

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
FALK AUDITORIUM

THE ROLLER COASTER OF
TURKEY-RUSSIA RELATIONS

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, September 19, 2017

PARTICIPANTS:

TORREY TAUSSIG, Moderator
Post-Doctoral Fellow
The Brookings Institution

EVREN BALTA
Fulbright Visiting Scholar
New York University

PAVEL K. BAEV
Nonresident Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution
Research Professor, Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO)

NAZ DURAKOĞLU
Senior Policy Advisor to Senator Jeanne Shaheen, U.S. Senate
Former Senior Advisor, U.S Department of State

KEMAL KIRIŞCI
TÜSIAD Senior Fellow and Director, Turkey Project
The Brookings Institution

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. TAUSSIG: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to the Brookings Institution. Thank you for joining us for what will be an interesting conversation on Turkish-Russian relations hosted by the Center on the U.S. and Europe.

My name is Torrey Taussig. I am a post-doctoral fellow here at Brookings, and I have the pleasure of moderating a discussion between our distinguished panelists that will focus first and foremost on an insightful and interesting paper written by Brookings scholars Pavel Baev and Kemal Kirişci titled "An ambiguous partnership: The serpentine trajectory of Turkish-Russian relations in the era of Erdoğan and Putin." It's an incredibly informative paper. I learned a great deal from it. I think it helps us to better understand the contours of this relationship and the implications for the EU, the U.S. and NATO, and I hope you have a chance to read it as well. It's my understanding that copies are being distributed in the back.

Before we hear from our authors and discussants, I wanted to take a moment to thank the Jensen Foundation for their generous support in making this event and this report possible.

And I would also like to take a few moments to introduce our panelists. You have copies of their full bios in your handouts, so I will just say a few words about each of them.

First, we have Kemal Kirişci, who is the TÜSIAD senior fellow and the director of the Center on U.S. and Europe's Turkey Project. A true academic at heart, we can say Kemal came to Brookings after serving as a professor at Bosphorus University in Istanbul, and Kemal has a forthcoming book titled "Turkey and the West: Faultlines in a Troubled Alliance," which will be published by Brookings Institution Press, I believe, in the coming months.

Next we have Pavel Baev. Pavel is a nonresident fellow in the Center on U.S. and Europe here at Brookings as well. Pavel is also a research professor at the Peace Research Institute in Oslo, where since 1992, in the early days of the post-Cold War era, he built a longstanding career focusing on Russian military, foreign, and security policies, as well as Russia's relations with Europe and NATO. So those are our two co-authors.

We also have two expert discussants today. First, Evren Balta, who joins us from New

York University, where she is a Fulbright visiting scholar. Evren is also a prolific writer on Turkish foreign policy and on Turkish-Russian relations in particular. And Evren's current research focuses on the sources of conflict and cooperation in the Russian-Turkish relationship following the end of the Cold War.

And last but not least, I would like to welcome Naz Durakoğlu. Naz is a senior policy advisor to Senator Jeanne Shaheen in the U.S. Senate, and Naz recently left the State Department where she was a senior advisor to the assistant secretary for Europe and Eurasian Affairs in the Obama administration, and in this capacity, Naz helped to shape U.S. policy on a wide range of European issues, including U.S. policy on Russia, Turkey, and NATO.

So we clearly have a lot of expertise and experience on this subject. It is also incredibly timely for us to be hearing from these panelists today given a series of international events and trends. First and foremost, I believe that Erdoğan is speaking at the U.N. as we speak, so this could not have been timed more perfectly. We also have --

SPEAKER: He won't be listening to us so we're safe. Sorry, Torrey.

