

“The New Geopolitical Environment of Turkey”

AUTHORS

Hakkı Çiftçi

ARTICLE INFO

Hakkı Çiftçi (2007). The New Geopolitical Environment of Turkey. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 5(4)

RELEASED ON

Tuesday, 08 January 2008

JOURNAL

"Problems and Perspectives in Management"

FOUNDER

LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

0



NUMBER OF FIGURES

0



NUMBER OF TABLES

0

© The author(s) 2025. This publication is an open access article.

SECTION 1. Macroeconomic processes and regional economies management

Hakkı Çiftçi (Turkey)

The new geopolitical environment of Turkey

Abstract

The future reflection of a concept of Turkey based on “National Independence” and “National Sovereignty”, a part of the global world, and facing the facts of the new world order strictly depend on its being equipped with an understanding in which national knowledge, awareness, strategy, and policies are produced; vision, strategy, effort, and creativity are the primary components; the new dimensions of the technological revolution provide life with speed, mobility, and easiness, and the concept of ethics and legal structures are stronger (Işık, 1997: p. 2). This dimension is the primary condition of a global integration of Turkey based on identity, personality and equal conditions. Infinite opportunities are provided for “a global individual or a global country” being able to be determined as the individual or a society undergoing a dynamic period, his background beforehand, planning his future on his own and experiencing it, using the common language of business, mastering information technology, and conceiving the local characteristics of the common civilization as well as understanding its culture in general. The present study which is going to be evaluated within the framework of the above mentioned thematic components aims at revealing the future opportunities of Turkey by identifying its new geopolitics. In the meantime, geopolitics aims at creating a scientific framework in which national information can serve as a source for national strategy and politics, and contribute to global integration. The first section of the study consists of a situational analysis of the identity, theories, threats of geopolitics and geopolitical developments. In the second section, the new geopolitics and their present conditions are going to be identified; evaluations are going to be conducted. In the third and last sections, the outcomes of these assessments are going to be presented and the opportunities the new geopolitical position of Turkey could provide are going to be determined.

Keywords: geopolitic theories, geopolitical development, new geopolitics, Turkey.

JEL Classification: F42.

Introduction

The World Political Atlas has been reorganized, the direction of this reorganization is determined by shared sovereignty reflexes, and is applied through strategic decisions. Metropolitan and hinterland borders form the backbone of the newly formed world political atlas (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 3; Paul, 1993, p. 35). Various western- (or the US) origin approaches such as “Neo Liberal Colonialism” (Manisalı, 2005, p. 4), “The Clashes of Civilizations”, “The End of History”, and “Eurasian Sovereignty”, introduced as the application components of the framework of sovereignty, attract particular attention as the primary sources of the newly formed political atlas (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 3). Within the embracing scope of the concept of globalization, “The New World Order” formed through a new political atmosphere with such concepts and claims as “postmodernism”, neo-liberalism”, “the end of history”, and “the clashes of civilizations” can neither maintain its validity nor is wholly embracing in its attempt to perceive the political future of the world (Giddens, 1996, p. 9; Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 3). Instead of establishing a comprehensive reconciliatory platform, all of these concepts and claims reflect enormous controversy due to their characteristics

leading to constant arguments and, therefore, result in new conflicts, new political actors, new relations of power, and new searches for sovereignty. New “geopolitical gaps” constitute the focus of sovereignty and power relations of the new process (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 4).

In today’s world, a geopolitical change has been experienced since 2000. In other words, the world has entered a period of change from a single-focused power to a multi-focused one (Wolferen, 1992, p. 27). Apart from the USA, some other powerful nations such as Russia, China, the EU, partly India and Japan have begun to emerge on a global scale (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 7). Furthermore, some regional powers such as Turkey, Iran, Indonesia and Brazil have also emerged (Onay, 2005, p. 5). This has resulted in two aspects of the new geopolitical atmosphere. The first aspect is that the USA attempts to maintain its policy of the sovereignty of a single power and the second is that the others endeavor to form a multi-focused power (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 4). With the formation of the new political atmosphere, Turkey, which is not alienated from these developments and which itself is in a very dynamic structure trying to perceive its position within an already dynamic region (Davutoğlu, 2003, p. 37), represents a dimension which must be supported with much more active and dynamic reflexes by assuming a central role thanks to its

geographic position (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 3). The “reflection points” of the elements causing the economic and political arguments, disintegration and conflicts in this new political atmosphere have been surrounding Turkey (Yeldan, 2001, p. 10).

In this respect, in order to identify the geographic position of Turkey within the international environment undergoing the most intensive change, it is necessary to place Turkey on an empty world map indicating its boundaries and consider the continents on a regional scale (Polanyi, 1986, p. 29). Turkey is situated on the junction of three continents; it connects the west to the east, the east to the west, the south to the north, and the north to the south. It is like a hinge of the three continents. It is worth a lock to the three continents and the key to open this lock. It is situated on the junction of the Balkans, the Middle East, and the Caucasus, as well. It has coasts to the inland seas (the Mediterranean and the Black Sea) of the world island and the straits joining these two seas. The Republic of Turkey is established on an extremely precious property. The geographic structure extending from the Caucasus to the Black Sea to Central Asia, from the Balkans to the Mediterranean to the Middle East emerges as the practice area of the clashes and trials of powers, of the legalization efforts of the cold war institutions and their actions, and of the global-regional power positions, subsequent to the Cold War era (Atay, 2005, p. 25; Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005: 21). The regions under discussion reflect a uniform holistic atmosphere when in particular energy is the case. Making a realistic political analysis by distinguishing the Middle East from the Caucasus and the Central Asia, and the Balkans from the Mediterranean and the Black Sea poses a great difficulty. This situation reflects the basic picture of the new geopolitical atmosphere of the post-Cold War era. Turkey is one of these basic components (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 4).

The future reflection of a concept of Turkey based on “National Independence” and “National Sovereignty”, a part of the global world, and facing the facts of the new world order strictly depend on its being equipped with an understanding in which national knowledge, awareness, strategy, and policies are produced; vision, strategy, effort, and creativity are the primary components; the new dimensions of the technological revolution provide life with speed, mobility, and easiness; and the concept of ethics and legal structures are stronger (Kansu, 1997, p. 21). This dimension is the primary condition of a global integration of Turkey based on identity, personality and equal conditions. Infinite opportunities are provided for “a global individual or a global country” being able to be determined as the

individual of a society undergoing a dynamic period, his background beforehand, planning his future on his own and experiencing it, using the common language of business, mastering information technology, and conceiving the local characteristics of the common civilization as well as understanding its culture in general.

The present study which is going to be evaluated within the framework of the above mentioned thematic components aims at revealing the future opportunities of Turkey by identifying its new geopolitics. In the meantime, geopolitics aims at creating a scientific framework in which national information can serve as a source for national strategy and politics, and contribute to global integration. The first section of the study consists of a situational analysis of the identity, theories, threats of geopolitics and geopolitical developments. In the second section, the new geopolitics and their present conditions are going to be identified; evaluations are going to be conducted. In the third and last sections, the outcomes of these assessments are going to be presented and the opportunities the new geopolitical position of Turkey could provide are going to be determined.

