cyprus problem and disputes with Syria as traditional issues of Turkish foreign policy rather than building a Turkic economic and political union. Fifthly, as an international factor, Russia's turn-back to the Caucasus and Central Asia revitalizing its "Near Abroad" doctrine hampered Turkey's initial search for a regional leadership. As a sixth factor, "Turkish Model" did not become too much an attractive option for the authoritarian Turkic leaders as they "did not have much interest in fostering broader

political participation and pluralism" (Torbakov, 2005: 119). Moreover, newly-independent Turkic leaders hesitated from accepting a new "big brother", which was supposed to be Turkey, although Turkey did not have sufficient financial and political leverage to carry on such a hegemonic role (Winrow, 2003: 101). Finally, several years after independence, Turkic leaders of Azerbaijan and Central Asia no more depended on Turkish assistance, to open up their markets and energy resources for foreign powers. Hence Western as well as Chinese and Indian economic and political activity in the region increased, making Turkish geopolitical influence smaller.

Turkey's relations with the Turkic republics went through a serious test in balancing democratic development in the Turkic republics and keeping stable and well-governed state structures. According to Andican (2010), "autocratic nature" of Turkic leaders prevented Turkey to establish in-depth relations – especially non-governmental ties – with the peoples of Turkic republics. Turkey hesitated to support Turkist Elchibey of Azerbaijan, who adhered to a democratic model of governance, and supported Aliyev in order not to sacrifice Turkey's relations with its closest ally (see Ergun, 2007: 246-252 for a detailed analysis). Tensions with Uzbek leader Karimov was even a more critical test for Turkish foreign policy. As of 1996 Karimov started to warn Turkey and the Welfare Party not to establish ties with Uzbek radical Islamists (Yanık, 2004: 295). Moreover, Uzbek opposition leader Muhammad Salih's presence in Turkey and the warm-welcome towards him from nationalist circles further increased the anger of Karimov. Following rumors that Uzbek students in Turkey, who had the Turkish government scholarship, were controlled by Salih, Karimov withdrew a total of 1298 students in 1997 and another 243 students by 1999 (Yanık, 2004: 296). As Yanık (2004: 296) quotes then-Prime

Minister Ecevit, Turkish-Uzbek relations were hardly damaged due to "unnecessarily created distrust". Karimov's authoritarian rule in Uzbekistan not only damaged its relations with Turkey but also closed the windows for non-state actors to interact transnationally.

5.2 Revision in Turkish Foreign Policy toward the Turkic World: Pragmatism or Continuity?

Turkey experienced a slow-down in relations as Turkish politicians and decision-makers realized fact that neither Turkey was strong to acquire a regional leadership status in such a short period of time, nor the Turkic states of the former Soviet Union were so eager to build relations based on a common identity. Nevertheless, the relationships have been sustained and followed patterns of institutionalization – internalization and socialization – concerning Turkish foreign policy behavior. The explanatory factor for the insistence of Turkish decision-makers to establish a coherent policy toward Turkic republics despite mutual disappointments is the idea of "Turkic World", which made Turkey's relation with the Turkic states one of top issue-areas in Turkish foreign policy. For instance, during the Foreign Ministry of İsmail Cem – between June 1997 and July 2002, who was a well-known social democrat, Turkish foreign policy toward Turkic republics was perceived as a source of Turkish soft power in Eurasia that could contribute to Turkey's bargaining power in EU accession process (Cem, 2005: 99-100, 113). However, Cem (2005: 240) also recognized that Turkey had an "Asian" identity and had brother nations in the East with for which Turkey had a responsibility to assist economic transition and state-building. Hence his perception of the Caucasus and

Central Asia was not only shaped by a geopolitical vision, but carried a normative aspect.

According to Winrow (2003: 107) the emergence of the Caspian basin as a potential source for influencing Turkey's geopolitical significance has given Turkish foreign policy toward Turkic states a new dimension. Similarly Aydın (2004: 10) argues that it was "actual economic, political and strategic gains expected from the transportation of Caspian energy resources" that led to an evolution of Turkish foreign policy toward the former Soviet space in more pragmatic terms. Hence, construction of the Baku-Tblisi-Ceyhan (BTC) pipeline and possible involvement of Kazakhstan to the project became an important aspect of relations. Energy diplomacy among Turkic peoples caused such a euphoria that Turkish president Demirel and Azerbaijani President Aliyev would call the BTC "the project of the century", which facilitated closer ties among brothers (Demirel, 2005: 20). Turkey's focus on getting involved in pipeline diplomacy – such as the ongoing Nabucco Project – in order to become an energy hub connecting the Caspian Basin with Western markets might be evaluated as a turn to pragmatism as Turkey no more relied on ideational factors related to common ethnicity.

However, the idea of "Turkic World" has remained in Turkish foreign policy toward the Turkic world and also continued to influence it. Accordingly, there have been strong indicators of continuity, in other words internalization in Turkish foreign policy toward the Turkic world. As stated in the official website of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey has followed several goals towards Central Asia, which was comprised of "brother" countries. These goals are; "to contribute to the consolidation of their state structuring, to preserve political and economic stability and promote regional cooperation, to encourage political and economic reforms, to

112

assist their integration with the international community and Euro-Atlantic structures, to develop bilateral relations in all fields on the basis of equality, mutual interest and respect for sovereignty, to support the transportation of their energy resources to international markets freely and through alternative routes". As it was mentioned before in this study, the first, third and fourth official goal has been a responsibility for Turkey, who has wanted to assist brother nations administratively, economically and politically. One result in international platforms has been the rapid strengthening of Kazakhstan and finally its success in holding the chairmanship of OSCE for the 2010 term. Although almost two decades have passed since Central Asian republics gained their independence, this official responsibility felt by Turkish diplomats and decision-makers has remained constant. Finally, the fifth official goal might be interpreted in such a way that Turkey hesitates to look like a "big brother" in Central Asia. Otherwise, it is natural and not required to mention at all that relations are based on equality, mutual interest and sovereignty, which is the case for relations with all countries. A similar note appears for Turkey's relations with the Balkan countries, "with which Turkey has historic, cultural and humanitarian ties". Finally, there is a similar note for Turkey's political relations with Russia, which arises from mutual understanding in fight against terrorism and ethnic separatism.

5.2.1 Turkic Summits: a Transgovernmental Platform

Turkic-speaking States Heads of States Summits, or "Turkic Summits" have been an important component of Turkey's relations with the Turkic world. This is primarily because authoritarian and non-democratic structures of Turkic leaders have inevitably made inter-personal contact between Turkish Presidents and their counterparts undeniably significant. All six Turkic leaders attended the five summits;

first in 1992 in Ankara, second in İstanbul in 1994, third in Bishkek in 1995, fourth in Tashkent in 1996, fifth in Astana in 1998. Turkmen leader Niyazov did not attend the sixth summit in Baku in 2000 and the eighth summit in Antalya in 2006, whereas Uzbek leader Karimov has not attended the summits since the sixth one in Azerbaijan. New Turkmen president Berdymukhammedov followed his predecessor and did not attend the ninth summit in Nakhchivan in 2009. Despite the failure of the summits to realize concrete goals throughout the 1990s and hesitance of Turkic leaders to trust Turkic bonds as a means of increasing multilateral cooperation, summits have paved the way for institutionalizing Turkish foreign policy toward the Turkic world.

The final summit, which was held in Nakhchivan in October 2009, was of crucial importance due to the steps taken by Aliyev of Azerbaijan, Gül of Turkey, Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan and Kurmanbekbakiyev of Kyrgyzstan. The first result that came out of the Summit was the establishment of the Turkic-speaking Countries Cooperation Council, "Turkic Council" in short – based in İstanbul – which would act as a secretariat of Turkic Summits (Kanbolat, 2009). Hence, summits bureaucratized in a transgovernmental manner to incorporate Turkic diplomats and bureaucrats to discuss their views on critical matters in Eurasia such as the Nagorno-Karabakh problem, transportation of Caspian energy resources, cooperation in trade and fight against terrorism. Besides permanent secretariat, Turkic Council also includes Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Council of Senior Officials and *Aksakallar Konseyi*, Council of Wise Men (Kanbolat, 2009).

Secondly, Turkic Parliamentarians Assembly based in Baku, which was established in November 2008 with an agreement signed between the Heads of Parliaments of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey, was made a sub-unit

of the Turkic Council. Turkic Parliamentarians Assembly, Turk-Pa in short, constitutes an international platform bringing together Turkic parliamentarians periodically. Third result of the Nakhchivan summit was the decision to establish a "Turkic Academy" in Kazakhstan, which is planned to bring together Turkic academics by organizing congresses and publishing books and journals on common Turkic identity. Turkic Academy was opened in May 2010 by Nazarbayev and Gül, during the official visit paid by the latter to Kazakhstan.

According to Kanbolat (2009), who thinks that the 9th Turkic Summit was a "turning point" for the future of the Turkic world, the aim of the Nakhchivan Agreement signed between four Turkic leaders was to "establish an institutional structure similar to the cooperation achieved in the Arab League, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), the International Organization of the Francophonie (OIF), the Commonwealth of Nations, the Council of Europe and among Latin American countries". Concerning transnationalism the institutionalizing pattern of the Turkic Summits are significant since internationalization leads to fewer regulations between states and closer ties among citizens of the states, which are part of the process. According to Risse-Kappen (1995: 7):

> The more the respective issue-area is regulated by international norms of cooperation, the more permeable should state boundaries become for transnational activities. Highly regulated and cooperative structures of international governance tend to legitimize transnational activities and to increase their access to the national polities as well as their ability to form "willing coalitions" for policy change.

If Risse-Kappen's (1995: 29) argument comes true, the establishment of transgovernmental and international institutions that coordinate cooperation among independent Turkic states, then one can foresee that the policy impact of transnational actors that advocate a common Turkic future will increase. This

institutionalizing pattern may also contribute to further transnationalization of social movements and advocacy networks of the Turkic world as such transnationalization becomes more and more expected by Turkish and Turkic governments. That NGOs interested in Turkey's relations with the Turkic world have been invited to a meeting in the Çankaya Palace in order to be informed about the Turkic Council is a clear indicator of this further transnationalization. As Güngör (2009), a Turkish activist of the rights of Turks living in the Netherlands, mentions a significant role is predicted for NGOs that are accepted to be the "third sector" of world politics to handle the mission of the Turkic Council.

Steps taken as a result of the 9th Turkic Summit were important also because it was the Kazakh leader Nazarbayev who proposed the establishment of a Turkic Council in the 8th Summit in Antalya as well as the 9th Summit in Nakhchivan (see TGNA Website on Turk-Pa). In the 11th Turkic *Kurultay* held in Baku in 2007, Erdoğan followed the proposal made by Nazarbayev a year ago, and said that Turkic Summits should have been institutionalized to foster ties among Turkic peoples (Qurbanov and Miralem, 2008: 18). Consequently, Turkic-speaking Countries Heads of States Summits have constituted a basis for the institutionalization of the idea of "Turkic World" in Turkish foreign policy. Although they were not as effective and fruitful as it was supposed in the first Summit held in Ankara in 1992, they have established platforms for Turkic leaders to come together periodically. Efforts made by the Turkish decision-makers to take steps for establishing an institutional framework for Turkic Summits, Turk-Pa as well as forming transgovernmental bodies to bring Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Senior diplomats together is a clear indicator of the significance paid to the Turkic world by the Turkish state despite dissapointments. Such a step is also a strong part of the socialization and

internalization (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998 and Risse-Kappen and Sikkink, 1999) of the idea of "Turkic World" in Turkish foreign policy on its process of becoming a norm.