MS. TAUSSIG: We also had just last week Turkey announced its decision to purchase S-400 air defense missile systems from Russia. It's a move that was strongly criticized by NATO and by the U.S. but endorsed by Erdoğan as a step that strengthens Turkey's national security interests. There was also the recent news that Turkey, Russia, and Iran might seek deeper cooperate on the war in Syria as the three have agreed to jointly implement de-escalation zones in the country. And, of course, these recent events take place in deeply fraught relations between Russia and the West and increasingly tense relations between Turkey and the West, especially since a failed coup attempt in Turkey in July of 2016 and Erdoğan's subsequent domestic actions that have moved Turkey in a more authoritarian direction. And there is still the relatively new Trump administration, which brings its own set of dynamics to U.S.-Turkey relations, U.S.-Russia relations, and new directives on Middle East priorities.

So with this brief introduction, I would like to just give a quick run of the show. We'll first hear from Kemal and Pavel for their remarks on the paper as coauthors. We'll then hear from Naz and Evren for their perspectives on the paper and for the broader issues at hand. Then I have a few questions to fire at the panelists, and then we will open it up to discussion with you in the audience.

So with that, why don't we turn to our coauthors first, Kemal and Pavel. Kemal, we'll start with you. To make this a little different, I would like to ask you both what you found most striking or surprising in the contributions made by your coauthor. So Kemal, from your perspective, what did you learn about Russia's role in this relationship from the contributions of Pavel? And then Pavel, we'll hear from you. Go ahead.

MR. KIRIŞCI: Thank you, Torrey. Thank you for the introductions and thanks for coming by.

Russia to me is a fascinating country because I'm a product of the Cold War. And as I was a student at Bosphorus University, the old Robert College there on the Bosphorus, a few miles to our north was the Black Sea and the world for us in the '70s ended at the Black Sea shores. We just didn't have the courage to look beyond it, and occasionally, weekends the campus was isolated from Istanbul. We would tune into Radio Moscow broadcasting in Turkish. We would kind of shiver feeling that a big hand would come crushing on us for listening to Soviet broadcast.

The reason why I'm saying this is that the world has changed dramatically, and part and parcel of that dramatic change with the end of the Cold War was the way in which Russian-Turkish relations evolved. And through the last 10 years until a couple of years ago, the relationship evolved in a manner I thought was going to be very linear. You know, they're going to get closer to each other and be very economy functionalist focused. The beauty about working with Pavel on this particular paper was how research leads you away from presumptions, from what you think are established truths. And the deeper you go into it, the more evident it becomes how weak your assumptions are and how the future of the relationship is not particularly given. And working with someone, especially like Pavel, we belong to the same generation, also with a background in the Soviet Union.

A couple of discoveries for me were striking that may not be that evident for you. One example -- I'd like to cite three examples and they're all in one way or another related, especially the first two. When Turkey shot down the Russian fighter plane and then the reactions came from Russia, the one that stuck with me was Vladimir Putin's word, "stab in the back." That was it. That remained like the writing on the wall. However, working with Pavel, I came to discover that there was more to the sentence,

and the part of the sentence that I missed out was “stab in the back by accomplices of terrorists.” And behind that lied clearly references to radical extremist Islamist groups in Syria with which the Turkish government had become in the eyes of public opinion in the West and in the international community closely associated for a variety of reasons.

But those remarks also came within literally weeks of an invitation that Putin had extended to Erdoğan of an opening of a mosque that had just been restored in Moscow in September 2015. So that journey within two months from an invitation to open a mosque and then be accused of terrorism was very striking to me and it made me realize how uncomfortable Putin is with political Islam.

The second point that came a bit like a discovery for me and is very much related with the first one is the way in which one of the factors that are driving this relationship that we highlight in the report, too, is anti-westernism, very evident in the case of Putin, but also in the case of the Turkish president. And you’re aware of the details of it almost on a daily basis. I wonder what he’s actually saying right now at the General Assembly.