1. Situational analysis of the identity of geopolitics

Geopolitics is a planning study preparing data for politics and having an institutional base. Geopolitics utilizes geographic and anthropological values (economic, social, political, military, cultural) in order to produce data at a political level. Geopolitics is the activation of political geography through anthropological values. It investigates power and target, the two fundamentals of politics, geographically. All types of geography, primarily political geography, have an effect on geopolitics (Brzezinski, 2005, p. 13).

Some thinkers tend to regard geopolitics as a component of political geography within political geography. This assumption means placing political geography in a wider area whereas geopolitics in a much narrower area than it actually is. Geopolitics is a continuation of political geography. However, it comprises more numerous topics in a wider area. Geopolitics is expected to make assumptions regarding the future. The most significant characteristic of geopolitics is its being directed towards practice. Geopolitics connects political geography to politics (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 1).

1.1. Historical development of geopolitics. Such leaders as Iskender, Anibal, Caesar, Cengiz, and Attila who conducted long intercontinental journeys set out their journeys by predetermining the characteristics of the target countries and the geographic regions in between, and their course of movement.

Geopolitics, the art of utilizing geographical environment in politics, first began to gain meaning as a concept in the early 20th century and was developed particularly during the World War II.

The great geopoliticians who influenced those countries which endeavored to dominate the world or stay powerful through the theories they put forward lived mostly in this period.

Table 1. The changing nature of geopolitics

Herodotos	(485-425 BC), studied the relations between the state and the property on which that state was situated.
Eflatun	(427-347 BC), studied the relations between the state and the property on which that state was situated.
Aristoteles	(384-322 BC), encouraged by the positive characteristics of the city of Athens where he lived, he asserted that, for a country to develop and flourish, it must be protected from potential external attacks thanks to hills and mountains and be in the vicinity of a good port so as to make maximum use of overseas trade relations.
Strabo	(63 BC-24 AD), tried to describe the cultural and political activities of the countries, their relations with the properties they were situated on. Based on this assumption, he argued that Italy had the potential to become such a powerful country considering its excellent geographic place, climate, and resources.
Julius Caesar	(100-44 BC), he is known to have thoroughly studied the effects of geographic components on conquering a country, and it can be asserted that one of the most important reasons he was able to emerge victorious from all of his battles was his paying particular attention to geography. He claimed in his book "Gallia Wars" that there were important relations between geography and politics and strategy.
Ibni Haldun	(1332-1406), his greatest contribution to geography is that he elaborated on the relation between physical geography and history. Thanks to Ibni Haldun, physical, social, and economic geography was integrated with sociology, economy, and political history and thus a new field of science based on synthesis called "Geopolitics" emerged.
Cardinal Richelieu	(1585-1642), natural Borders Thesis.
Friedrich List	With his Life Area Thesis, he displayed the concept integrating politics and geography.
Montesquieu	(1689-1775), gave importance to the climate of any geographic area and associated the characters of the people inhabiting these areas with this climate.
Emanuel Kant	(1724-1804), was the first person to argue that political geography was a distinct field of science. He was called "the father of political geography" for his views on this subject. He is even known as the founder of modern geography.
Friedrich Ratzel	(1844-1904), according to the German geographer and anthropologist Friedrich Ratzel, known as the founder of modern geography, although political geography is able to draw excellent maps, provide information to know the countries better, adequately explain the effects of the weather, the population, and the climate, it remains lifeless and plain since it could not attain a satisfactory position in political sciences. In such a case, by processing the political sciences in their field, geography will liberate Political Geography from its static state and provide it with life and vigor. He primarily based his theory on two components geography introduced to politics. "Space-raum" determined through extension, physical characteristics, climate and so on, and "position" designating the condition of space on earth and governing some of its relations. Ratzel, through his views resembling the geographic and political structures of the state to biological organisms, laid the foundation of the German Geopolitical École which was to develop with the name "Life Area – Lebensraum". Ratzel viewed the borders between the countries as temporary signs. Smaller political areas would be eradicated by bigger ones, leading to the emergence of some powerful countries entering a period of great fight for an ultimate world dominance (Mütercimler, 1997, p. 39).
Rudolf Kjellen	(1864-1922), in his work "State as a Form of Life" which he wrote in 1916, he named the five active components of the state which he resembled to a living organism as "Sociopolitics, Econopolitics, Kratopolitics, Demopolitics, and Geopolitics". Thus, the term GEOPOLITICS emerged. For the first time in history, resembling the state to a human being, he made up a doctrine by comparing both of their organs and attributing behaviors similar to those of humans to the states.
Karl Haushofer	(1869-1946), following Ratzel and Kjellen, he was able to show his talent to reinforce his thesis through foreign references. He exploited Mackinder's views on behalf of the Germans by assigning his "Kalpgäh" a little more to the West.
Paul Vidal de Blanche	(1845-1918), contrary to the German Geopolitic Échole, he always strove for an explanation of geographic events by not being restricted to observing and classifying them. He regarded the state not as a living organism but as a "Cultural and National Entity". He believed that human factor was dominant on politics. Hence, he opposed geographic determinism. Geographic events are progressive and subject to change. This is a very important concept introduced by Vidal.
Sir Halford Mackinder	(1861-1947), studied the world geography from a political and especially world dominance aspect and, as a result of his evaluations, he developed the "Land Dominance Theory". While Mackinder proposed utilizing geography as contributor to state administration, Kjellen formulized a state administration system based on geography. Mackinder supports the view that there is only one big piece of land on earth. This is the European-Asian-African continents which he called the "World Island". The central region where Russia is situated is "Heartland-Kalpgäh". Mackinder explains his famous formula through Heartland whose borders he expanded on three stages. Those who possess "Eastern Europe" become dominant on Heartland, those who dominate Heartland becomes dominant on the World Island, and those who dominate this world island dominate the whole world. The only country having such a piece of land is Russia and if it is to be prevented from possessing the world hegemony, its access to open seas must also be prevented (Sempa, 2005, p. 7).
Alfred Thayer Mahan	(1841-1914), defined the principles of "Sea Hegemony Theory" in his work "The Effects of Naval Forces On History" published in 1890. As a result of the Industrial Revolution at the end of the 19 th century, new discoveries were made and, at the same time, economic relations improved. The search for raw materials and the need for marketing the new products made sea transportation important and thus the distances were shortened thanks to the new technology. The old "Silk Road" lost its importance and Mahan's theory that "Those who become dominant on seas dominate the world" emerged coincidentally.
Nicolas Spykman	(1893-1943), through his two important works "The Geography of Peace" published in 1944, Spykman presented geopolitics and the geographic principles on which the American national security policies and strategies would be based, and through his evaluation of the world geography put forward the "Rimland Theory". In fact, with this theory Spykman responded to Mackinder's "Land Dominance Theory" and emphasized the policies and strategies which could greatly keep the Soviets within the center of Asia and prevent its access to the seas. The "Rimland" and "Sea Dominance" theories appropriated by the USA in designating security strategies have maintained their validity up to the present day.