5.2.2 TIKA: Turkey's Soft Power

As analyzed before in this study (see Chp. 4: 57) TIKA's establishment, as a new pattern in Turkish foreign policy behavior, was a clear indicator of the importance paid by Turkey to the Turkic world. Referring to aid directed by developed nations to the developing world during the Cold War, Fidan and Nurdun (2008:95), as a former and a current top-level administrators of TIKA, mention that humanitarian aid may also aim to benefit donor countries politically, economically and strategically in the long run. A similar situation may be claimed to exist for TIKA as it has acted as the primary actor of Turkish "Soft Power" in Turkey's neighborhood including the Balkans, the Caucasus, Black Sea basin, Central Asia and the Middle East. The emergence of newly-independent states in the former space, five of which are of Turkic origin, and "cultural ties" with those Turkic republics have been the major motive behind Turkey to develop a comprehensive foreign aid policy (Fidan and Nurdun: 2008, 102). Enhancement of such a policy by revising TIKA to become a powerful regional donor institution is a continuation of the "responsibility" (Bal, 2000: 44) felt by Turkish decision-makers to assist brother countries.

According to Karasar (2007: 153), TIKA's ambitious and exciting initial efforts almost came to a halt by the end of the 1990s as the institution was left open to problems stemming from domestic political problems of Turkey. Since 1999, when the agency was reorganized as a relatively strong institution under the Prime

Ministry, TIKA has been a very important actor of the evolving Turkish foreign policy toward the Balkans, the Caucasus and Central Asia as three regions with the biggest bulk of Turkic-speaking peoples. The symbolic significance and budget of TIKA have been increasing since the first JDP government took the seat in 2002. According to a report of the Agency, the total number of projects and activities realized by TIKA between 1992 and 2002 was 2345 whereas the number between 2003 and 2006 rose up to 2792 (TIKA, 2006: 19).

As former Minister of State Yazıcıoğlu mentions in the TIKA Annual Report 2007 (foreword), the Agency has become an important instrument of Turkish foreign policy as well as a respected development institution of the international community. Parallel to the Strategic Depth doctrine of the JDP, the geographic scope of TIKA has increased in the last decade as the institution has opened up offices in the Middle East and Africa. However majority of its projects and aid have continued to focus on the Turkic world. In 2007 the Caucasus and Central Asia –including Afghanistan- have received the greatest share of expenditure for projects and programs with 57 % (TIKA, 2007: 13). Similarly, according to the Annual Report of the Agency (TIKA, 2008: 10) prepared for activities in 2008, South – refers to Afghanistan – and Central Asia maintained its priority receiving almost 54 % of the total amount of Official Development Assistance given through TIKA. The agency also offers humanitarian and technical aid for the Crieman Tatars and who live as a minority in the Crimean peninsula of Ukraine in order to trigger their integration into the main bulk of the society as well as maintaining their ethnic well-being (TIKA, 2008: 79-80). The amount of projects completed by TIKA in Central Asian countries are worth $ 100 million (MFA website).

What should also finally be mentioned as an important contribution of TIKA to Turkey's relations with the Turkic world from a point of view of transnationalism is that the Agency has been directing a "Turcology Project" to bring together academics of Turkic history and languages since 2000 and has been supporting the activities of NGOs such as the Turkic World Research Foundation, Turkish Hearths, World League of Turkic Youth and Turkish Cultural Centers in Eurasia. The Agency has devoted special focus on strengthening non-governmental organizations and cooperation of governments with NGOs in the countries, where it has offices. TIKA has also sponsored the activities of *Türk Dünyası Belediyeler Birlidği* (Turkic World Union of Municipalities) which is an umbrella organization that aims to foster cooperation among local administration of Turkic countries and regions (TIKA, 2008b: 14).

Consequently, TIKA, with its focus on development aid and support for non-governmental actors, has become a major actor of Turkish "Soft Power" in Turkey's neighborhood and this indicates the evolving though continuing importance of the place of the Turkic world in Turkish foreign policy. Through its projects in various fields, TIKA, as a governmental body, has acted as a facilitator for closer contacts among the bureaucrats, academics and intellectuals of the Turkic world. Its strengthening role in Turkish foreign policy has proved that Turkey's relations with the Turkic-speaking peoples have much more to do with than energy security and economic cooperation. In this sense it has led to the consolidation of the transnational idea of "Turkic World".

5.3 Patterns of Norm Creation: Government and Party Programs, Ministers of State and Official Visits

5.3.1 Turkic Republics in Government Programs

Another indicator that the idea of "Turkic World" is on the process of internalization as a norm in Turkish foreign policy is the emphasis given to relations with Turkic states of Eurasia in government programs. In each program of a newly elected Turkish government, foreign policy constitutes an important component. As in other sub-topics of the program such as domestic security, economic development, fight against unemployment and matters related to social security, most important foreign policy concerns are listed. In "foreign policy" as a chapter of government programs, Turkey's relations with the EC and then the EU, Turkey's crucial role in NATO, Turkish-Greek problems and Cyprus issue have always appeared as natural topics of Turkish foreign policy and political life (see TGNA website for "Governments of Republic of Turkey" for detailed information).

While there was no reference to relations with the Turkic world in the program of the 48th government of Mesut Yılmaz[24], the term "Central Asia" was first used in the 49th government[25] program, which was declared by Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel. However, the term was used to describe Turkey's role as a bridge to carry European values and norms to its neighborhood. The First Çiller, or the 50th Turkish government[26], was clearer in terms of defining Central Asia and the Caucasus as the program argued that Turkey had "linguistic, religious and cultural ties" with those regions and hence cooperation should have been increased. The 50th program also stressed upon the determination of the government to support "brother Azerbaijan" against Armenia, with which Azerbaijan had an ongoing war over

---

[24] 23 June 1991 – 20 November 1991.
[25] 20 November 1991 – 25 June 1993.
[26] 25 June 1993 – 5 October 1995.

Nagorno-Karabakh. The 51st government[27] program, which was again declared by Çiller, listed relations with Central Asia and the Caucasus, in which Turkey had "brothers", among only five foreign policy priorities and two paragraphs were devoted to it. Interestingly enough, program of the 52nd government[28], or the third Çiller government, included no references to Central Asia or the Caucasus in the foreign policy section.

Program of the 53th government[29] of Yılmaz included similar sentences related to Central Asia and Azerbaijan while it also emphasized need to increase social, cultural and educational ties with Turkic states and communities. Program of the 54th, or Erbakan government[30], in which the Islamist Welfare Party was the leading partner, had three paragraphs on relations with the "Turkic Republics" and listed relations with those countries as important as relations with Europe, the Balkans and Muslim countries. Program of the 55th Government[31] of Mesut Yılmaz had a similar approach as well. Fourth Ecevit, or the 56th government[32] was the first to touch upon "Turkic and relative communities that live in different countries".

Program of the 57th government of Ecevit[33], in which pan-Turkist NAP was a government partner besides the Homeland Party, also included a paragraph related to proposed efforts to foster cooperation with Turkic republics. For the purpose of this study, Erbakan's and Ecevit's government programs were especially important because both leaders came from two distinct political traditions – political Islam and democratic left – which both dismissed pan-Turkism. The fact that relations with Turkic states has been accepted as a foreign policy priority for all Turkish leaders

---

[27] 5 October 1995 – 30 October 1995.
[28] 30 October 1995 – 6 March 1996
[29] 6 March 1996 – 28 June 1996.
[30] 28 June 1996 – 30 June 1997.
[31] 30 June 1997 – 11 January 1999.
[32] 11 January 1999 – 28 May 1999.
[33] 28 May 1999 – 18 November 2002.

including an Islamist and a Leftist one is a clear manifestation of the process of norm creation in Turkish foreign policy.

Period of JDP governments started in Turkey with the 58th government of Abdullah Gül in November 2002. In the program of the 58th government[34], Prime Minister Gül said that it was a fact that Turkey could not realize what had been expected of it in its relations with Turkic republics and that the new government would carry relations between Turkey and the Turkic Republics of Central Asia to the "farthest point". Moreover, Gül's program proposed to "transform the region into a region of cooperation". Similar to Gül, program of the first Erdoğan or the 59th government[35], the same paragraph as in Gül's program existed. Finally, in the 60th government program, which is the current second Erdoğan government, Central Asia was listed as one of the regions alongside the Balkans, the Caucasus, the Middle East, and Caspian, Mediterranean, Black Sea and Basra basin as regions of Turkish foreign policy interests. Moreover, the program emphasized former and current development aid given to Turkic states and Turkic communities.

Consequently, although the term *Türk Dünyası* (Turkic World) has never been used in government programs, brotherhood with Central Asian republics and Azerbaijan – sometimes brother republics, Turkic republics and Turkic and relative communities – has been emphasized and determination for stronger cooperation has been stressed. The 52nd government program has been an exception for this institutionalized and internalized pattern related to foreign policy.

---

[34] 18 November 2002 – 14 March 2003
[35] 14 March 2003 – 29 August 2007

5.3.2 Ministers of State

It is quite significant as a foreign policy behavior for Turkey that most of the above-mentioned governments have included a Minister of State responsible for the coordination of Turkey's relations with Turkic states and communities. No such position has been devoted for another region or group of countries and identities, including the Refahyol government that was dominated by the Islamist Welfare Party. Although the Ministry has occupied a symbolic importance for Turkey's relations with the Turkic republics and it did not have personnel of its own to organize as a full-fledged ministry, it has conducted important missions such as coordinating TIKA, and fostering cooperation among NGOs in Turkey related to Balkans, the Crimea, Iraqi Turkmen, the Caucasus and Central Asia. The Ministry also supported transnational and transgovernmental – among bureaucratic bodies of Turkey and Turkic states – conferences and congresses on increasing cooperation among Turkic peoples in fields such as economic transition, information technologies and alphabet union. Since TIKA's re-organization as an Agency, its President has been responsible for reporting to the related Minister of State. The Ministry was symbolically very important for Turkish domestic politics in the 55th government as Minister of State responsible for coordination between Turkey and the Turkic world, Ahat Andican, was also the government spokesperson, and hence was quite popular and well-known in Turkish media and public opinion. In the current 60th government, Minister of State responsible for this task is Faruk Çelik, who took over this mission from Sait Yazıcıoğlu in May 2009.

5.3.3 Official Visits

Official visits of Turkish leaders to Azerbaijan and Central Asian republics upon invitation from Turkic leaders have been a ceremonious event. Consistent with the "brotherhood" discourse internalized by Turkish politicians concerning Turkic-speaking peoples, current Turkish Presidents, Prime Ministers and Ministers of Foreign Affairs have tended either to pay their first official visits to Turkic capitals, or include Turkic capitals among the first to be visited. Despite his hesitance in fostering inter-personal relations with Turkic leaders unlike his predecessor Demirel, Turkey's 10th President Ahmet Necdet Sezer paid his first official visits to TRNC in June 2000, Azerbaijan in July 2000 and Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan respectively in a four-day trip to Central Asia in November 2000. Similar to his predecessor Sezer, 11th President Gül went first to TRNC in September 2007. Three of his next five official visits were paid to Turkic capitals; Azerbaijan in November 2007, Pakistan, Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan in December 2007, and the US in January 2008. That the former and current Turkish Presidents have chosen to visit TRNC first and Azerbaijan second indicates the importance of Turkic ethnicity in Turkish foreign policy, which is a pattern for norm internalization process.

Prime Ministers have also chosen TRNC and Turkic capitals as their first destinations to fly. However, as foreign policy agendas of Prime Ministers as chief executers in the Turkish political system may vary according to the conjuncture, their official visit schedules for Turkic states are not as clear as those of the Presidents. One instance is former Prime Minister Yılmaz, who visited Azerbaijan in April 1996 just a month after he took his seat. In his third term as Prime Minister, Yılmaz visited Kazakhstan as his first foreign destination in November 1997 with a large group of businessmen to sign important agreements. One should note here that Prime

Minister Erdoğan paid his first three official visits to TRNC in May 2003, Malaysia and Pakistan in June in 2003; he had already visited Azerbaijan and all the Turkic capitals of Central Asia in January 2003 before anywhere else, while he was the leader of JDP during Gül's Prime Ministry, but not a member of parliament since his political ban was continuing. Similar to Erdoğan, current Minister of Foreign Affairs Davutoğlu paid his first official visits to TRNC and Azerbaijan in May 2009 right after he was appointed.