However, there’s a big difference. The discovery was, I had been picking these bits and pieces, was how Putin and his elite sees Russia and themselves as part of a European civilization and that they kind of represent an alternative Europe, what they call “true Europe,” a conservative Europe, a non-postmodern Europe. I will let you figure out the details of what that is. Whereas, you have a country that had a long European vocation stretching maybe way back into the Ottoman times until about the Arab Spring. With the Arab Spring, you begin to see a discourse coming out of Turkey, particularly led by the former minister of foreign affairs, as well as Prime Minister of Erdoğan, Ahmet Davutoğlu who is injecting increasingly a new vocation for Turkey, rather than Europe, rather than European civilization, the notion of becoming part of the Islamic civilization and leading it. And that’s the context in which Turkey approached the Arab Spring while for Putin the Arab Spring was about color revolutions and about regime change. That was striking to discover.

Finally, the last, the third point, which is very pertinent to the state in which Turkey finds itself these days is the way in which through Pavel, but also through a former Kyrgyz intern that had worked here, I came to discover how the Russian state works for Putin, hand in glove. This is critical.

Whereas, when we look at Turkey, the Turkish state apparatus is in the state that I'm sure you're aware of it, the Turkish military has been deeply damaged by the purges and the coup attempt that has occurred in 2016, but its origins also go back to two judicial cases known as "Ergenekon and Sledgehammer," of which -- of which it was the Turkish navy that emerged most weakened. To the extent that while until the early 2000s references were being made to the Black Sea as a Turkish Sea, in the meantime, the situation has changed dramatically.

These are, Torrey, the three discoveries for me. They, I'm sure, are not for Evren, an old hand in Russian studies, but these three discoveries also helped me better capture, appreciate the current volatility and uncertainty in the relationship between the two sides.

MS. TAUSSIG: Excellent. Thank you.

So Pavel, same question to you. What did you find most surprising or learn most from your Turkish colleague and Turkey's role in this relationship that may have been surprising or that you didn't know before?

MR. BAEV: Yes, thank you.

I've been associated with Brookings for several years. It's the first time I'm really coauthoring a work under the Brookings logo and it was a very interesting experience. A learning experience in many ways, and we're certainly shooting at a very moving target. At first quite desperately because expecting what happens, what might possibly be the situation when the report is ready, where it's all going was very muddled. And I think by the end we were generally able to more or less establish the next political zig and the follow up political zag. So I think the report might have a bit more life than the Erdoğan speech today. I don't think it will destroy all conclusions.

What about learning? I think one thing I had to learn from the very start is that examining this topic, this partnership, it is generally far more important, relevant, and interesting to focus on the Turkish side, which was generally against my best interests. I am a Russian expert. But it is -- focusing on Turkey where you can see it is possible to make a difference, to influence, to make an impact, because to all intents and purposes, particularly it remains in the life of the United States, for Europe, and with allies. Yes, with all the difficulties, structural and personal, you still continue to work. You need to

work on this partnership no matter what. You have no other choice and that's where every bit of analysis, every bit of research makes a difference.

Russia, on the other hand, yes, certainly very complex. A topic with a lot of heavy agenda, but it is clear in principle what Russia is. It is an adversary. And it's not any more a matter of expert opinion. It is established by law so to say, which again happened before we completed our report, but again, with adversaries, it's a different kind of attitude. There's not that much you can really do to influence this and that. It is much more about containing and seeing that the damage, which this adversary is able to do to Western interests through that particular channel of partnership for Turkey is limited. So that is why collectively we have focused much more on the Turkish side, which I had to learn a lot of things about it. That is why it is, as you see, Turkish-Russian relations and not the other way around as the alphabetic order would prescribe.

Second thing I had to learn, yes, I would probably come with the same point as Kemal. It's about the difference between two states. My initial assumption is that both are very statist states, so to say. The state bureaucracy and the traditional state is very strong, strong in both, and that's kind of the fundamental in their cooperation.