Table 1 (continued). The changing nature of geopolitics

Pascal Boniface	(1956). defined geopolitics as a systematic approach laying down the general inclinations of the parties in international relations and enabling an analysis of the chess attempts of the related actors. Boniface rightly asserted that it was essential that the effect of geography on state policies should be defined geopolitically.
Yves Lacoste	(1929), argued that "Geopolitical Problems" rather than "Geopolitical Theories" were present and that these problems must be presented in the most objective way. He claimed that the only method to achieve this was to lay down the tricks, developments, the powers and leaderships with counter arguments as they really were. He also asserted micro nationalism by focusing geopolitics on national problems and minority problems.
Jacque Attali	(1943), emphasized the requirements of power and of becoming a power, that the geopolitics of the 21 st century will be tightly dependent on things, and that these will be the position of Russia and China based on the partnership between the EU and the USA.
Foucher	He pointed out that geopolitics turned into a dynamic geography of foreign politics.
Brzezinski	He plainly stated that "Those who become dominant on Eurasia dominate the world."
Samuel Huntington	(1927), argued that the great wars will be fought among civilizations and stated that these opposing civilizations will be the Catholic Society, the Orthodox Society, the Muslim Society, and the Confucian states. The summary of his thesis is that in the 19 th century the states, in the 20 th century the ideologies, and in the 21 st century the cultures will have clashes (Keskinetepe, 2003, p. 29). Huntington's thesis is supported by the similar ideas of the French philosopher Raymond Aron in the 1960s and English Arnold Toynbee and Christophe Rufin in the 1940s. According to Huntington, the world entering an era when religious and ethnic blocks and clashes were about to take place. The boundaries would represent the cultural regions rather than the national states. The future global political conflicts would be on the borders separating the civilizations from each other. While Rufin mentioned an inclination towards "European Castle", Huntington similarly stated that those who wanted to preserve the unity of the West should not only preserve Western culture but also define its borders. In the battle for international power, culture was deliberately utilized as a means.

Sources: Serin, Vildan, Aral Berdal, Köse, M. (2004), "The Geopolitical and Economic transition in Eurasia Problems and Prospects", "Global Scholarly Publication", I-59267-077-6, İstanbul; Atalay, İbrahim (2000), "Türkiye Coğrafyası ve Jeopolitiği", Ege Üniversitesi Basımevi, ISBN:975-94965-5-0, İzmir, İlhan, Suat (1989), "Jeopolitik Duyarlılık", Atatürk Kültür Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, VII Dizi-Sa.113, Ankara; Mütercimler, Erol (1997), "21.Yüzyıl ve Türkiye Yüksek Strateji", Erciyas Yayınları, ISBN 975-8029-03-07; Özey, Ramazan (1999), "Dünya ve Türkiye Ölçeğinde Siyasi Coğrafya", Aktif yayınevi, ISBN: 975-6755-07-5, İstanbul.

There have been some periods when conflicting ideas have emerged in defining and directing geopolitics and some views and inclinations causing concern among scholars. J.W. Semyenov stated his views simply with the two words "Fascist Geopolitics". On the other hand, J. De Castro pronounced his concern pointing out that "the true meaning should be attributed to this word which has been an issue of such conflict and hatred" (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 13). Geopolitics could be viewed as a novel and young field of science. In fact it cannot be said that it has completed its development and formed a basis. For this reason, Dr. Erich Obst felt the need to express his concern that if dealt without being thoroughly mastered, it causes dangerous paths and polemics to surface and that it turns out to become the geographic conscience of the geopolitic state. Apart from having scanty information on it, some radical scientists aim at causing extensive clashes exploiting geopolitics and attempt to disunite the countries by creating ethnic groups or provoking the existing ones (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 4).

1.2. The systems and factors related to geopolitics.

In geographic conditions indicated by Guido Fischer in which the environment is spoilt, there are potential anticipations of such a techno-economic speed, and a boom is observed in nuclear weapons with an aim to capture political factors comprising geographic condition, the size of land, the size and density of

population, organization ability, culture level, border features, and the approaches of neighboring countries, psychological factors such as the efficiency of economic policies (Ergin, 1974, p. 71), adaptation ability, and novel intelligence, and economic factors such as land productivity, the richness of the resources of raw materials, industrial capacity, the level of technology, trade volume, and financial opportunities, all of which uniformly cause people's concern about the future (Morin, 2005. p. 12).

In order to thwart these concerns, international political activities such as negotiations, good will and reconciliation attempts biased decisions, economic pressures and possible conditions for war, provocation and terror campaigns, sabotages and coup d'états, cold war, restricted wars, unrestricted wars, the changing world and nuclear weapons have each found its place in various platforms in the present era (Ergin, 1974, pp. 75-101). Such elements as conflicts, inability to establish peace, fights for interest, imaginary enmities, the deeply-rooted efforts to be governed sustain the search for a new order and form the sovereignty poles by means of exploiting the dynamism of the new conditions (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 3).

Regarding the sovereignty poles and security systems, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Kautilya, Pyrrhus, and Hieron II emphasized the importance of the balance of forces. Among the methods they applied

were utilizing every kind of policy and interest tools, strengthening their position through the competition of armament, and reciprocal concessions and agreements. In multi-pole systems, however, none of the actors is able to dominate international politics on its own. Influential people in history such as Talleyrand, Metternich, Palmerston, Bismarck, Canning, Nesselrode, Capodistria, Garçakof, Ignatieff, De Vergennes, Disraeli and Grey became popular within multi-pole environments. In such a system, relations of friendship or emotions of enmity do not exist. In a bipolar system, the countries trying to establish their security under the shadow of this system are the allies of the coalition leaders of the either side. Moreover, the countries that do not join any of the poles form a third group. Thucydides, Stanley Hoffmann, Morton A. Kaplan analyzed the multi-pole system. In the systems based on agreements and coalitions, the cooperation they establish in international politics and military fields to maintain national security gain importance. They could be partial or favor reciprocal support. Dreikaisernbund, Kello Treaty, and Cento are examples of such psycho-diplomatic treaties. Raymond Aron and William H. Riker are among the pioneers of this view. The last one is collective security. The organization of the international relations through a central security organ and the solution of conflicts without resorting to weapons form the primary principle of this philosophy. Emmanuel Kant emphasized that the road to wisdom was that the nations must abandon aims of "Violent Liberation", organize mutual relations within an order of law instead of "an atmosphere of war where law does not work", and by flourishing within time, ultimately establish "a site of nations" to encompass all of the world nations. According to Metternich, no nation is alone any more. It must be remembered that the modern world is a society of nations, a *societe des etats*. Ernest Renan thinks that the need for constant coalition based on reason and civilization and emphasizing securing high mutual interests and thwarting potential dangers. Such thinkers as Hans J. Morgenthau, and Raymond Aron emphasize collective security based on a society of nations. Outside the balance of the forces, such doctrines as passivism, isolationism, being neutralized and disarmed, regarding the "wars of violation" as unlawful actions, the neutralization doctrine which refuses taking part in great political and ideological blocks competing with one another and objects to any military agreement with them have their own place within the protection and political actions away from wars (Ergin, 1974, pp. 135, 165-168). Yet, regional,

global, and functional integration is determinant on national policies (Aydın, 2002, p. 7).