5.3.4 Party Programs

Turkey's relations with the Turkic world has also been included in the programs of major political parties such as the ruling JDP, main opposition party RPP, nationalist NAP, Kurdish PDP and center-right DP within their foreign policy sections. Similar to the most recent three government programs the ruling JDP argues that it will transform Central Asia into a region of cooperation and will also foster ties between Turkey and Turkic republics, which are not in the expected level (see AK Party Official Website). Major opposition party RPP, despite its more Western-oriented Kemalist vision of foreign policy devotes a considerable space to Turkey's relations with "Turkic republics" as well as "consanguineous" citizens of different countries such as Turks of Western Thrace and the remaining Balkans (Republican People's Party, 2008: 129-131). In addition to such an emphasis on Turkic peoples, RPP (2008: 134) officials regard Turkey's relations with the "Turkic republics" as a key element of establishing a "distinctive character" in foreign policy alongside relations with the Balkans, Muslim countries, the Caucasus, Cyprus, the UN and OSCE. As the first and foremost pan-Turkist political party in Turkey, NAP's program includes the biggest emphasis on relations with Turkic-speaking peoples.

Under a sub-chapter of foreign policy titled "Turkic World", NAP (2009: 126-127) offers priority and privilege for Turkey's relations with Turkic states and communities. In addition, NAP's program (2009: 77, 81) proposes priority given to Turkic states in fields such as mining, energy security and technological and scientific cooperation. NAP also has a vice-chair, former Ambassador Deniz Bölükbaşı, who is responsible for relations with the Turkic world. Finally, as the fourth party, which has a parliamentary group in the TGNA, Kurdish Peace and Democracy Party's program (see PDP Official Website) also includes Central Asia as one of the regions, which Turkey is a part of. Consequently, programs of the major political parties in Turkey all agree that Turkey's relations with the Turkic world should be enhanced, which is another indicator of the ongoing process of "norm creation" in Turkish foreign policy.

5.4 Test Cases in Norm Creation: Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan in Turkish Foreign Policy

5.4.1 Turkey and Kazakhstan: Strategic Partners in Eurasia

Central Asia is not supposed to be a foreign policy priority for the ruling JDP, according to various scholars (Aydın, 2004, Murinson 2006, Öniş and Yılmaz, 2009). For instance Aydın (2004: 17) argued that JDP's foreign policy priorities "raised doubts about Turkey's commitment towards the region. Similarly, Murinson (2006), Öniş and Yılmaz (2009) and Keyman (2009) did not list "Central Asia" or "Turkic states" among countries or regions of importance for Turkish foreign policy. Rather, rapprochement with Syria, relations with Iraq in the post-2003 period, friendly relations with Iran, Turkey's struggle to act as mediator in Middle Eastern conflicts – Syria-Israel and Syria-Lebanon – efforts towards EU membership, a new

vision on the Cyprus problem, Turkish-US strategic partnership, increasing Turkish-Russian trade relations have been listed as top issues for Turkish foreign policy within the "Strategic Depth" doctrine of Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ahmet Davutoğlu.

Although relations with Turkey's near neighborhood including the Balkans, the Middle East and the Caucasus have been of prior importance for the foreign policy conducted by JDP, the impact of the idea of "Turkic World" has been strengthened by the step taken toward strategic partnership with Kazakhstan. Minister of Foreign Affairs Davutoğlu (2007: 81) indeed argues that Turkey is a part of Caucasian and Central Asian geopolitics alongside the Balkans and the Middle East (see also Davutoğlu, 2001: 455-500 for the place of Central Asia and the Turkic world in his theory of "Strategic Depth"). Both President Gül's and Nazarbayev's close ties and the latter's two-decade old commitment to Turkic cooperation in Eurasia have speeded up the process. During Kazakh leader Nazarbayev's official visit to Ankara in October 2009, "Strategic Partnership Agreement" was signed between Turkey and Kazakhstan, which aimed to foster cooperation in fields of defense and military affairs, foreign direct investment, economic development, scientific cooperation, educational exchange and tourism. As the two leaders talked about the agreement before the media Gül said it was for the first time that such an agreement was signed between Turkic states of Eurasia and praised Nazarbayev during the ceremony when he received a medal from Turkey for being "the Elder Statesman of the entire Turkic world" (see Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Website). Both leaders' speeches made references to a common Turkic civilization that is the cement that make the partnership between two countries an obligation to be fulfilled.

In February 2010, Minister of Foreign Affairs Davutoğlu visited Kazakhstan. In an article of him published in a Kazakh newspaper, that had a quite emotional tone, Davutoğlu (2010) praised Nazarbayev as the "wise man of the Turkic world" and said contribution of Kazakhstan to cooperation mechanism among the Turkic states shall never be forgotten. Recently, in May 2010 Gül paid an official visit to Kazakhstan, for the third time during his Presidency. Gül's visit looked very similar to trips of Özal and Demirel to Central Asia in the 1990s as there were more than 250 Turkish participants, including ministers, heads of Higher Education Council (YÖK) and TÜBİTAK, academicians, and business-men alongside the President. According to a report of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan (2010: 1-3), Gül's visit boosted "brotherly ties" in the Turkic world as the officials of two countries signed a package of agreements worth $ 400 million. During the visit, two leaders opened the above-mentioned Turkic Academy in Astana, which was "visionary idea of Nazarbayev" in Gül's words (see Presidency website). Both presidents pledged to increase the trade volume between Turkey and Kazakhstan to $ 10 billion in a few years, which is currently around $ 3 billion, in a meeting of Turkish-Kazakh Business Council organized by Turkish Assembly of Exporters (TİM) and Turkish Confederation of Businessmen and Industrialists (TUSKON). Turkish President also delivered a speech at the Kazakh parliament.

Based on the initial perception of Turkish leaders that Turkey has several "responsibilities" in the Turkic world, Turkish-Kazakh partnership further strengthened as Turkey has supported Kazakhstan's chairmanship of OSCE in 2010 and Islamic Conference Organization in 2011. In addition, Turkey hosted the third Conference on Confidence and Interaction-building Measures in Asia in June 2010, which is an Asian platform initiated by Kazakh leader Nazarbayev. In the

Conference, Turkey took over the presidency of CICA from Kazakhstan for the next two years. Finally, the second General Assembly meeting of Turk-Pa is planned to be held in Astana in October 2010. Finally, geopolitical dimension cannot itself explain the deepening relations between Turkey and Kazakhstan. It is also based on identity and the perception that peoples of both countries share the same origins as well as cultural and civilizational roots. Therefore, Turkish-Kazakh strategic partnership and its patterns – discourse of leaders, agreements signed and fields of cooperation – are outcomes of the consolidation of the idea of "Turkic World" in the minds of Turkish leaders.

5.4.2 Undeniable Alliance with Azerbaijan

The second recent test case concerning Turkey's relations with the Turkic world has been the place of Azerbaijan in Turkish foreign policy. In this case, ideational factors have been even more evident than the case of Kazakhstan since Azerbaijani Turks are the closest to Anatolian Turks in terms of ethnicity and language. Since 1991, Turkey's relations with Azerbaijan have been marked with pan-Turkist Elchibey's presidency, Armenian occupation of Nagorno-Karabakh, Haydar Aliyev's takeover, Baku-Tblisi-Ceyhan pipeline and energy diplomacy, and finally the process of Armenian opening. Haydar Aliyev's words "one nation, two states" have determined brotherly relations among the leaders of both countries and the idea of "Turkic World" has influenced relations with Azerbaijan at the highest level. Website of Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs also quotes Atatürk's words "Azerbaijan's happiness is our happiness, and its sorrow is our sorrow" in order to describe ties between two countries and peoples. As for official visits, similar to Turkish President Gül, Azerbaijani President Aliyev paid his first official visit to

Turkey in November 2008 having been reelected for his second term. Due to such a brotherly basis of relations Azerbaijan officially recognizes Turkey as a "strategic partner" alongside Russia and the US (National Security Concept of the Republic of Azerbaijan, 2007). This strategic partnership and the notion of "one nation, two states" date back to Turkey's support for Azerbaijan against the Armenian invasion of Nagorno-Karabakh as a result of a war that continued between 1988 and 1994 (see Cornell, 1998 for a detailed analysis). Besides energy diplomacy, which has kept relations quite dense and alive, another field that has helped transform the relationship into a strategic one has been cooperation in military field and Turkey's ongoing support to modernize the Azerbaijani army to meet NATO standards.

Since Armenia declared its independence in September 1991 and Turkey recognized it in December 1991 diplomatic relations have never been established. There are three reasons for that (Görgülü et al., 2009: 7; Oğuz, 2010: 79-80). Firstly, Turkey has asked Armenia to recognize the territorial integrity of Turkey as well as to denounce its claims over Turkish territory. Secondly, Turkey has refused to normalize relations as long as Armenia kept Azerbaijani territories under invasion. Thirdly, Turkey has wanted Armenia to put an end to genocide campaigns (Görgülü et al. 2009: 7). Since April 1993, the major official reason obstacle for the normalization of Turkish-Armenian relations has been Armenia's aggression in Nagorno-Karabakh (Punsmann, 2009).

Turkey's attempt for an "Armenian opening" has acted as a cornerstone and hence has seriously tested partnership based primarily on Turkic brotherhood between Turkey and Azerbaijan (see Oğuz, 2010 for an analysis). It was until the ruling JDP came up with a roadmap to normalize relations between Turkey and Armenia starting from a so-called "football diplomacy" in September 2008 as

President Gül went to Yerevan to watch a football game between the national teams of two countries. As the possibility of a Turkish-Armenian rapprochement became clearer in April 2009, Azerbaijani media, public opinion and politicians have reacted to the proposed opening process (Oğuz, 2010: 92-96). The tone of reactions from Azerbaijan was quite romantic and based on the brotherhood between to countries. Azerbaijani reactions have gone as far as closing the Turkish mosque in Baku's center in April 2009 and lowering the Turkish flag in the Turkish Martyrs' Monument in October 2009. However, Baku has undertaken responsibility for neither of these reactions officially. Such reactions from Azerbaijan as well as the nationalist sentiment of the opposition in Turkey have made the "Nagorno-Karabakh" link in Turkish-Armenian relations a key factor (see ICG, 2009: 6-8, 18-20 for the Azerbaijani factor in the process).

More importantly, Azerbaijani President Aliyev refused to attend the Alliance of Civilizations meeting İstanbul in April 2009. Following that, Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan and Minister of Foreign Affairs Davutoğlu went to Baku in May 2009 respectively, in order to convince Azerbaijani leadership and public opinion that Turkey's relations with Armenia will not be normalized unless Armenia ends its invasion of Nagorno-Karabakh. In his speech at the Azerbaijani parliament Erdoğan assured members of parliament saying that Turkish perspective on the Caucasus cannot be different than the Azerbaijani one and constantly referred to Azerbaijanis as "brothers" (Hürriyet, 13 May 2009). In response to Gül's visit Armenian president Sarkisian visited Bursa in October 2009 to watch the second game between two football teams. October 2009 was more important concerning the "Armenian opening" process as Turkish and Armenian Foreign Ministers signed Protocols in Zurich (see MFA website to read the official document), which were the legal

documents that prescribed a roadmap to open-up Turkish-Armenian border and settle diplomatic relations between two countries. Although there were no direct references to the ongoing conflict and occupation in Nagorno-Karabakh, Turkey has not brought the legal document to the TGNA in order for it to be ratified, but on the contrary has waited an Armenian initiative to withdraw from the seven Azerbaijani districts surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh. Following his trip to Tehran on the uranium exchange deal Prime Minister Erdoğan visited Baku in May 2010. During the visit two leaders agreed on the establishment of "High Level Strategic Cooperation Council" between two countries, with "brotherhood" and "common ties" being stressed as usual (Hürriyet, 18 May 2010).