I would probably not quite agree with Kemal that the Russian state works for Putin like a hand in glove. There are too many competing interests there. There is more than two hands, the left and right hand, always in every situation and none of them with particular agreement with one another. But all in all, it is -- and it is obviously a state in decline. I argued that point many times. And the main source of decline is poor leadership. Nevertheless, it is a very functional state. In particular, for Putin, what works in that state is various special and security services. The role of that institution is huge, and coming to Turkey you suddenly discover that what works in that state is not at all loyal to Erdoğan. It is not at all what is functional and effective and modern is not really quite what Erdoğan can rely on. So it is, what was for me a strange experience that in every situation Russia is able to mobilize much more quickly, much more convincingly, to move faster with many state institutions than Turkey is able to. I somehow never expected that the damage done to the Turkish state, before the coup, and particularly after, would go that deep. It is really now a state in crisis, not probably quite in the category of failed state but

generally not entirely far from that description.

And the third point, kind of gradually working on the topic I was coming to a realization how little the complexity of Turkish politics is understood in Moscow. You know, with that long history of interaction, with that kind of strong background, you would expect that there will be a lot of expertise and fundamental understanding of what is happening, where Turkey is going, but it is like there are several different Turkeys coexisting in the Russian mind. There is this Turkey that is a NATO member state and security problems related to that. There is another Turkey of a traditional geopolitical rival and also the suspicions relate to that notion. There is a Turkey as an economic partner with a lot of work done through the '90s and 2000s, and some of that still is going on, and there are kind of material interests involved in that which has no relation with those two Turkish (inaudible). There is a tourist Turkey where Russians now love to come and we're very upset when the incident interrupted their tourist plans, but now they're all back, no matter what everything is forgotten. And there is a Turkey of Erdoğan, a Turkey of political Islam, which exists particularly in its own very special corner to which others are not really relevant. It's as if these Turkeys exist in different geographic locations and not in one Russian neighborhood just to the south of newly acquired Crimea.

So with that level of misunderstanding of Turkey, that level of ignorance I would even say in Moscow about what is really going on, and not just in public opinion but in many political circles in the highest echelons of power, and for that matter, in Putin's mind at all, if he thinks he understands what is going on in Turkey, he was mistaken more than once in recent years and probably will be mistaken again.

MS. TAUSSIG: Thank you.

So clearly there are a number of contradictions and asymmetries in this relationship that make understanding their trajectory as a partner to one another even more complicated. So to better understand this, I would like to turn now to our discussants.

First, Evren, from your perspective as a Turkish academic first and foremost, what did you draw from the paper? What would you say your primary insights were and implications for the U.S. and the EU in looking at this potentially budding partnership or complex partnership moving forward?

MS. BALTA: Well, this was a really great paper. Let me just start by complimenting the

authors because it's just so exhaustive in the literature, the references that it uses, and the period that it covers. I mean, it covers like two -- the last two centuries starting from the Ottomans and looking at the Republican period. So trying to let us know the patterns of conflict and cooperation, not in the contemporary Russian-Turkish relations but also giving us a historical perspective. So I really very much liked the report and learned a lot from the facts that it cites and also the literature that it cites. I mean, there were many books and articles, and the pieces that I never came across even though I have been working on the Russian-Turkish relations in the last couple of years, in the last decade let me say. So it was really a privilege to be discussing this report right here at Brookings today.

As I was reading the report I was really, once again, I guess, puzzled with the fact that this (inaudible) ability to survive major -- recent major crises, and the cooperation that they have developed despite the multiplicity and the depth of the clashing policy areas. I mean, there were many examples of these clashing policy areas in the report, but let me give some of the examples from the report.

First, one of the national security priorities of Turkey is its energy security and diversifying its energy resources, and as the report shows, Turkey is currently importing 50-55 percent of its gas needs from Russian. Also, signed the TurkStream Pipeline very recently to turn Turkey into a transit route for Russian gas. And making things more complicated as the report cites, Turkey now more -- and making Turkey more dependent on Russia, the Turkish government has also awarded the contract for construction of Turkey's first nuclear power plant, Akkuyu, to Russia.