1.3. The components related to geopolitics and power relations. A geopolitic way of thinking is a concept where numerous disagreements could be solved through the exploitation of various policies and strategies (İlhan, 1989, p. 113). As has been advocated since 1967, theories have been replaced by geopolitical comments and assessments to be made in accordance with the power centers and there has been no need to produce new theories. International and national power centers, their geographic and geopolitic institutions, the opportunities, intentions, and goals of these powers continue to be influential. The geographic components of geopolitics in strategy are in a relation of "space" while the human components are the relations of "power" in strategy. For both of them, it is the time that makes the topics and thoughts active. A total evaluation of these components determines the national power that depends on geographic values. National power studies that do not depend on geography and geographic values are incomplete (Roel et al., 2003, p. 79).

Table 2. The components of geopolitics

Components subject to change	Constant components
Population	Space and its sections
Natural and other sources	The scope of the region
Energy and new sources of energy	Physical structure
Socio-cultural structures	The type public order
Economic values	Marine conditions
Political values	Central condition
Military values	Geographic conditions

Sources: İlhan, Suat (1989), "Jeopolitik Duyarlılık", Atatürk Kültür Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, VII Dizi-Sa.113, Ankara.

Each of these sub-units of geopolitics, which are also the components of national power, possesses distinct strategic value (Özey, 1999, p. 7). "The two important components contributing to the formation of power centers are humans and resources. It has been observed within the power centers having been formed throughout history that the human component has been superior in terms of quality" (TUSİAD, 2002, p. 57). "It is education and culture that evaluate human, while the resources are evaluated through technology". Undoubtedly, it is also the human that promotes technology. Power centers are most likely to emerge as a result of the integration of the qualified human with the strategic resources on the right geography (Pierre et al., 2003, p. 21). "The current theories have been put forward according to the power centers of the present day and of the future."

The concept of imperialism defined by Rupert Emerson as the domination of a powerful nation over a weak one, whereas defined by Feridun Ergin as the policy of a nation to extend its field of sovereignty and control beyond its national boundaries through its potential power is essentially based on extending the field of sovereignty “through utilizing power or threatening to utilize it”. The realistic analytic methodologies of International politics have intensified Machiavelli’s “vital interests” balance within the same parallel as a natural result of the competition among the countries to establish a powerful nation and maintain it. The power of pull between the central nations in the international arena and the small ones in the periphery is the primary component shaping the concepts of time and space in the geopolitical context. The power factor, as one of the primary instruments of international political strategies, possesses the potential of influencing other nations thanks to its intensity and influence (TESEV, 1998, p. 27).

According to Paul Kennedy, nations have always felt the need for “Military Power” throughout every period in history in order to obtain these riches and maintain them. In this context, Edward Hallet Carr defined the importance of military power owing to its having emerged as the “ultimate ratio” in international relations. The Prussian strategist Clausewitz simplified the issue by describing war as the continuation resulting from the integration of political relations with the other components. However, while identifying how nations will acquire their fields of interest and national strategic interests, the equations of “sovereignty, peace, and war” of their foreign policy strategies, according to John Keegan, are in such a close relation as to affect all civilizations and cultures. Accordingly, the changes and developments humanity has undergone from its beginning of up to the modern world have, at the same time, formed the history of war.

Global processes in the political, economic, cultural, and ecological fields prevent the nation-state from performing its function in some respects (Glassner, 1996; Hall, 1998; Kazgan, 2000). The sovereignty of nation-state, the main actor of the global system, has been under discussion and there has been activity in world geopolitics (Karabağ, 2005, p. 3).

2. The new geopolitical environment of Turkey

The fundamental and swift changes in the world at the end of the 20th century have attributed new accountabilities for Turkey, and created new opportunities and horizons as well. Turkey came out from a wing country of North Atlantic Treaty to a central location connecting Europe to Asia in the Eurasian

zone, and became important in terms of politics, security and economic issues (Atalay, 2000, p. 7). Turkey survives in a very wide geographical location where problems, conflicts, and instabilities exist. But, Turkey succeeded to preserve her attribute of being a peace and stability island in such a region. Turkey is one of the rare democracies which exist in the wide region from Europe to Pacific and Middle East (Atalay, 2005, p. 3).

The Anatolian Peninsula, which owns a geographical integrity to a large extent, has been surrounded by the Balkans, the Caucasus, Iran and the Arab Peninsula. The Anatolian Peninsula appears as the castle of this geography and the heart of the “World Island”. Either blocks or enables all kinds of initiatives in the directions of East to West and South to North. Turkey is at the crossroads of the interests and on the route of the politics of the big powers such as the USA, Russia, and the EU (Tezkan, 2005, p. 5). She may even be the target or the starting point of these politics. Turkish geography composes the closest and the most favorable action platform for intervention to the threats against the interest of the West and to the undesired changes, in the region of Middle East, the Caucasus, the Central Asia where it is not in the accountability of NATO. The weak societies in all its meanings and fields have no chance to survive on the Turkish geography. Turkey, seeking a global efficacy, has a very sensitive position as a regional state (Atalay, 2000, p. 5).

The Republic of Turkey is located in a difficult geographical environment and it is not an easy task for her to formulate long range policies because, these to be versatile, multi-optional, and stand-alone. The near surrounding countries, the powers of the Eurasian, the global big powers and the emerging powers influence the policy-making in Turkey. For this reason, prior to suggesting alternatives, the geopolitical developments in the surrounding geography, the regional and the Eurasian scale politics and strategies of the USA, and the countries of the EU, the Russian Federation, the Balkans, the Caucasus, the Middle East, the Central Asia, and their views on Turkey will be briefly revealed (Brzezinski, 1992, p. 97).

According to Brzezinski, Turkey is in the position of a hinge of the “World Island”, which is composed of three continents namely Asia, Europe, and Africa. At the same time, she has a value of a lock and a key opening and closing this hinge (Brzezinski, 1992, p. 9). Turkey connects the Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea, which are inland seas of these three continents; she connects and separates the Balkans, the Caucasus, and the Middle East. This geographical location has a great value for all kinds of power

structures that may become into being in the region and the world. When this geographical location and the country's geopolitical power composed with her human capital is assessed and interpreted in company with the regional and world powers, the geopolitical position of Turkey would be determined (Serin et al., 2004, p. 77).

Turkey, being at the heart of the geographical location composed of Middle East and the Hazar Basin which have the world's most valuable petroleum reserves; the Mediterranean Basin which is the crossroads of important sea transportation routes; Black Sea Basin and Turkish Gates which have long been important in history; the Balkans which underwent structural changes as a result of the scattering of the Former Russia and Yugoslavia; the Caucasus (ASAM, 2003, p. 3) which has rich natural resources as well as ethnical conflicts; and beyond these at the center of the geography composed of Middle Asia, is in a drastic location. Interconnecting three continents and possessing a very significant geostrategic location, Turkey is a European, an Asian, a Caucasian, a Middle Eastern, a Mediterranean, and a Black Sea country at the same time. In short, Turkey is a Eurasian country (MSB, 2005, p. 13).