President Gül visited Azerbaijan five times since he took office in 2007 and Prime Minister Erdoğan visited Azerbaijan ten times since 2003. Although Turkey's efforts to normalize its relations with Armenia is a recent and new trend in Turkish foreign policy, Nagorno-Karabakh problem still continues to be the major issue where Turkey fixes its bilateral relations. In parallel with such a policy, Turkey's Armenian opening has come to a halt as Armenia has refused to progress with the current roadmap, whereas Turkey has insisted on Armenia to withdraw from the Azerbaijani cities surrounding Karabakh. Alternative explanations for why Turkey could not sacrifice its relations with Azerbaijan may rely on energy diplomacy and JDP's neighborhood policy. However, Turkey's energy policy does not solely rely on the Caspian Basin and projects conducted with Azerbaijan. Moreover, Davutoğlu's "zero-problem" policy with Turkey's neighbors should have pushed Turkish decision-makers towards insisting on normalizing relations with Armenia. On the contrary, Turkey has hesitated to lose Azerbaijan for the sake of opening-up to Armenia. At this point the idea of "Turkic World" comes out as the explanatory

132

factor, which is supported by high level official visits paid to Baku after each crisis that occurred between Turkey and Azerbaijan because of Turkish-Armenian rapprochement. This means that Turkic brotherhood between Turkey and Azerbaijan has an unquestionable status in the eyes of Turkish decision-makers.

The "Armenian opening" process has been a serious case for Turkish foreign policy, in which the place of the idea of "Turkic World" has been tested. Consequently, the idea and "Turkic brotherhood" have proved to be successful, not letting Turkey change its policy towards Armenia despite the international euphoria that marked the protocols before and after October 2009. Nationalist and pro-Azerbaijani sentiment in Turkish public opinion is the final element, which indicates the strength of the idea of "Turkic World" in Turkish society and politics. The idea of "Turkic World" has had its strongest impact over Turkish foreign policy towards Azerbaijan and all fields of cooperation between the two countries have been based on the motto "one nation, two states".

5.5 Conclusion: Place of the Turkic World in Turkish Foreign Policy

This chapter has made an evaluation of the evolution of Turkish foreign policy toward the Turkic world since 1991 with emphasis on the behaviors of actors – presidents, governments, and political parties – and the role of different instruments and agents – Turkic Summits, Turkic Council, Turk-Pa and TIKA – in order to indicate that there has been a continuity in Turkish attitude towards Turkic-speaking peoples despite the disappointment dominant in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Although Turkey could not prove to be successful in inter-state relations by the late 1990s, transnational relations have remained strong and the idea of "Turkic World" has continued to be kept alive and consolidated through non-governmental

efforts. Due to the impact of the perception that Turkey should somehow sustain its relations with brother peoples of the Turkic world a revision was sought for in the early 2000s. Although the ruling JDP's "Strategic Depth" doctrine is supposed to focus more on Turkey's Ottoman heritage – that has tended to include the Balkans and the Middle East more than other regions – as a geopolitical opportunity, Turkey's relations with Turkic states have deepened in political and economic terms for the last decade.

In various stages such as Turkic *kurultay*s or summits, Turkish decision-makers have repeated their calls for establishing a Union of Turkic States similar to the 9th President Demirel. As of 2008, Turkey's trade with Azerbaijan has approached $ 3 billion, whereas the amount for Central Asian states has exceeded $ 5.5 billion, with Kazakhstan having the largest share making almost 60 % of it (see Undersecretariat of Foreign Trade Report for details). Moreover, final chapter of this study has attempted to analyze Turkey's relations with Kazakhstan as a recent official "strategic ally" and Azerbaijan as one of the two states of the same nation in the rhetoric of leaders. Turkey's relationship with Kazakhstan was selected because the concept of "strategic partnership" is based on Turkic brotherhood and cooperation in this case. Hence, this case is a clear indicator that ideas and identity can strengthen ties between two countries to reach the highest level. In addition, case of Azerbaijan was selected because, the idea of "Turkic World" in this case has affected Turkey's regional policies – in Transcaucasia – and bilateral relations with Armenia as a problematic issue dating back to the early 20th century.

Consequently, despite efforts and trends of making Turkish foreign policy towards the Turkic world more "realistic" and "pragmatic", there is certainly a normative aspect to it which can be explained by the impact of the transnational idea

of "Turkic World", whose roots go back to a century-old pan-Turkist activism. Regardless of their political views and ideological backgrounds – Kemalist Sezer, social democrat Cem or former Islamist Erdoğan – Turkish decision-makers cannot ignore the Turkic world, and on the contrary try to foster economic, political, cultural, scientific and educational ties between Turkey and their "brothers". At this point the attitude of Turkish decision-makers towards political Islam is crucial. Despite the efforts of political Islamist Erbakan to re-orient Turkish foreign policy towards the Islamic world with an emphasis on Islamic identity rather than pragmatism, Turkish politicians and decision-makers have not internalized Erbakan's offers such as establishing the D-8 composed of Islamic states and therefore, his ideas have not been socialized in Turkish politics. On the contrary, Turkish leaders of the last two decades have given priority, though in varying degrees, to Turkey's relations with the Turkic world and emphasized common ethnicity and linguistic ties as facilitators of partnership among Turkic states.

Re-structuring of key foreign policy organs of the Turkish state to encompass the Caucasus and Central Asia, devoting sentences or sometimes paragraphs for the Turkic states and communities in government and political parties' programs, paying first official visits to Turkic capitals and sticking relations with a third party – Armenia – in favor of a brother Turkic state – Azerbaijan – are strong patterns indicating institutionalization or norm internalization in Turkish foreign policy. Beside all that, although Turkey could not reach its ambitious goals set in the early 1990s there has emerged a strong Turkic consciousness in Turkey and Turkic republics in the last two decades. Transnational relations have increased to an unprecedented level as Turkish state has been supporting and taking into account the views of non-governmental activities such as congresses related to Turkic literatures,

135

architecture, urban planning, youth activism, cinema and theater festivals, sports games as well as transgovernmental meetings among different bureaucratic bodies such as foreign trade, scientific cooperation and cultural exchange.

As Karasar (2007: 168) mentions Turkey's "gains exceed beyond the limits and capacities of state policies" due to several outcomes. Accordingly, integration has speeded up among Turkic intellectuals, artists, writers as a result of various transnational meetings. Thousands of Turkic students who study in Turkey – both in universities and military schools – and Turkish students who study in Azerbaijan and Central Asia have been dynamic components of multilateral relations. Turkish companies have constructed hotels, congress centers and state buildings, which are quite prestigious and, Turkish and Turkic companies have formed joint ventures in major Turkic cities. Besides all these transnational efforts commitment of Turkic leaders towards transition to Latin alphabet (Karasar, 2007: 168) have all contributed to what Şen (2007: 142) depicts as dynamism in relations between Turkey and the Turkic world. The emergence of such dynamism and intensity of relations indicate the strength of "transnational" and its primacy over "international" or state-to-state relations. Although Turkey has become unsuccessful in reaching its goals in the Turkic world throughout the 1990s, Turkish decision-makers have acted much better as they have re-evaluated the suggestions of pan-Turkist NGOs made in several platforms such as the Turkic *kurultay*s. Such policy revision and the emergence of a dynamic Turkish community in the Turkic world within two decades after the collapse of the Soviet Union are clear indicators of the strength of the transnational idea of "Turkic world" based on Turkic identity.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 Theoretical Implications

In 1994 in his speech for the annual opening ceremony of TIKA the Turkish President Süleyman Demirel elaborated on the importance of the Turkic World in Turkish foreign policy (Quoted in Bal, 2000: 44):

> It is quite natural that Turkey acts by taking into account its national interest in terms of its security, its economic and social relations. However, Turkey, which considers its national interests in this issue, has some moral responsibilities. These moral responsibilities come from Turkey's history…It is impossible to isolate yourself from your history…History offers opportunities as well as responsibilities and difficulties.

Demirel's emphasis on history is closely related with how the Constructivist turn in the study of international relations have brought ideas, identity and culture in the formation of foreign policy and definition of national interests. The explanatory factor for the special meaning attached to the emergence of five newly independent Turkic states in Turkey's Eastern neighborhood, and the redefinition of Turkey's national interests in order to incorporate those states and other Turkic-speaking peoples into Turkish foreign policy is the impact of the transnational idea of the

"Turkic World". The end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union forced Turkish decision-makers to a re-evaluation of Turkey's foreign policy goals and national interests. Turkish decision-makers were quick enough to respond to the process of globalization as they enlarged the scope of Turkey's neighborhood to incorporate Central Asia. The increasing ease with communication technologies, the eradication of the Turkish-Soviet border, and use of media across borders on the one hand enabled Turkic peoples to speed up in establishing contacts with each other and on the other hand offered Turkish decision-makers to benefit from the potential transnational relations. This signaled a significant perception change among the Turkish political, bureaucratic and intellectual elite regarding the borders of Turkish ethnicity. The once-jailed and punished idea of "Turkic World" was now re-entering into Turkish minds now as an asset to be utilized for Turkish national interests.

6.1.1 Life Cycle of the Idea of "Turkic World" in Turkish Foreign Policy

The first phase of the lifecycle of the idea of "Turkic World" was the "norm emergence" period (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998: 893). In fact this phase would be better titled as "norm re-emergence" as the idea was almost eight decades old in 1991. What brought the idea back to Turkish politics were the efforts of "norm entrepreneurs", which were mainly nationalist and pan-Turkist intellectuals and activists in Turkey. Committed to a common Turkic identity that would shape the cultural, economic and political future of the entire Turkic world, Turkish nationalists managed to keep the idea alive during the Cold War although they did not have any transnational contacts with pan-Turkist networks in the Soviet Union. There were indeed, no such networks in the Soviet Union and hence, the only "norm entrepreneurs" for Turkish foreign policy would be domestic non-state actors.

Second phase of the lifecycle of the idea of "Turkic World", "norm cascades" would be realized quite rapidly since many of the prominent actors of Turkish politics; presidents, prime ministers, political parties as well as different branches of Turkish media, including the Kemalist *Cumhuriyet* and Conservative *Tercüman* accepted the re-emerging reality and took it seriously as a factor that could have a significant place in Turkish foreign policy[36]. The "norm cascades" stage also included the "socialization" (Risse and Sikkink, 1999: 11) of the norm by Turkish politicians, public opinion and bureaucrats, who all-together started to perceive Turkey as part of the entire Turkic world alongside the European, or Western civilization, transatlantic security community and the Islamic world. Consequently, Turkic identity was accepted as part of Turkish identity by Turkish decision-makers. The socialization of the idea was a key step in the transformation of the idea into a norm in Turkish foreign policy as it created a society of actors agreeing on the priority of the idea (Risse and Sikkink, 1999: 11). As Andican (2010) argues even the Turkish left did not oppose the new policy framework.

The third phase, the "internalization" phase of the idea of "Turkic World", still continues in Turkish foreign policy. There are strong political indicators as mentioned in Chapter 5 that the "Turkic World" as a principled idea has been transforming into a norm in Turkish foreign policy, as it leads to certain behavioral patterns in Turkish foreign policy such as continuing support for non-state actors, empowering TIKA as a "soft power" instrument, paying frequent official visits to Turkic capitals and taking steps to institutionalize multilateral ties among Turkic

---

[36] For the attention paid by the left-wing *Cumhuriyet*, see 10 April 1993, "Anadolu Anayurt Orta Asya Atayurt" (Anatolia is the Homeland, Central Asia is the Fatherland) and 18 October 1994, "21. Yüzyıl Türklerin Olacak" (The 21st Century Will Belong to Turks); and right-wing *Tercüman*, see 15 April 1993, "Türkiye Milleti ve Devleti ile Azerbaycan'ın Dostu" (Turkey is a Friend of Azerbaijan with its Nation and State) and 19 October 1994 "Türk Birliğine İkinci Adım" (The Second Step for Turkic Union).

states. Special emphasis given to Central Asia in government and party programs, bureaucratic bodies such as the Central Asian department of Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Turkic republics and other CIS countries department of the Undersecretariat of Foreign Trade, technical and humanitarian aid given to the Balkans, the Crimea, the Caucasus and Central Asia by TIKA, official visits paid to Turkic capitals and participation in pan-Turkic cooperation bodies such as Turk-Pa and the Turkic Council are such standards of appropriate behavior concerning Turkish foreign policy toward the Turkic world.