Another national second, I mean, which was another national security priority for Turkey, and for centuries I would say, is the military -- is to keep the military balance in the Black Sea region as our two authors were mentioning in their opening remarks vis-à-vis Turkey. Starting with the 2008 Georgian conflict, and especially since the annexation of Crimea, Russia has drastically, dramatically expanded its Black Sea fleet, and in the last two years it also has built a formidable A2/ AD sphere in the Black Sea as well. So the military balance that used to be there is not there anymore.

Third, Russia also strengthened its position alongside its position in the Black Sea in the Mediterranean as well and is actively taking an anti-Turkey position in Cyprus negotiations, which is a

core foreign policy concern for Turkey over a half century.

Fourth, in Syria, Turkey and Russia have clearly competing interests as well and that's what the report cites. They have been in different camps, supporting different political agendas right from the beginning of the conflict, and the report suggests that Turkey has increasingly accepted Russia's agenda in Syria, rather than vice versa.

So you have all this. And what else? I mean, they also cite that Russian and Turkish world leaders differ significantly and this difference, it really manifests itself in terms of counterterrorism, and this is one of the aspects that Professor Kirişci just cited in the beginning of the panel and the Putin government believes political Islam is a major international and domestic security threat, like the stab in the back code shows us. And it means to openly express the view that there is nothing such as moderate Islam, which is very different from the Western version of Islam and so on and so forth. So for as much, you see a more radical counterterrorist agenda in the Russian case when you compare it with the West.

And you also have the S-400s. As you see, the problem with the S-400s, just last Tuesday, Turkey had signed a deal to purchase Russian surface-to-air missile systems, if I say it correctly. I'm not really used to military terms. It has the potential of jeopardizing the Turkish-Western military alliance. It's a very important move so you have that and Turkey did it despite that it's going to jeopardize its relation with the West. And finally, as the report shows, this is all happening in a context of Turkey's longstanding and robust military and economic, but mostly economic ties with the EU and North America, which again, the report shows with figures and this and that, that (inaudible) with Russia.

So what is happening? Why? And I think the question that the report asks, and kind of trying to, I mean, it tries to answer why this happens. What is the pattern of conflict and cooperation here? Given though there are a lot of asymmetries in this relationship, what is happening? I think there are just three answers that the report provides to us to solve this puzzle, to solve these questions.

One of them is just Professor Kirişci mentioned, again, which is the growing anti-Westernism in both countries. It's real and it's there. So how to counter that growing anti-Westernism is very important for any kind of policy recommendation. Political leaders in both countries believe that their fates are converging, vis-à-vis the West. They are mistrustful of Western intentions. They perceive that,

for example, this is more in Russia and in Turkey, especially in Turkey after the coup attempt and in Russia after 2012, the protest cycle in Moscow. So you have the leaders believing that the West is using democracy promotion as a cover to advance its strategic interests. And in Turkey, political leaders believe that the objective of the West is not just regime change but it's also territorial change. And this is, I'm referring to the Kurdish issue as well. So you have that perception. It's a real -- it's a threat. It's a real threat. I mean, I'm not saying that it's real but the way that these leaders perceive it is there so you have to counter that.

Second, the report also suggest that -- and I think this is one of the most important contributions of the report, and the original parts of the report, which I don't see that much in the literature on Russian-Turkish relations, or in Turkish foreign policy literature -- it shows us how domestic and international trends are driving both countries towards increasing with similar regime tariffs. So what I'm here saying is that maybe the report suggests it's just not very subtle -- in a very subtle way, of course, maybe it's not the rationally calculated national interests but maybe they are talking about the interests of specific political coalitions, and a lot of conflict going on within these countries. So we really have to be careful about these coalitions rather than saying that it's just Russia versus Turkey or Russia collaborated, cooperated with Turkey, this and that. Whose interests does it serve, this military agreement, for example, or this gas trade? Which economic blocks and what kind of trade interests? What is their relationship with the political coalitions and governments? So any kind of sanctions should really address that, not the whole country. Maybe a policy recommendation coming from that can be done.

So the third point, I guess, and I'll finish by saying that I know probably I'm over. No? Is that fine? Okay.