The Republic of Turkey, adopting the most excellent aspects of human values brought forth in this land which has been a geopolitical crossroads through the history thanks to richness Anatolian Peninsula provides, appears as an excellent synthesis of various cultures. A democratic, an affluent and a stable Turkey, is a remarkable evidence of the fact that the values of the East and the West may integrate and survive in accordance. The eastern and western aspects of Turkey can also be recognized by the variety of international institutions Turkey is affiliated with. Turkey is the only country which holds the membership of the NATO, the European Council, OECD, KEI, OCO, D-20, and IKO at the same time (Başoğlu et al., 1999, p. 53).

Turkey, furthermore, will have a bridge role in the transformation of Hazar's and Middle East's natural resources to the West. The 70 percent of the world's natural energy resources are located around Turkey. The Baku-Ceyhan Project, which is based on the transportation of the Hazar Petroleum and has been widely supported by the international community, presents the most stable option with regard to the petroleum transportation route and entertains the minimum level of risk as a matter of environmental safety. The developments in the geography of the Balkans, the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea Basins, the Caucasus, the Central Asia, the Middle East under the post Cold War circumstances, have brought renewal and mobility to the roles played by

Turkey in these regions. Developments in this region will have a determining role in the future of the Europe and the world. Turkey, on the one hand, tries to fulfill her responsibilities with greatest effort, on the other hand, she tries to draw benefit from the opportunities. In such an important and wide geography, Turkey will have to carry on her efficacy and determining role in the new century (Çeçen, 2005, p. 23). Integration of Europe and Asia is not possible unless peace and stability are established in the Balkans, the Middle East, and the Caucasus (Yıldızoğlu, 2004, p. 23). Turkey's contribution to peace initiatives in the Balkans, the Middle East, and the Caucasus is aimed to materialize this integration (Suat, 1999, p. 4).

An overview of the EU, the Russia, the Balkans, the Caucasus, the Middle East, the Central Asia, and the China with regard to the geopolitical opportunities and interrelationships allows us to articulate the following issues. Along with Turkey's integration to the EU, the Union's borders will extend to the Asia and the Middle East (Özdağ et al., 2003, p. 11). In regards of Russia, it is evident that Turkey has a significant role in the Balkans due to her geopolitics and history. It is possible that in case Turkey's effectiveness increase in the region Russian-Serbian-Greek Orthodox solidarity will be strengthened. Russia has been observing the developments and views on "Turks Living Abroad" issue in Turkey with a great notice. Russians possess imperialism in their genes. Their objectives and policies have not been changed since 18th century. It is not an easy task to make projections about the developments for the period following the first quarter of the 21st century, but it is not likely to be mistaken about Russians in this regard. In the case of the Balkans, the peace in and the stability of Balkans are closely related with Turkey's security. The Turkey-Greece balance is one of the fundamental components in the Balkans equation (Aydın, 2000, p. 2).

At the same time, a brief account of the Caucasus reveals that Turkey is at a position to gain geopolitical and economic benefits from the Caucasus. Turkey's tendencies have the possibility to make a deterministic influence on the Caucasus countries. As for the Central Asia (Turkistan), Turkey has both advantages and disadvantages. The country gains a special position thanks to her historical and cultural affiliations, the dynamism of the private sector, and the initiatives in the field of education. In case Turkey undertakes the transportation of a high stake of the Central Asian petroleum and natural gas to world markets, she will have a significant role in the region (Taşağil, 2004, p. 13). Speaking of China, Turkey's strategies regarding China should be

directed through the China of the 2020s. If Turkey underestimates the importance of China this may result in the establishment of stronger relationships between China and Iran. China already sees Iran as a main ally in the Middle East. Turkey should try to know more about China and establish “close cooperation” based on versatile relationships by formulating a long run strategy. It would not be incorrect to consider that while trying to transform single-poled global system to a multi-player global system, China will adapt to globalization and endeavor to make progress with a system unique to her (Kuchins, 2005, p. 1). In the case of the Middle East, it is well-known that this region has a significant influence on the formation of the geopolitics and geostrategies of Turkey (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 2).

Being the subject of these developments, the alternatives for Turkey are either to enjoy from her faithful (Şimşek, 2005, p. 4) ally of USA role dating from Cold War under nowadays fabricated “strategic partnership” concept which does not reflect the essence of partnership or decide to be an active “regional power” favoring primarily creating a peace environment; competent to form the basis for new collaborations and relations; capable of developing permanent, strong, stabilizing, and multi-optional relationships (Henze, 1995, p. 7).

Conclusion and implications

In today’s world, international relations have come to a point that single poled global system is a temporary situation resulted from the absence of a power. Waltz, in support of such argument, stated that the emergence of new regional powers has changed this situation (Waltz, 1993, p. 50). The US has wished to carry the qualifications of being a superpower for a while after the integration of two Germanies, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the end of the Gulf war. It has even had to bear such a role reluctantly. Yet, the emergence of some countries like Germany, France, Turkey, Egypt, and Iran as superpowers in their regions necessarily has taken the US away from such a role. Germany and France have achieved this process through the European Union (Açıkçeşme, 2005, p. 7). The situation of Turkey, Egypt, and Iran is quite different. These countries have kept their geopolitical positions by sacrificing the welfare of their societies. In this manner, they have become regional powers. The new international political system has increased the pressure on the internal politics as well as on the foreign politics. As a result, the number of actors in the decision making process on the internal political issues have increased (Baldwin, 1995, pp. 126-130). The bureaucratic restrictions play an impeding role on the process of negotiation (Fisher et al., 1997, p. 7).

The obligations stemming from being a great power have led the role of security managers to be taken by the superpowers rather than by regional powers (Hoppman, 1995, p. 3). If the structure of the system is polycentric, the states feel the perception of the threat stronger. In a hierarchical polycentric structure, it is possible for a superpower to have an influence on or prevent from the strength (Goldstein et al., 1997, p. 5). The reality of today’s world is the existence of a global economy. Multinational companies are the sole actors of the reality of mutual interdependence. More importantly, multinational companies as global actors have substantial roots in our minds (Thurow, 1996, p. 134).

On the other hand, the world appears to go into an atmosphere that generates new contradictions and continuous tension and war based on the ideological competition stemming from the ended Cold War. The endeavors for military initiating, weapon manufacturing, excessive arming, and military organizing as well as for having nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, and producing advanced military technology, organizing go on. We see the reflections of a situation in which the ended cold war has not been able to be transformed into a dominant world peace in the aspects from the project of “The Missile Leverage“ to the formation of European Arm, from the inclinations to make the disarming agreements useless to higher emphasis on the production of mass weapons, new threat perceptions to globalized terror (Onay, 2005, p. 5).

The power relationships of new geopolitical trends after the Cold War, which rely on the economic potential and relationships of the developed countries, run in a hierarchical structure that has not been clear yet. The progress in the separating predisposition between global powers seems to be determining element of the near future. The extent to which the political environment in the US based one poled world primarily depends on the levels of the bottom and top elements of the power, its continuity, as well as on the conflicting potentials of the powers. In this framework, the probable developments in the Eurasia region in particular and the reciprocal relationships between the Eurasia powers and their foreseeing capabilities seem to have a determining role. The future of the Europe, the possibilities for the three countries, China, Russia, and India, to extend their regional power potentials toward being global power, the reciprocal alliances and conflicts are the issues that will affect the Eurasia region and the US based one poled political environment.