Risse and Sikkink (1999: 17) argue that once actors follow the norm, it is incorporated in the "standard operating procedures" of domestic institutions and it becomes the "normal thing to do" to act according to the norm. Therefore, norm internalization leads to "depersonalization" as actors implement the policies required by the norm "irrespective of individual beliefs" (Risse and Sikkink, 1999: 17). Although there are signs of behavioral and discursive institutionalization of the idea of "Turkic World" in Turkish foreign policy it is yet early to claim that "norm internalization" process is over. In other words, "Turkic World" is still a principled idea advocated by "norm entrepreneurs" and socialized by Turkish political actors; but one which requires further efforts of both transnational actors and governments to become a norm.

Obstacles remain as well, for the transformation of the idea into a norm in Turkish foreign policy. One obstacle might be that the idea is still advocated by nationalist and/or pan-Turkist NGOs in Turkey, which has strong ties with the wider nationalist community as well as the NAP. In order for the idea to become a norm, it should be accepted and promoted by a variety of non-governmental actors in Turkey and transnational contacts should be established in new areas such as journalism,

human rights and environmental protection. Acccording to Pope (2010), a journalist researching and writing on Turkey for two decades, diplomats in the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs do not have a Turkic concept in their minds. Western-oriented philosophy of Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs has prevented Turkish diplomats from establishing close relations with their Turkic counterparts and acting together in international platforms. Çay (2010) argues that Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs have regarded Azerbaijan and Central Asian Turkic republics as countries with secondary importance and hence Turkish diplomatic personnel in Turkic capitals have remained very small, making it impossible to compete with diplomatic efforts of the US, Russia and even Iran, which have much bigger numbers of diplomats in these regions. Thirdly, the establishment of the Turkic Council, Turk-Pa and the Turkic Academy may not contribute to the internalization of the idea unless bigger financial support is given to those institutions. It is early yet to evaluate on the achievements of those institutions.

6.1.2 Ideas and Foreign Policy: "Turkic World" as a Road Map

In Goldstein and Keohane's (1993) terms, it can be claimed that transnational idea of "Turkic World" played the role of a roadmap in the minds of Turkish decision-makers. Ideas offer roadmaps when policy makers need a prescription for sudden developments related to domestic politics or foreign policy (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993: 13-16). Under such conditions an idea as a roadmap determines what is right and wrong – similar to the Constructivist definition of norm – and provides decision-makers new visions. In the case of Turkey's relations with the Turkic world Gasprinsky's motto, "unity in language, thought and action" was loudly repeated in every official visits and multilateral meetings between Turkic leaders. More clearly,

the idea led to active efforts among several key figures of Turkish foreign policy to formulating a policy framework, which was based on ethno-linguistic ties – unity in language –, promoted a common position regarding international politics – unity in thought –, and stimulated bilateral and multilateral projects in political and economic cooperation between Turkey and the five newly independent Turkic states to pave the way for future integration – unity in action. Moreover the idea of "Turkic World" as a roadmap captured "the attention of a wide array of actors" as it was so compelling (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993: 16) and hence made the socialization process easier.

Having indicated that the idea of "Turkic World" offered a roadmap for Turkish decision-makers from the perspective of the impact of the idea on foreign policy, one should also elaborate on what kind of an idea in Goldstein and Keohane's (1993: 8-10) terms "Turkic World" is. At this point, the transnational idea of "Turkic World" can be located in between a "worldview" and a "causal belief". Worldviews are closely related with identities and hence determine the framework of action within which an actor might operate depending on one's identity. According to Goldstein and Keohane, world's great religions offer such worldviews. On the other hand causal beliefs are such ideas, about which decision-makers have a consensus as to what kind of results are derived once they are implemented as policies. Environmental protection policies can be given as the most concrete example for causal beliefs. The idea of "Turkic World" offered a worldview for Turkish decision-makers as it led to a redefinition of "Turkishness" and hence enlarged the boundaries of Turkish nation to include even the Balkans and Western China. Former Minister of State responsible for Coordination of relations between Turkey and Turkic states and relative communities Andican (2010) mentioned that all political wings in

Turkey, including the Turkish left, which was opposing pan-Turkist ideology of the NAP, accepted the Turkic world as a necessity and even an "obligation" to be dealt with. However, the idea of "Turkic World" also acted as a causal belief as Turkish policy makers and diplomats thought that newly independent Turkic states offered Turkey a chance to increase its economic and political might in its neighborhood. This was the result of a perception that any kind investment in those countries – political, cultural or economic – would bring in great benefits for Turkey. Consequently, the idea of "Turkic World" offered a road map for Turkish decision-makers and offered both a worldview-like position in the minds of Turkish politicians- bureaucrats and intellectuals and a great opportunity to be utilized in material terms.

6.1.3 Social Movements, Identity and National Interests

According to Rucht (2009: 207), a social movement can be called a transnational one "when it is essentially composed of closely interrelated groups and organizations that belong to more than one country". As soon as the Soviet Union collapsed Turkic activists and intellectuals from Turkey, the Crimea, Azerbaijan, Central Asia and Russia engaged in a campaign to establish NGOs and platforms through which transnational contacts could be sustained. Hundreds of intellectuals, scientists, artists and politicians from among the whole Turkic-speaking world have attended different meetings related to cooperation in academic life, language and alphabet, agriculture, economic development, cultural rapprochement and political dialogue. Although the intensity of such transnational Turkic activities have changed depending on the political conjuncture both in Turkey and in the other Turkic countries they have laid the ground for future ties among Turkic peoples. In addition,

they have sent strong messages to Turkish policy-makers that transnational Turkic identity is a phenomenon that should not be dismissed but rather utilized.

As the process of globalization has become irresistible for states, decision-makers have searched for ways to cooperate with non-state actors of the new age. Due to globalization, activities of non-governmental organizations and social movements have spread throughout the globe in recent decades. Advocacy networks that have been promoting causes such as human rights and environmental protection have followed the path of conducting "contentious politics" in order to make governments accept their demands. However, the case of transnational Turkic activism indicates that there is not necessarily contention in any kind of social movement/advocacy network-government interaction process. Rather since the emergence of the newly independent Turkic states in Turkey's eastern neighborhood Turkish governments have supported-at least not seriously tried to stop- activists from all over the Turkic-speaking countries, who support a pan-Turkic future, to establish ties with Turkey.

Moreover Turkish governments have devoted funds to sponsor civil society organizations such as the Balkan Turks' associations, Crimean Tatar associations and leading pan-Turkist NGOs such as the *Türk Ocakları* or the *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı* to establish institutional ties with the Turkic peoples and promote the transnational Turkic identity. 14 Turkic World Youth Days and Congresses have been organized by *Dünya Türk Gençleri Birliği* (World Leage of Turkic Youth) – a pan-Turkic platform of youth NGOs all over the Turkic world – under state sponsorship in various places including Bishkek, Baku, Skopje and Nicosia. *Türk Dünyası Belediyeler Birliği* (Union of Turkic World Municipalities) as a huge platform with tens of members from fourteen countries, which aims to

increase cooperation among local administrations in the Turkic world, has been another pan-Turkic platform that has been sponsored by the Turkish state. More seriously, Turkish state has sponsored Turkic *Kurultay*s as the broadest platforms united pan-Turkists from all over the Turkic-speaking areas. In Tarrow's words, nationalist social movement leaders in Turkey who have supported the integration of Turks of Turkey and the other Turkic peoples "have become skilled at combining contention with participation in institutions" (Tarrow, 1998: 5). To put it more correctly, they have had the chance to cooperate with Turkish governments to promote the Turkic cause. From the perspective of the state and decision-makers those nationalist groups in Turkey, which had been dissidents within the Turkish political system since the early 1940s, were now accepted as legitimate actors as a bridge between Turkey and the newly independent fraternal countries. This particular cooperation of a transnational advocacy network with the government, or vice versa, is a direct outcome of the impact that the idea of "Turkic World" has made on the reconceptualizion of Turkey's national interests and redefinition of its foreign policy goals. In addition, such a cooperation, as a result of which the transnationalization of Turkish identity would become easier to realize, has been understood by Turkish decision-makers as a way of increasing Turkey's influence in the Turkic countries of the Caucasus and Central Asia and occupying a prestigious position in world politics.

6.1.4 Prerequisites for Transnational Impact Revisited

As mentioned in the first chapter several conditions are key for understanding transnational impact on foreign policy. The end of the Cold War was one of the factors that led to an increase in transnational activity between Turkey and the Turkic world. The easing up of tensions between Turkey as a part of the Western security

bloc and the Soviet Union led non-state actors to flourish dramatically and search for ways to influence governmental policies toward newly independent Turkic republics. This was the geopolitical factor that also made the interaction between non-state actors and the Turkish state easier and desirable.

Secondly, domestic structures in Turkey and policy networks connecting the Turkish state and non-state actors should be addressed to understand the impact of the idea on Turkish foreign policy (Risse-Kappen, 1995: 22). Similar to the impact of anti-colonialism, human rights and environmental protection as transnational norms on foreign policies of a significant number of states, political conditions or domestic structure were important intervening variables concerning the impact of the idea of "Turkic World" in Turkish foreign policy. Following the argument suggested by both Keohane and Nye (1971: 329-349), and Risse-Kappen (1995: 3-36), Turkey's search for democratization and liberalization that speeded up in the early 1990s as the country was slowly moving away from the effects of the 1980 military coup could have been another factor that paved the way for the interaction between the state and transnational actors.

However, one should also take Evangelista's (1995: 1-38) counter-argument that countries, which are going through a process of transformation but which are not necessarily democratic might have open doors for transnational influence over their foreign policies. Hence, it can be argued that although Turkey had serious problems related to human rights abuses, domestic security and civil-military relations, its regional power aspirations helped the transnational idea of "Turkic World" and non-state actors that advocate the idea to influence Turkey's new active foreign policy toward the Turkic republics. Finally, highly centralized and authoritarian nature of domestic structures in Azerbaijan and Central Asian Turkic states have prevented

146

further transnationalization among Turkic peoples and the consolidation of the idea of "Turkic World" in foreign policies of those states. Non-state actors advocating the idea of "Turkic World" could not find winning coalitions especially in the most authoritarian states of Central Asia; Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, but on the contrary have been accepted by leaders as dangerous groups for the regime and sovereignty.

Risse-Kappen (1995: 3-36) takes international institutionalization as the second pillar of the power of transnational activity. His argument is that "the more the respective issue-area is regulated by international norms of cooperation, the more permeable should state boundaries become for transnational activities" (Risse-Kappen, 1995: 7). As analyzed in the sub-chapters above Turkish decision-makers were quite sensitive toward representation of the newly independent Turkic republics in regional and international organizations such as BSEC, ECO and OSCE. Moreover, Turkic Summits constituted a transgovernmental platform where Turkic diplomats and high-ranking bureaucrats could share their views. It can be predicted that steps taken for institutionalizing cooperation in international platforms will continue to create a positive image of "norm entrepreneurs" who promote the idea of "Turkic World" in the eyes of Turkish decision-makers.

As argued by Risse-Kappen (1995: 32) activities of transnational actors – lobbying, pressurizing, informing – advocating Turkic unity will be legitimate in the eyes of Turkish politicians, decision-makers and diplomats so long as the idea of "Turkic World" is consolidated and heads towards becoming a norm in Turkish foreign policy. Moreover, further internationalization among Turkey and independent Turkic states will contribute to collective Turkic identity thereby making it possible for transnational relations to flourish. Finally, such

institutionalization might make non-state actors advocating the Turkic cause in Azerbaijan and the four Central Asian Turkic republics more acceptable and legitimate for the authoritarian domestic structures of those countries.

Besides domestic structures and international institutionalization, it is crucial for the state and those decision-makers who define a state's foreign policy goals and national interests to accept the ideas promoted and advocated by non-state actors as legitimate and applicable in policy terms. This has indeed been the case for Turkey's relations with the Turkic world, in which Turkish decision-makers have chosen to cooperate with NGOs, intellectuals and activists of pan-Turkist background in order to develop a foreign policy framework towards the Turkic world. In Risse-Kappen's (1995: 293) words, transnational actors advocating Turkic unity have been able to form "winning coalitions" with domestic actors since 1991. Moreover, "norms embedded" (Risse-Kappen, 1995: 293) in the Turkish political culture – nationalism mainly – was suitable for the transnational idea of "Turkic World" to penetrate into Turkish politics right after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

6.2 Policy Implications and Future Prospects

There are several reasons why it was the idea of "Turkic World", whose origins go back to Turkism of early 20th century that led Turkish decision-makers toward new lines of foreign policy thinking with a certain emphasis on identity and fraternity on the one hand and economic cooperation and integration on the other hand. One reason is that it was perceived to be a cooperative and peaceful idea (Aydın, 2006: 307) as opposed to the early Republican and Cold War perception that it was a sign of irredentism and imperialism. As the public opinion was also eager to incorporate an enlarged Turkish identity, thereby putting an end to the centuries-old

feeling of loneliness in the world, the idea was not conceived to be related to racism or fascism as it used to be during the Cold War confrontation between the left-wing activists and nationalists. As Bal's study clearly indicates, though more hesitant than conservative and nationalist figures, left-wing politicians were not against developing friendly relations with Turkic-speaking peoples. It is significant to note that it was the social democrat Minister of Foreign Affairs Hikmet Çetin – and an ethnic Kurd – who organized the first Turkish official visit to the newly-independent Turkic republics after they acquired independence. The traditional reactionary position of Turkish left-wing intellectuals and politicians towards the Turkic world changed in the 1990s as they also welcomed the independence of Turkic countries (Bal, 2000: 60). Bal (2000: 60) quotes Murat Karayalçın, one of the leaders of the Social Democratic Populist Party in the 1990s, saying that Turkey had to side by Azerbaijan in its struggle against the Armenian invasion of Karabakh and that withdrawal of Armenia from Karabakh might be the only way for re-starting Turkish-Armenian diplomatic relations.

Secondly, the end of the Cold War offered a chance for Turkish politicians and diplomats not only in the Caucasus and Central Asia, but also in a closer neighborhood such as the Balkans and the Muslim Middle East. However, for none of these regions and countries Turkey has tried to develop an institutionalized foreign policy with different state bodies such as the Ministry of National Education and TIKA included alongside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Even during the *Refah-Yol* government, in which the Islamist Welfare Party was the dominant force in the cabinet, no such institutionalization was followed regarding the Islamic world and no serious transnational Islamic movement challenged the policies of Ankara. Robins (2003: 149-154) argues that Kemalism and Islamism offered the two clashing

dominant ideologies of foreign policy in contemporary Turkey. According to Robins the National View led by Erbakan strengthened by the late 1980s as a strong foreign policy option to oppose the Kemalist tradition. Its strong ideological background and transnational ties all-over the Muslim world made Erbakan's Islamist foreign policy agenda a priority for Turkey's national interests. However, there has been no consensus among Turkish diplomats and different governments formed by different political parties since the end of the Cold War on the benefits of such rapprochement with the Muslim world.

Thirdly, there was little if no political and academic knowledge on the Turks of the Soviet Union during the Cold War. In the scholarly world it was only a group of nationalist-oriented Turkologists, who studied Turkic languages and history. However no political assessment and analysis was made as to what kind of a future awaited the Turkic world. Despite this lack of academic and political wisdom regarding Turkic-speaking peoples, the Turkish state was rapid enough to develop a comprehensive foreign policy approach, which also indicates the influence of the idea of "Turkic World".

As analyzed in the chapters above Turkish foreign policy towards the Turkic world has gone through an evolution as the romanticism and excitement of the initial phase of relations were marked with disappointment as of the late 1990s. However, transnational relations have remained constant creating NGO networks among Turkic-speaking peoples. Moreover, thousands of Turkic students have received education in Turkey and thousands of Turkish students have studied in Turkic states. Finally, Turkish business community in Turkic republics have made Turkish citizens and products familiar with the local population and Turkish public and private television broadcasts have made Turkish way of life popular for Turkic audience.

Since linguistic ties and common ethnicity make communication and permanent contacts very easy, there is further room for the consolidation of transnational ties among the Turkic world.

The possibility of permanence of transnational relations among the Turkic world will be something that Turkish decision-makers should take into account as it will utilize Turkish national interests in the Caucasus and Central Asia. In other words, transnational should inform and enlighten international, or inter-state relations as a mere geopolitical perspective on Turkey's relations with the Turkic states will not be enough to sustain a successful foreign policy framework that results in the achievement of the official goals of Turkey. If Turkish decision-makers really want to increase cooperation among Turkic states by establishing a Commonwealth of Turkic states, one similar to cooperation bodies among European states (EU) North American states (NAFTA) and Southeast Asian states (ASEAN), they should support and take into account the views, principles and demands of non-state actors advocating the transnational idea of "Turkic World". This means that Turkish governments should work together with non-governmental actors in order to "maintain order and achieve collective goals" as is required by an ideal type of governance (Barnett and Sikkink, 2008: 78). Even if such interaction between the state and the transnational may not lead to a union-like organization among Turkic states, it might contribute to better policy formulations in various fields ranging from educational exchange and scientific and academic cooperation to economic integration and commonalities in regional and international politics.

One the other hand, advocacy networks operating transnationally to promote the idea of "Turkic World" and make it a norm in foreign policies of Turkic states, should increase their contacts with Turkish governmental officials and politicians

through lobbying and pressuring methods in order to contribute to the consolidation of the idea in Turkish political life. Finally, it can be argued that in the foreseeable future, the consolidation of the idea of "Turkic World" in Turkish foreign policy will continue as the issue is perceived to be related to Turkish identity, which is itself related to history and geography.

6.3 Directions for Future Research

In order to enrich theoretical studies on world politics and make them more reliable for both scholars and decision-makers, impact of non-state actors on foreign policies of states should be analyzed with more case studies. Such studies will also contribute to the strengthening of theoretical approaches on the emergence of non-state actors in international relations. Therefore, similar case studies focusing on other Turkic republics – Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan – might contribute to understanding how the transnational idea of "Turkic World" have influenced politics of the post-Soviet Turkic space.

Nevertheless, there is certain limitation to studying the role and impact of non-state actors on international relations of states. It is a difficult topic because geopolitical factors that are closely intertwined with realist conceptions of national interest are very powerful explanatory factors. This difficulty in distinguishing the role of non-state actors in foreign policy from geopolitics or rationalist explanations may lead researchers to the pre-assumption that the former does not have any or little influence in world politics. Moreover, it is difficult to measure how adaptive governments have become for transnational relations and global governance. However, the role of various non-state actors – advocacy networks, NGOs and illegal armed groups – on states' policies should be studied by scholars of Diplomatic

History, Comparative Politics and International Relations to overcome perceptional limitations. The more theoretical approaches are enriched by case studies the more boundaries of scholars will be eliminated.

In order to achieve that, actors should be taken as the primary units to be studied. For any kind of ideational factor on foreign policy, the anatomy and evolution of the "norm entrepreneurs" as well as their relations with the state should be analyzed. Researchers should observe behaviors – both intellectual efforts and activism of certain issue areas – of non-state actors carefully, while on the other hand keeping a scholarly distance to the subject studied. This is because there is the risk of becoming a part of those promoting ideas rather than studying the issue in an academic manner. Actor-centric studies might push researchers towards understanding non-governmental involvement in policy making processes.

As a further effort, studies on the impact of ideas and identities on foreign policies of states should be merged with studies on transnationalism. This is because ideas and identities, as regional and sometimes global phenomena, go beyond the borders of the Westphalian modern nation-states thereby causing transnational loyalties to affect the policy preferences of individuals or groups within governments. Such an approach would also help better understand and explain foreign policy behaviors of states that have on the one hand regional power potentials or aspirations, and on the other hand identity perceptions that exceed national boundaries. Moreover, since it is non-state actors that promote transnational ideas and identities, Constructivist emphasis on ideational and normative factors of foreign policy analysis should incorporate transnationalism. Consequently, the role of non-state actors on making decision-makers adapt governmental policies according to ideational factors will be better understood.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andican, Ahat. 2007. *Turkestan Struggle Abroad: From Jadidism to Independence.* Haarlem: SOTA Publications.

AK Party Official Website. "Party Programme", available at http://eng.akparti.org.tr/english/partyprogramme.html#6>

Akçura, Yusuf. 2005. *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Three Models of Politics). (Reprint). Ankara: Lotus.

Alptekin, İsa Yusuf. 1985. *Esir Doğu Türkistan İçin* (For Captive Eastern Turkestan). İstanbul: Doğu Türkistan Neşriyat Merkezi.

Andican, Ahat. 2009. *Türkiye ve Orta Asya* (Turkey and Central Asia). İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.

Arım, Reşat. 2001. *Foreign Policy Concepts: Conjuncture, Freedom of Action, Equality*. Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute.

Ataman, Muhittin. 2002. "Ozal Leadership and Restructuring of Turkish Ethnicity Policy in the 1980s," *Middle Eastern Studies* 38(4): 123-142.

Aydın, Mustafa. October 1999. "Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy: Historical Framework and Traditional Inputs," *Middle Eastern Studies* 35(4): 152-186.

Aydın, Mustafa. 2003. "Between Euphoria and *Realpolitik*: Turkish Foreign Policy toward Central Asia and the Caucasus". In Tareq Y. Ismael and Mustafa Aydin (eds.), *Turkey's Foreign Policy in the 21st Century: A Changing Role in World Politics*. Hants & Burlington: Ashgate, 139-160.

Aydın, Mustafa. Summer 2004. "Foucault's Pendulum: Turkey in Central Asia and the Caucasus," *Turkish Studies* 5(2): 1-22.

Aydın, Mustafa. 2006. "Kafkasya ve Orta Asya'yla İlişkiler" (Relations with the Caucasus and Central Asia). In Baskın Oran (ed.), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt II, 1980-2001* (Turkish Foreign Policy: Facts, Documents and Interpretations since the War of Independence, Volume II, 1980-2001). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 366-439.

Aydınlı, Ersel. October 2008. "Before the Jihadists There Were Anarchists: A Failed Case of Transnational Violence," *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 31(10): 903-923.

Aydınlı, Ersel. 2010. "Statist-transnationalism for a security cooperation regime". ın Ersel Aydinli (ed.). *Emerging Transnational (In)Security Governance: A Statist-Transnationalist Approach*. London and New York: Routledge, 1-22.

Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal. 2005. *Nutuk* (The Speech). (Reprint). İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

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

Barış ve Demokrasi Partisi (Peace and Democracy Party) Official Website. "Barış ve Demokrasi Partisi Programı" (Peace and Democracy Party Program), available at http://www.bdp.org.tr/hakkimizda/program.html>

Barnett, Michael and Kathryn Sikkink. 2008. "From International Relations to Global Society". In Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 62-83.

Basch, Linda G., Nina G. Schiller and Cristina Szanton Blanc. 1995. *Nations Unbound: Transnational Porjects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-State*. Basel: Gordon and Breach Publishers.

Bennigsen, Alexandre and Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay. 1967. *Islam in the SovietUnion*. London: Pall Mall Press.

Cem, İsmail. 2005. *Avrupa'nın "Birliği" and Turkey* (Europe's "Union" and Turkey). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Cornell, Svante. January 1998. "Turkey and the Conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh: A Delicate Balance," *Middle Eastern Studies* 34(1): 51-72.

Cumhuriyet. 5 April 1993. "Özal: Dişimizi Göstermeliyiz" (Özal: We Must Show Our Teeth).

Cumhuriyet. 10 April 1993. "Anadolu Anayurt Orta Asya Atayurt" (Anatolia is the Homeland, Central Asia is the Fatherland).