Eurasia region constitutes a spatial deepness that makes clear the post Cold War political setting and determines the new global powers, regional actors,

and their relationships and future positions. The power relationships manifested in the Eurasia region and focused on “market effectiveness” and “the dominance of natural resources” seem to be a basic determinant of the near future, the political outlook of the region and the world. The dimensions of separations, conflicts, agreements, and integrations are the manifestation of a dynamic structuring that the Eurasia region can pass on from today to the future. The US, EU, Russia, China, India, and Japan are the actors that seek to integrate their roles in the Eurasia region for their future positions. We should add Turkey and Iran to these actors. The role of Turkey in particular, though its interest in and closeness to the Eurasia have not been established as well as its relationships to the Europe and thus its position has been effective in the region yet, will likely to determine the choices, power levels, and relationships in the near future in the region of Eurasia. Nevertheless, Turkey appears to have a two dimensional role (Europe and Asia) in the Eurasia region. This situation reflects an unbalanced political position, an unriched strategic accumulation, and relationship dimension with limited choices for Turkey. Therefore, the region of Eurasia (the Europe) as a single entity can not be expected to produce a positive relationship and thus unlikely to last for a long period, just like it has not exhibited any suitability with the conditions post Cold war. The geographical position of Turkey seems to condition the background of two dimensional relationship in the Eurasia region after the Cold War. This two dimensional relationship also constitutes multidimensional relationships on account of Turkey by producing sub-choices. However, as seen in the power figure, what is important here is to be able to do what is required by committing the guidance of geographical position, developing well-established communication, and feeling the accumulation and role right. After all these, it can be said that “the end of the history” has not come yet on account of the world political life. The contradictions manifested in today’s world do not seem to be clarified correctly by the theses like “Civilization Conflicts”. The basic contradiction is resulted from the lack of ability to eliminate the increasing differences in the development level. The primary source feeding such a scene is the interest conflict reflecting on the power relationships (Tahsin, 2001, p. 17).

There exists a global scaled new geopolitical structural dimension and thus region-wide (sometimes country-wide) geopolitical interferences in the area of global and regional relationships arise Europe, seeking to identify the metropolitan borders by using its EU identity, has been forming a hinterland map with those that will display a strong commitment

to the Union. At this point, EU has given priority to the Mediterranean and the project of the EU moves on as a geopolitical plan. On the other hand, the US, as also be seen from the new national security document, displays an effort to make two basic purposes everlasting. The US aims at taking precautions against the emergence of a new prepotent global power that could possibly upset its position and the formation of an active regional power that leads to regional collaborations. These two basic desires underline the basis of the geopolitical trends of the US and lead to focus on the geography of Eurasia. Accordingly, the post cold war “geopolitical vacuums” tend to be taken as the prior parts of the new political map (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 1). After the Balkans, in today’s world the Middle Asia and the Middle East (with a focus on Iraq) have turned out to be the focus of new disintegrations and arrangements. The focus on Iraq after Afghanistan (Baleta, 2005, p. 27) is a manifestation of a basic part of the attempts for the new Middle East map (Öztürk, 2005, p. 2). In this light, the insistence of the US on Iraq issue appears to be a requirement of the Eurasia policies. Hence, the sensitivities of the US on Iraq are based on the following elements: 1) to make the control over possible global powers such as China, Japan, France, and Germany everlasting through the energy resources (the control of the production and the prices); 2) to take measures against the emergence and the constitution of a new regional power that will affect the Eurasia geopolitics and create a climate for power collaboration and cooperativeness; 3) to enable the US strategies to be implemented thoroughly and completely; and finally 4) to overcome the recent economic stagnation.

These four main reasons have higher level of priority for the US than the all other reasons that are brought forward to explain the boundaries of Iraq border. That is to say, the close attention of the US to Iraq can not be explained with neither its national interest in Iraq and Middle East oils nor with the courses of the peace and stability in the Middle East (Hacısalıhoğlu, 2005, p. 4). On the other hand, the reasons related to mass destruction weapons just lead to underline the role of the US as an implementer of the “asymmetric war”. Moreover, the insensitivity of the US against the North Korea that has just recently stated that it possesses mass destruction weapons demonstrates that the “preventive war approach”, which has been the core element of the US new national security strategies, is not based on the apparent reasons (Cordier, 2005, p. 3).

Those taking place in this framework still keeps their validity for the US. For instance, the closeness of the Europe (France, Germany) with the Russia,

the recovery of the Russian economy leads the US to put more emphasis on the Eurasia politics. The European view of the US has differed. The central focus of the US in Europe appears to slip from West to East in terms of the dominance of Eurasia and balances of Russia-China and France-Germany. The importance of the former East Block countries such as Poland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria increases in this trend. The US is willing to establish an East based geopolitical constitution line from Baltic to the Balkans. On the one hand, getting closer to the Eurasia and hindering Russia and Europe to get closer, on the other hand, the new geopolitical line as an extension of the disintegration of Germany, France, and the US carry particular meanings on whether the Europe is a reliable or unreliable alliance (Davutoğlu, 2003, p. 73).

While the EU and the US are considering all these, Turkey has certain difficulties in identifying itself, establishing variety in strategies; rather it exhibits an appearance of a country that is fragmented and has no vision and is thus in a dilemma in the EU membership and integration policy (Canbolat, 1998, p. 3). Beside, it also displays an appearance of a country that has not been able to perform well in dissolving its problems in relation to the Post Cold War, in making the power identity clear, and in being an “active regional power”. It has also an appearance of a country that performs the requirements of a country with a land surrounded by sea in its three lines of borders, uses the terrestrial and continental possibilities, and develops its economic potential with its neighbors using the integration and embeddedness advantages (İslamoğlu, 2003, p. 13).

All these show that Turkey is confronting a new geopolitical position and setting in the formation of a new political map. This geopolitical position and setting conditions help Turkey in identifying national standing, in having an active regional identity, in determining internal and external geopolitical integration, and in obtaining a geopolitical position equipped with multiple choices and strategic foresights (Arat, 2003, p. 7). This approach enables Turkey to face and dissolve the current uneasy issues on the East Mediterranean, Cyprus, EU, and North Iraq (Şimşek, 2005, p. 4).

All these show that Turkey should rehandle (or revise) the national security strategies. All developments and trends should be examined in detail, focusing on Turkey. The threat perception should be made clear based on the national security. The multiple choice relationships rather than single choice relationships should be lasting. The EU issue should be worked out under the consideration of that it is a one sided dependence relationship. Moreover, the people should be informed truly in order to become aware of the realities. There should be an intense effort to turn the knowledge into the consciousness. The all accumulations gathered through the historical civilizations in the land of Anatolia should be turned into a synthesis under the framework of the Republic. This synthesis should be based on the real needs and requirements of the Anatolia and Turkey. The artificial distinctions and one-sided sensitivities are the most important drawbacks in front of Turkey. The full accomplishment of an independent Turkey with a strong identity is a fervent desire for all individuals that are fed with the values of this country.