Cumhuriyet. 18 October 1994. "21. Yüzyıl Türklerin Olacak" (The 21st Century Will Belong to Turks).

Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (Republican People's Party). 2008. "Çağdaş Türkiye için Değişim: CHP Programı" (Change for Contemporary Turkey: RPP Program). Ankara: CHP.

Çaman, Efe. January-April 2006. "Kafkasya ve Orta Asya'da Türkiye'nin Yeni Bölgesel Politikası: Dış Politikanın Yönelim Sorunsalı" (New Regional Policy of Turkey in the Caucasus and Central Asia: Orientation Problematic of Foreign Policy), *Avrasya Etüdleri* 12(1): 185-215.

Çay, A. Halûk. 1995. *Ikinci Türk Devlet ve Toplulukları Dostluk Kardeşlik ve İşbirliği Kurultayı, Konuşma, Bildiri, Tutanak ve Karar Metinleri* (Second Turkic States and Communities Friendship, Brotherhood and Cooperation Congress, Texts of Speeches, Declarations, Records and Decisions). Ankara: TUDEV.

Çay, A. Halûk. 1999. *Altıncı Türk Devlet ve Toplulukları Dostluk Kardeşlik ve İşbirliği Kurultayı, Konuşma, Bildiri ve Karar Metinleri* (Sixth Turkic States and Communities Friendship, Brotherhood and Cooperation Congress, Texts of Speeches, Declarations and Decisions). Ankara: TUDEV.

Çay, A. Halûk. 2006. *1-10'uncu Türk Devlet ve Toplulukları Dostluk, Kardeşlik ve İşbirliği Kurultayları, Komisyon Rapor ve Sonuç Bildirgeleri* (1-10th Turkic States and Communities Friendship, Brotherhood and Cooperation Congresses, Commission Reports and Final Declarations). Ankara: TUDEV.

Çelikpala, Mitat. 2007. "Türkiye'de Kafkas Diyasporası ve TDP'ye Etkileri" (Caucasus Diaspora in Turkey and its effects on TFP). In Mustafa Aydın (ed.), *Türkiye'nin Avrasya Macerası: 1989-2006* (Turkey's Eurasia Adventure: 1989-2006). Ankara: Nobel, 35-72.

d'Encausse, Helene Carrere. 1994a. "Civil War and New Governments". In Edward Allworth (ed.), *Central Asia: 130 Years of Russian Dominance, a Historical Overview*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 224-253.

d'Encausse, Helene Carrere. 1994b. "The National Republics Lose Their Independence". In Edward Allworth (ed.), *Central Asia: 130 Years of Russian Dominance, a Historical Overview*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 254-266.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet. 2001. *Stratejik Derinlik* (Strategic Depth). İstanbul: Küre Yayınları.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet. January-March 2008. "Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assesment of 2007," *Insight Turkey* 10(1): 77-96.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet. 16 February 2010. "Avrasya'nın Güvenliği ve Turkiye-Kazakistan Dayanışması" (Security of Eurasia and Solidarity between Turkey and Kazakhstan), available at http://www.mfa.gov.tr/sayin-bakanimizin-egemen-kazakistan-gazetesinde-_kazakistan_-16_02_2010-tarihinde-yayimlanan-makalesi.tr.mfa>

Demirel, Süleyman. "BTC Siyasi Kararlılığın Ürünüdür" (BTC is a Product of Political Determination), *Stratejik Analiz* 6(62): 20.

Deringil, Selim. 2004. *Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War: an 'Active' Neutrality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ergun, Ayça. 2007. "Türkiye-Azerbaycan İlişkileri" (Turkey-Azerbaijan Relations). In In Mustafa Aydın (ed.), *Türkiye'nin Avrasya Macerası: 1989-2006* (Turkey's Eurasia Adventure: 1989-2006). Ankara: Nobel, 241-267.

Erol, Mehmet Seyfettin. Winter 2007. "11 Eylül Sonrası Türk Dış Politikasında Vizyon Arayışları ve "Dört Tarz-ı Siyaset" (Search for a Vision in Turkish Foreign Policy Following September 11 and "Four Types of Politics), *Gazi Akademik Bakış* 1(1): 33-55.

Ersanlı, Büşra. 2001. "Can Eurasia Be An Identity Issue for Turkish Foreign Policy?". In Ismail Soysal (ed.), *Turkish Views on Eurasia*. İstanbul: The ISIS Press, 111-124.

Evangelista, Matthew. Winter 1995. "The Paradox of State Strength: Transnational Relations, Domestic Structures, and Security Policy in Russia and the Soviet Union," *International Organization* 49(1): 1-38.

Fidan, Hakan. March 2010. "Turkish Foreign Policy toward Central Asia," *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 12(1): 109-121.

Fidan, Hakan and Rahman Nurdun. April 2008. "Turkey's Role in the Global Development Assistance Community: the Case of TIKA (Turkish International Development and Cooperation Agency)," *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 10(1): 94-111.

Finnemore, Martha. 1996. *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. Autumn 1998. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," *International Organization* 52(4): 887-917.

Fuller, Graham E. 1993. "Turkey's New Eastern Orientation". In Graham E. Fuller and Ian O. Lesser (eds.), *Turkey's New Geopolitics: From the Balkans to Western China*. Boulder: Westpress View, 37-97.

Goldstein, Judith and Robert O. Keohane. 1993. "Ideas and Foreign Policy: An Analytical Framework". In Goldstein, Judith and Robert O. Keohane (eds.), *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 3-30.

Güngör, Veyis. 12 November 2009. "Çankaya Köşkü'nde Nahçıvan Zirvesi" (Nakhchivan Summit in the Çankaya Palace) available at http://www.habera.com/default.asp?page=yazar&id=2242)>

Görgülü, Aybars, Sabiha Senyücel Gündoğar, Alexander Iskandaryan and Sergey Minasyan. 2009. *Turkey-Armenia Dialogue Series: Breaking the Vicious Circle*. Ankara: TESEV Publications.

Haas, Peter M. Winter 1992. "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination," *International Organization* 46(1): 1-35.

Hale, William. 2000. *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774-2000*. London, Portland, OR: Frank Cass.

Hanioğlu, Şükrü. 2008. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Period*. Prinecton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Hayit, Baymirza. 1997. *Basmacılar: Türkistan Milli Mücadele Tarihi, 1917-1934* (Basmachis: Turkestan National Struggle History, 1917-1934). Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınevi.

Haynes, Jeff. April 2001. "Transnational Religious Actors and International Politics," *Third World Quarterly* 22(2): 143-158.

Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton. 1999. *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999.

Heper, Metin. 2007. *The State and Kurds in Turkey: The Question of Assimilation*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hewson, Martin and Timothy J. Sinclair. 1999. "The Emergence of Global Governance Theory". In Martin Hewson and Timothy J. Sinclair (eds.). *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 3-22.

Hunter, Shireen. May 2001. "Turkey, Central Asia, and the Caucasus: Ten Years after Independence," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 1(2): 1-16.

Hürriyet. 19 September 2006. "Erdoğan: Türkçe Konuşan Devletler Topluluğu Kuralım" (Let's Establish Union of Turkic-speaking States).

Hürriyet. 13 May 2009. "Erdoğan: İşgal Bitmeden Kapı Açılmayacak" (Erdogan: Border will not be Opened Unless the Occupation Ends).

Hürriyet. 18 Mayıs 2010. "Açıkça Karabağ Olmadan Olmaz" (Manifestly No Progress without Karabakh).

International Crisis Group. 14 April 2009. "Turkey and Armenia: Opening Minds, Opening Borders," *ICG Europe Report No. 199*. Brussels and Istanbul: International Crisis Group.

İlhan, Attila. 2006. *Sultangaliyev: Avrasya'da Dolaşan Hayalet* (Sultangaliyev: The Ghost that Roams in Eurasia). İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları.

Kakınç, Halit. 2003. *Sultangaliyev ve Milli Komünizm* (Sultangaliyev and National Communism). İstanbul: Bulut Yayınları.

Kakınç, Halit. 2004. *Destansı Kuramcı Sultangaliyev* (Legendary Theoretician Sultangaliyev). İstanbul: Bulut Yayınları.

Kamalov, Ilyas. June 2008. "Türkiye-Tataristan İlişkileri" (Turkey-Tatarstan Relations), *Stratejik Analiz* 9(98): 80-85.

Kanbolat, Hasan. 6 October 2009. "Turkic Council". *Today's Zaman*.

Karasar, Hasan Ali. 2002. "Chicherin on the Delimitation of Turkestan: Native Bolsheviks versus Soviet Foreign Policy. Seven Letters from the Russian Archives on *Razmezhevanie*," *Central Asian Survey* 21(2): 199-209.

Karasar, Hasan Ali. 2007. "Türk Cumhuriyetleri'nin Bağımsızlıklarının 15. Yılında Türkiye-Türk Cumhuriyetleri İlişkilerine Bir Bakış" (A Look at Turkey's Relations with Turkic Republics at the 15th Anniversary of Independence). In Alaaddin Korkmaz and Orhan Kavuncu (eds.), *Bağımsızlıklarının 15. Yılında Türk Cumhuriyetleri* (Turkic Republics at the 15th Anniversary of Independence). Ankara: TOBB, 145-169.

Katzenstein, Peter J. 1996. "Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security". In Peter J. Katzenstein (ed.). *The Culture of National Security*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1-32.

Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Keyman, E. Fuat. Spring 2009. "Turkish Foreign Policy in a Globalizing World," *Turkish Policy Quarterly* 8(1): 35-42.

Khagram, Sanjeev, James V. Riker and Kathryn Sikkink. 2002. "From Santiago to Seattle: Transnational Advocacy Groups Restructuring World Politics". In Sanjeev Khagram, James V. Riker and Kathryn Sikkink (eds.). *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks, and Norms*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 3-23.

Keohane, Robert and Joseph Nye. Summer 1971. "Transnational Relations and World Politics: An Introduction," *International Organization* 25(3): 329-349.

Keohane, Robert and Joseph Nye (eds.). 1976. *Transnational Relations and World Politics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press.

Kırımlı, Hakan (ed.). 2004. *İsmail Bey Gaspıralı İçin* (For Ismail Bey Gaspirali). Ankara: Kırım Türkleri Kültür ve Dayanışma Derneği.

Kırımlı, Hakan. February-April 2007. "İsmail Bey Gaspıralı, Türklük ve İslam," (Ismail Bey Gaspirali, Turkishness and Islam) *Doğu Batı* 31(4): 146-176.

Kocatürk, Utkan. 1999. *Atatürk'ün Fikir ve Düşünceleri* (Ideas and Thoughts of Ataturk). Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi.

Kushner, David. April 1997. "Self-Perception and Identity in Contemporary Turkey," *Journal of Contemporary History* 32(2): 219-233.

Landau, Jacob M. 1995. *Pan-Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Louër, Laurence. 2008. *Transnational Shia Politics: Religious and Political Networks in the Gulf*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Milliyet. 25 September 1967. "Demirel Timur'un Kabrini Ziyaret Etti" (Demirel Visited Timur's Tomb).

Milliyet. 26 September 1967. "Demirel'e Cüppe ve Takke Hediye Ettiler" (Demirel was Given Jubbah and Cap as Gift).

Milliyet. 27 September 1967. "Demirel: Rus Dostluğu Kalkınmaya Hizmet Eder" (Demirel: Russian Friendship Serves Development).

Milliyet. 25 June 1989. "Sofya'ya Milli İhtar" (National Warning to Sofia).

Milliyet. 28 February 1992. "Karabağ Alev Alev" (Karabakh under Fire).

Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi (Nationalist Action Party). 2009. "MHP Parti Programı: Geleceğe Doğru" (NAP Program: Towards Future). Ankara: MHP.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan. 28 May 2010. *Astana Calling: a bi-weekly Online Publication of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan* 64: 1-3, available at http://portal.mfa.kz/portal/page/portal/mfa/resources/Pictures/Astana%20Calling%202010%20(PDF)/Astana%20Calling%20052810.pdf>

Murinson, Alexander. November 2006. "The Strategic Depth Doctrine of Turkish Foreign Policy," *Middle Eastern Studies* 42(6): 945-964.