The accomplishment of this desire is primarily based on Turkey’s self-confidence, its plans for future, its openness to out world with its own (Kazgan, 1985, p. 75) will, its potential to increase the impacts on the markets, its capability for the dominance of natural resources, and its abilities to produce strategically important advanced technologies, to bring out new collaboration and cooperativeness opportunities by establishing peace in its environment, to establish a balance between Europe and Asia identities by giving priority to multiple choice foreign trade and foreign policies, to become an effective actor in the Eurasia geopolitics, and to develop a comprehensive national security strategy (Yeniçeri, 2005, p. 3).

The tendencies that all communities come together on account of national interests, and societal interests prevail over individual goals and interests are also significant in the accomplishment of this will. In such case, Turkey will again carry the feeling of a profound progress and development and thus aim at boom with a strong identity and consciousness (Kabasakal, 1996, p. 77).

References

1. Açıkkışme, Sinem (2005), “The Underlying Dynamics of the European Security and Defence Policy”, Research Assistant, Department of EU studies, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara University.
2. Arat Fikret, Ceyhan (2003), “Atatürk’ün Strateji Anlayışı”, Anıtkabir dergisi, Yıl: 3, Sayı: 14, Temmuz 2003, Ankara.
3. ASAM (2003), “Kafkasya’nın Jeopolitik Sorunları”, Avrasya Bir Foundation, ASAM Publications: 53/07, Ankara: 20.
4. Atalay, İbrahim (2000), “Türkiye Coğrafyası ve Jeopolitiği”, Ege Üniversitesi Basımevi, ISBN: 975-94965-5-0, İzmir.
5. Atay, Mehmet (2005), “21.Yüzyılın Başlarında Türkiye ve Orta Asya’nın Yeni Jeopolitik Konumu”, <<http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-2/atay-2-1.asp>>, Erişim Tarihi, 09/12/2005.

6. Aydın, Mustafa (2000), "New Geopolitics of Central Asia and the Caucasus", SAM papers No. 2/2000, Ankara, June 2000.
7. Aydın, Senem (2002), "Türkiye'nin Tam Üyeliğinin Avrupa Birliğine ve Türkiye'ye Katkıları", İKV Yayınları, No: 168, İstanbul Mayıs, 2002, s. 7.
8. Baldwin, David A. (1995). "Security Studies and the End of the Cold War". World Politics. No. 48. 1995, ss. 126, 127 ve 130.
9. Baleta, Abdi (2005), "Eski Jeopolitiğin Yeni Perspektifleri", <http://www.yarindergisi2/> haziran 2002, Erişim Tarihi, 09/12/2005.
10. Başoğlu, U., Ölmezoğulları N. ve Parasız İ. (1999), "Dünya Ekonomisi", Ezgi Kitabevi, 1. Baskı, Bursa.
11. Brzezinski Zbigniew (2005), "Jeopolitik Boşluk", <<http://www.bkd.org.tr/analiz/>> jeopolitikboşluk.asp, Erişim Tarihi, 09/12/2005.
12. Brzezinski, Zbigniew (1992), "Büyük Çöküş", Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, Genel Yayın no: 309, Ankara.
13. Canbolat İbrahim S.(1998), "Uluslarüstü Sistem AB: Bir Dönüşümün Analizi", Alfa Yayınlar, Geliştirilmiş 2. Baskı, İstanbul.
14. Cordier, De Bruno (2005), "The Southern ex-Soviet republics after one and a half decade of independence: from transition societies to developing countries?", Avrasya etüdleri, 27-28 Sonbahar-Kış 2005.
15. Çeçen, Anıl (2005), "Avrupa ve Türkiye", <<http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-4/cecen4/>>, Erişim Tarihi 09/12/2005.
16. Davutoğlu, Ahmet (2003), "Stratejik Derinlik; Türkiye'nin Uluslar arası Konumu", Küre Yayınları, 13. Baskı, BSV Kitaplığı Stratejik Araştırmalar 1, ISBN 975-6614-00-5, İstanbul.
17. Ergin, Feridun, "Uluslar arası Politika Stratejileri", İstanbul Üniversitesi yayınları 2008, İstanbul, s. 9.
18. Giddens, A. (1996), "Beyond Left and Right, The Future of Radical politics, Polity Pres, 1996.
19. Fisher, Roger, Andrea Kupfer Schneider, Elizabeth Borgwardt ve Brian Ganson, (1997). Coping with International Conflict. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
20. Glassner, M.I. (1996), Political Geography, Second Edition, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1996.
21. Goldstein, Joshua S., ve Jon C. Pevehouse. (1997). "Reciprocity, Bullying and International Cooperation Time Series Analysis of the Bosnia Conflict". American Political Science Review. Vol. 91, No. 31997.
22. Hacısalihoğlu, İ. Yaşar (2005), "Jeopolitik Doğarken", <[http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-4/](http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-4/editörden.asp) editörden.asp, Erişim>: 09/12/2005
23. Hacısalihoğlu, İ. Yaşar (2005), "Dünya Siyasal Ortamının Berraklaşanlarla Türkiye'yi Algılamak", <http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-3>, 09/12/2005.
24. Hacısalihoğlu, İ. Yaşar (2005), "Türkiye Yol Ayrımında", <[http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-4/](http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-4/editörden.asp)editörden.asp, Erişim> tarihi:09/12/2005.
25. Hacısalihoğlu, İ. Yaşar (2005), "Irak'tan Avrasya Jeopolitiğine Yansyanlar ve Türkiye", <<http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-3>, 09/12/2005.
26. Hacısalihoğlu, a.ge. <[http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-4/](http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-4/editörden.asp)editörden.asp,Erişim> tarihi:09/12/2005.
27. Halford, J. Mackinder, "The Geographical Pivot of History", in democratic ideals and reality", p. 243.
28. Hall, S. (1998), Yerel ve Küresel: Küreselleşme ve Etniklik, Kültür Küreselleşme ve Dünya-Sistemi, Der: A.D. Henze, Paul B., (1995), "Türkiye'nin Yeni Jeopolitiği Balkanlardan Batı Çin'e", Harp Akademileri Basımevi, İstanbul.
29. Hopmann, Terience. (1995). "Two Paradigms of Negotiation: Bargaining and Problem Solving". The Annals 542.
30. İlhan, Suat (1989), "Jeopolitik Duyarlılık", Atatürk, Kültür, Dil ve tarih Yüksek Kurumu Yayınları, VII Dizi s. 113.
31. İlhan, Suat (1999), "Türkiye'nin Jeopolitik Konumu ve türk Dünyası", Atatürk Yüksek kurumu Atatürk kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı", ISBN: 975-16-1164-4, Ankara.
32. İslamoğlu, Hürrihan (2003), "Değişen Hukuk,Toplum ve Devlet İlişkileri Üzerine", İktisat dergisi, Sayı: 437, Mayıs 2003, İstanbul.
33. King, (Çev. G. Seçkin-Ü.H. Yolsal), Bilim ve Sanat yayınları, Ankara, 1998.
34. Kabasakal Öner (1996), "Dönüşüm Sosyal ve Stratejik Çözümler", Seba İlmî Araştırmalar Dizisi 8, Ankara.
35. Kansu, Işık (1997), "Emperyalizmin Yeni Masalı Küreselleşme", İmge Kitabevi yayını, 3. Baskı, Ankara.
36. Karabağ Servet, " Küreselleşme Ulus-Devlete Karşı mı?", <<http://www.jeopolitik.org>>. Org, Erişim Tarihi, 09/12/2005.
37. Kazgan, G. (2000), Küreselleşme ve Ulus-devlet, Yeni Ekonomik Düzen, Bilgi Üniversitesi yayınları, İstanbul.
38. Kazgan, Gülten (1985), "Ekonomide Dışa Açık Büyüme", Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi, Bilimsel Sorunlar Dizisi, İstanbul.
39. Keneddy Paul (1993), "Büyük Güçlerin Yükseliş ve Çöküşleri", Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları", Çeviren: Birtane Karanakçı, Genel Yayın No: 306, Ankara.
40. Keskintepe, Reha (2003), "On the Compatibility of İslam and democracy: The Turkish Experience", NSF Review, Winter 2003, Deputy Director and Directorate General For Policy Planning for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Turkey.
41. Kuchins, Andrew (2005), "Çin-Rus İttifakının Evrimi", Çev.İbrahim Kiras, <http://www.geocities.com/İbrahim-kiras/cinrus.html>,09/12/2005.
42. Manisalı, Erol (2005), "Batı'da Kapitalizm, Hristiyanlık ve Ulusallık Örtüşmesi", <<http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-4/jeo-2/manisali-2-1.asp>,Erişim> tarihi:09/12/2005.
43. Morin, Edgar (2005), "Avrupa Birliği'nin açık bir ahlakı, dinamik bir dini henüz oluşmadı", İktisat, İşletme ve Finans Dergisi Söyleşi, Yıl: 20, Sayı 234, s. 12, Eylül 2005, Ankara.