"National Security Concept of the Republic of Azerbaijan". 23 May 2007. (Unofficial Translation) available at: http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Azerbaijan2007.pdf>

Oğuz, Celal Cem. 2010. *Türkiye-Azerbaycan İlişkileri ve Ermenistan Faktörü* (Turkey-Azerbaijan Relations and the Armenia Factor). Ankara: YT Yayınları.

Olcott, Martha B. 1981. "The Basmachi or Freemen's Revolt in Turkestan, 1918-24," *Soviet Studies* 33(3): 352-369.

Østegaard-Nielsen, Eva. 2003. *Transnational Politics: Turks and Kurds in Germany*. New York: Routledge.

Oylupınar, Hüseyin. 2008. "Ukraine". In Mustafa Kibaroğlu (ed.), *Turkey's Neighborhood*. Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute, 53-93.

Öniş, Ziya and Şuhnaz Yılmaz. March 2009. "Between Europeanization and Euro-Asianism: Foreign Policy Activism in Turkey during the AKP Era," *Turkish Studies* 10(1): 7-24.

Özkan, İsa. 2007. "Bağımsızlıklarının 15. Yılında Türk Cumhuriyetlerinde Eğitim ve Sosyal Değişme" (Education and Social Change in the Turkic Republics in the 15th Anniversary of Independence). In Alaaddin Korkmaz and Orhan Kavuncu (eds.), *Bağımsızlıklarının 15. Yılında Türk Cumhuriyetleri* (Turkic Republics in the 15th Anniversary of Independence). Ankara: TOBB, 267-300.

Presidency of the Republic of Turkey. 3 October 2009. "Türk Dili Konuşan Ülkeler Zirvesi: "21. Yüzyılı Savaşların değil Barışın Yüzyılı Yapabiliriz"" (Turkic-speaking Countries Summit: "We Can Make the 21st Century, a Century of Peace, rather than Wars), available at http://www.tccb.gov.tr/common/iframes/Haberler/HaberArsiv/HaberDetay.as px?id=822&dil=tr>

Presidency of the Republic of Turkey. 22 October 2009. "Strategic Partnership Agreement between Turkey and Kazakhstan", available at http://www.tccb.gov.tr/common/iframes/Haberler/HaberArsiv/EnHaberDetay .aspx?id=909&dil=en>

Poulton, Hugh. 1997. "Turkey as Kin-State: Turkish Foreign Policy towards Turkish and Muslim Communities in the Balkans". In Hugh Poulton and Suha Taji-Farouki (eds.), *Muslim Identity and the Balkan State*. London: Hurst & Company, 194-213.

Punsmann, Burcu Gültekin. October 2009. "Moving Beyond Symbolism: The Normalization of Turkish-Armenian Relations: A Window of Opportunity for Regional Prosperity," *TEPAV Policy Note*. Ankara: TEPAV, available at http://yeni.tepav.org.tr/upload/files/1257767367r1562.Moving_Beyond_Sym bolism.pdf>

Qurbanov, Neriman and Elşad Miralem. 2008. *Türk Dövlət və Cəmiyyətlərinin XI. Dostluq, Qardaşlıq ve Əməkdaşlıq Qurultayı* (Turkic States and Communities Eleventh Friendship, Brotherhood and Cooperation Congress).

Reinicke, Wolfgang. November/December 1997. "Global Public Policy," *Foreign Affairs* 76(6): 127-138.

Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Protocol on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations between the Republic of Turkey and the Republic of Armenia", available at http://www.mfa.gov.tr/data/DISPOLITIKA/t%C3%BCrkiye-ermenistan-ingilizce.pdf>

Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Relations with the Balkan Region", available at http://www.mfa.gov.tr/relations-with-the-balkan-region.en.mfa>

Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Turkey's Relations with Central Asian Republics", available at http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey_s-relations-with-central-asian-republics.en.mfa>

Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Turkey's Political Relations with Russian Federation", available at http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey_s-political-relations-with-russian-federation.en.mfa>

Risse, Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp and Kathryn Sikkink (eds.). 1999. *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Risse, Thomas and Kathryn Sikkink. 1999. "The Socialization of Human Rights Norms in the Domestic Practices". In Thomas Risse, Stephen C. Ropp and Kathryn Sikkink (eds.), *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-39.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 2005. "Bringing Transnational Relations Back in: Introduction". In Thomas Risse-Kappen (ed.), *Bringing Transnational Relations Back in: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 3-36.

Robins, Philip. 2003. *Suits and Uniforms: Turkish Foreign Policy since the Cold War*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Rosenau, James N. 1980. *The Study of Global Interdependence: Essays on the Transnationalization of World Affairs*. New York: Nichols Publishing Company.

Rosenau, James N. 1989. "Global Changes and Theoretical Challenges: Toward a Post-International Politics for the 1990s ". In Ernst Otto-Czempiel and James N. Rosenau (eds.), *Global Changes and Theoretical Challenges: Approaches to World Politics for the 1990s*. New York: Lexington Books, 1-29.

Rosenau, James N. 1999. "Toward an Ontology for Global Governance". In Martin Hewson and Timothy J. Sinclair (eds.). *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 287-301.

Rosenau, James N. 2003. *Distant Proximities: Dynamics beyond Globalization*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Rubin, Barry. 2002. "Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Alanda Değişen Rolü" (Turkey's Changing Role in the International Arena". In Barry Rubin and Kemal Kirişçi (eds.), *Günümüzde Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası* (Contemporary Turkish Foreign Policy). İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, 1-6.

Rucht, Dieter. 2009. "The Transnationalization of Social Movements". In Della Porta, Donatella, Hanspeter Kriesi & Dieter Rucht (eds.), *Social Movements in a Globalizing World*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 206-222.

Sarınay, Yusuf. 2005. *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Tarihi Gelişimi ve Türk Ocakları, 1912-1931* (Historical Development of Turkish Nationalism and the Turkish Hearths). İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.

Sabri Sayarı. Fall 2000. "Turkish Foreign Policy in the Post Cold-War Ea: The Challenges of Multi-Regionalism". *Journal of International Affairs* 54(1): 169-182.

Sander, Oral. Winter 1993. "Turkish Foreign Policy: Forces of Continuity and Change," *Turkish Review Quarterly Digest* 7(34): 31-46.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie. 2004. *A New World Order*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Smith, Michael Peter and Luis Eduardo Guarnizo. 1998. "The Locations of Transnationalism". In Michael Peter Smith and Luis Eduardo Guarnizo (eds.), *Transnationalism from Below*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 3-34.

Spruyt, Hendrik. 1994. *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Swietochoswki, Tadeusz. 1995. *Russia and Azerbaijan: Borderland in Transition*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Şen, Mustafa. 2007. "Türkiye-Orta Asya Yatırım İlişkileri ve Bölgede Aktif Türk Girişimciler" (Turkey-Central Asia Investment Relations and Active Entrepreneurs in the Region). In Mustafa Aydın (ed.), *Türkiye'nin Avrasya Macerası: 1989-2006* (Turkey's Eurasia Adventure: 1989-2006). Ankara: Nobel, 109-142.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney. June 2001. "Transnational Politics: Contention and Institutions in International Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 1-20.

Tarrow, Sidney. 2007. *The New Transnational Activism*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

T.C. Basbakanlik Basin Yayin ve Enformasyon Genel Mudurlugu, Ayin Tarihi, Mart 1993 (Republic of Turkey Office of the Prime Minister Directorate General of Press and Information, History of the Month, March 1993), available at http://www.byegm.gov.tr/ayintarihidetay.aspx?Id=201&Yil=1993&Ay=3>

Tellal, Erel. 2006. "SSCB'yle İlişkiler" (Relations with the USSR). In Baskın Oran (ed.), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt I, 1919-1980* (Turkish Foreign Policy: Facts, Documents and Interpretations since the War of Independence, Volume II, 1980-2001). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 499-521.

Tercüman. 15 April 1993. "Türkiye Milleti ve Devleti ile Azerbaycan'ın Dostu" (Turkey is a Friend of Azerbaijan with its Nation and State).

Tercüman. 19 October 1994. "Türk Birliğine İkinci Adım" (The Second Step for Turkic Union).

Tickner, J. Ann. 2009. "On Taking Religious Worldviews Seriously". In Helen V. Milner & Andrew Moravcsik (eds.). *Power, Interdependence and Nonstate Actors in World Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 223-240.

Torbakov, Igor. April-June 2005. "Turkey and Post-Soviet Eurasia: Seeking a Regional Power Status," *Insight Turkey* 7(2): 115-127. .

Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency (TIKA). 2006. *TIKA Annual Report*. Ankara: TIKA.

Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency (TIKA). 2007. *TIKA Annual Report.* Ankara: TIKA.

Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency (TIKA). 2008a. *TIKA Annual Report.* Ankara: TIKA.

Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency (TIKA). 2008b. *TİKA Faaliyet Raporu* (TIKA Activity Report). Ankara: TIKA.

Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi, Kütüphane, Dokümantasyon ve Tercüme Müdürlüğü (Turkish Grand National Assembly, Directorate of Library, Documentation and Translation). "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Hükümetleri" (Governments of Republic of Turkey), available at http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/kutuphane/e_kaynaklar_kutuphane_hukumetler.html >

Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi (Turkish Grand National Assembly). "Türk Dili Konuşan Ülkeler Parlamenter Asamblesi" (Turkic Speaking Countries Parliamentarians Assembly), available at http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ul_kom/turkpa/genel_bilgiler.htm>

Tworkowski, Wojciech. 2008. "Realism Mixed with Romanticism: Turkey's Relations with the States of Central Asia". In Katarzyna Kazimierska (ed.), *Turkey after the Start of Negotiations with the European Union: Foreign Relations and the Democratic Situation, Part II*. Warsaw: Center for Eastern Studies, 41-53.

Undersecretariat of Foreign Trade. 2008. "Dış Ticaretin Görünümü 2008" (Outlook of Foreign Trade 2008). Ankara: UFT.

Vallier, Ivan. Summer 1971. "The Roman Catholic Church: A Transnational Actor," *International Organization* 25(3): 479-502.

Vertovec, Steven. 2010. *Transnationalism*. New York: Routledge.

Waltz, Kenneth N.. December 1999. "Globalization and Governance," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 32(4): 693-700.

Winrow, Gareth. 2001. "Türkiye'nin Orta Asya ve Kafkasya Politikası" (Turkey's Policy toward Central Asia and the Caucasus). In Alan Makovsky and Sabri Sayarı (eds.), *Türkiye'nin Yeni Dünyası: Türk Dış Politikası'nın Değişen Dinamikleri* (Turkey's New World: Changing Dynamics of Turkish Foreign Policy). Istanbul: Alfa, 157-177.

Winrow, Gareth. 2003. "Turkey and Eurasia". In Stephen Larrabee and Ian O. Lesser (eds.), *Turkish Foreign Policy in an Age of Uncertainty*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 99-126.

Yanik, Lerna. March 2004. "The Politics of Educational Exchange: Turkish Education in Eurasia," *Europe-Asia Studies* 56(2): 293-307.

Yeğen, Mesut. November 2004. "Citizenship and Ethnicity in Turkey," *Middle Eastern Studies* 40(6): 51-66.

Interviews

Andican, Ahat, former Minister of State and Government Spokesperson. May 1, 2010. Interview with the author. İstanbul.

Çay, A. Halûk, former Minister of State. May 28, 2010. Interview with the author. Ankara.

Kavuncu, Orhan, general secretary of the Turkish Hearths Association. January 15, 2009. Interview with the author. Ankara.

Pope, Hugh, International Crisis Group, Turkey/Cyprus Program Director. May 1, 2010. Interview with the author. Ankara.

Zeybek, Namık Kemal, former Minister of Culture, Minister of State, Chief Advisor to the Prime Minister and Chief Advisor to the President. January 8, 2009. Interview with the author. Ankara.