44. Mütercimler, Erol (1997), “21.Yüzyıl ve Türkiye Yüksek Strateji”, Erciyas Yayınları, ISBN 975-8029-03-07.
45. MSB (2005), <<http://www.msb.gov.tr/birimler/gnppd/Erişim>> Tarihi:09/12/2005.
46. Onay, Yaşar (2005), “Küresel Jeopolitik Durum ve Rusya Değerlendirmesi”, <<http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-2/Onay2-1>>, 09/12/2005.
47. Onay Yaşar (2005), “Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Düzenin Getirdiklerinin Türkiye Jeopolitiğine yansımaları ve Tehdit Farklılaşması”, <http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-4/onay4-1.asp>.
48. Özdağ Ü., Kalafat Y., Erol, M.S. (2003), “21.Yüzyılda Türk Dünyası Jeopolitiği”, Avrasya Stratejik araştırmalar merkezi yayınları”, Muzaffer Özdağ’a armağan, 3. Cilt, Jeopolitik Strateji Terör Dizisi 61, Ankara.
49. Özey, Ramazan (1999), “Dünya ve Türkiye Ölçeğinde Siyasi Coğrafya”, Aktif yayınevi, ISBN: 975-6755-07-5, İstanbul.
50. Öztürk Metin Osman (2005), “11 Eylül Sonrasında Ortadoğu ve Irak”, <<http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-2/öztürk2-1>, Erişim> tarihi:09/12/2005.
51. Pierre, Jeon, Miereille Dreko and Francos Koutand (2003), “New International Poverty Reduction Strategies”, London and New York.
52. Polanyi Karl (1986), “Büyük Dönüşüm”, Çeviren: Ayşe Buğra, Alan Yayıncılık: 65, Bilim Dizisi: 12, İstanbul.
53. Porter, Micheal (1998), “Global rekabette üstünlüğün Sırrı”, Rekabet Dersleri, Capital Yönetim Dizisi: 3, İstanbul.
54. Roel, Ruffen, Frans Bockhema and Elsa Kuijpers (2003), “Economic Geography of Higher education knowledge infrastructure and learning regions”, Routledge, London and New York.
55. Sempa, P. (2005), Jeopolitik merkez ve kara hakimiyeti teorisi, <<http://www.geocities.com/ibrahimkiras/jeopol.html>>, Erişim Tarihi, 09/12/2005.
56. Serin, Vildan, Aral Berdal, Köse, M. (2004), “The Geopolitical and Economic transition in Eurasia Problems and Prospects”, Global Scholarly Publication”, I-59267-077-6, İstanbul.
57. Şimşek, Halil (2005), “Türkiye ve Çevresinde Barış Ortamı Koşulları”, <<http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-4/şimşek4-1.asp/09/12/2005>>.
58. Şimşek, Halil (2005), “Türkiye Kıbrıs ve AB İlişkileri...”, <<http://www.jeopolitik.org/jeo-2/simsek2-1.asp>>.
59. Tahsin, E. (2001), “Dünya Ekonomisinde Üç Aktör”, İktisat Dergisi, Dünya Ekonomisi Nasıl Yönetiliyor, İFMC Yayınları, Yıl:2001, Sayı, 416, İstanbul.
60. Taşağil, A. (2004), Türkiye’nin Orta Asya Türk Cumhuriyetleri ile İlişkilerinin Dünü, Bugünü ve yarını”, Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi, Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt Başkanlığı yayınları, Yıl 2, Şubat 2004, Sayı: 3.
61. TESEV (1998), “Yoksulluğu Önleme Stratejileri”, STK Diyalogu, ISBN 975-8112-07-4 29-31Mayıs1997, Diyarbakır.
62. Tezkan, Yılmaz (2005), “Süper Bir Güç:Rusya ve Türkiye”, <http://www.yarindergisi.com/yarindergisi/haziran2002>, 09/12/2005.
63. Thurow, Lester C. (1996). Kapitalizmin Geleceği. İstanbul: Altan Matbaacılık. 1996, s. 134.
64. TUSIAD (2002), “Yeni rekabet Stratejileri ve türk Sanayisi”, Temmuz 2002, Yayın No:TUSIAD-T 2002-07/322, İstanbul.
65. Waltz, Kenneth N. (1993). “The Emerging Structure of International Politics”. International Security. Vol. 18, No. 21993, s. 50.
66. Wolferen Karel Van (1992), “Japon Gücünün Sırrı”, Çeviren: İnci Kurmuş, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları”, Genel Yayın No: 308, Ankara.
67. Yeldan Erinç (2001), “Küreselleşme Sürecinde Türkiye Ekonomisi”, İletişim yayınları: 710, İstanbul.
68. Yıldızoğlu, Ergin (2004), “Jeopolitiğin Geri Dönüşü”, Stratejik Analiz, Aylık Uluslar arası ilişkiler Dergisi”, Mart 2004, C. 4, Sayı: 47, Ankara.
69. Yeniçeri, Özcan, “Jeopolitik ve Jeostratejik Konumunun Türkiye’ye Yönelttiği Tehditler”, <http://www.geocities.com/ibrahimkiras/cinrus.html>,09/12/2005.