The third point that really is very important in the report is that Turkey and Russia are drawing closer not because of Russia but because of Turkey's chief vulnerability is the Kurdish problem. Right? Which is Turkey's number one security issue. And the Kurdish issue and the way it evolved in Syria has become a major fault line and we have to understand this as well between the West in general, the U.S., specifically, and Turkey. And that's what draws Turkey closer to Russia. Even though authors

acknowledge the fact that the Kurdish issue has a potential source of conflict between Turkey and Russia, because they have different agenda, agendas that do not overlap, but periodically, I mean, just right now, Russia gives more than the West in terms of solving the Kurdish problem to the Turkish nationalist elite you could say. And that only through reconciliation with Russia, Turkey -- I mean, that has enabled Turkey to advance -- to prevent YPG to advance further and this is one of the things that is cited in the report.

And I think there are three elements -- in terms of policy recommendations, those three elements should be taken separately. And also together. Because we need to say something about how -- what is the Western policy over the Kurdish issue? How to respond to that? And also, how to include increasingly totalitarian regimes in the international system, how to separate domestic from international. What would be the key institutions there? So there is another policy recommendation that we have to focus on.

And finally, how the West is going to counter growing anti-Westernism, not just in Russia and Turkey but mostly in the periphery. I mean, in India and elsewhere. So how we live together, actually, is the question that we should be asking. Thanks.

MS. TAUSSIG: Okay. Thank you very much.

I think the illustration of the S-400 missile defense purchase in particular illustrates this balance that Turkey has tried to reach between creating an independent national security direction while at the same time balancing its energy and economic interests and trade interests that are tied to the West and in Europe. And whether that balance is being achieved is a different question.

So turning it over to Naz. Naz, you clearly addressed these issues from a different perspective, from the U.S. perspective, first and foremost, looking at these issues inside and outside of government. Just to start with, I wanted to get your perspectives on the paper and what you found to be kind of the driving insights.

MS. DURAKOĞLU: Sure. Whatever Evren said.

But just a little bit more detailed on that, I have to agree entirely. This is a great paper. The way that Kemal and Pavel were able to summarize this vast relationship in a rather short paper is

incredible.

I think what stuck with me in terms of the bullet points that the paper hits on, it did a really good job at overlaying the differences and similarities between Turkey and Russia, and ultimately, what it does for the audience, it presents -- it puts you in the shoes of Turkish policymakers almost, looking at their various options on the international scene. And what you come out really understanding after reading the paper is when Turkey looks at Europe, there's a very strong economic link there. The strongest link. When Turkey looks at the United States and vice versa, there's obviously a very strong security link there. When it looks at Russia, it's a little bit harder to determine what that concrete link is, but as you read through the paper you discover the link is actually not concrete at all. What it is, it's a personality-driven relationship as well as what each of the presenters hit on today, it's also an anti-Western sentiment that's drawing these two together. So while the paper presents short-term goals and objectives and recommendations, I think it also has a lot to say for the long term of this relationship because clearly you can't built something on something that's not a solid foundation and personalities and emotions are not a strong foundation. And that's what, even though the paper actually says it in a much more articulate way that is ultimately, I think, what the paper is driving at. And this begs the question actually, particularly for policymakers in Europe and in the United States, if there is such a strong link again between Europe and Turkey, you see that economic link and you U.S. and Turkey, it's the military security issue, then what does that mean for them? What are the carrots and the sticks in terms of how you can shape this relationship? And I think it's difficult because what I came out feeling once I read the paper is Turkey really is taking a few risks, with not just this partnership with Russia but just generally its new trajectories. I what I think Turkish policymakers might be missing is that they're really investing a lot in American and European tolerance of their behaviors because if the spigot at any point is turned off in each direction, it leaves Turkey only with one option and it's the option that's not the one that's firmly grounded. So I think that's why this paper was incredibly reflective and I really appreciated the fact that it's there because quite frankly there isn't that much on Turkey and Russia. So congratulations.

MS. TAUSSIG: Thank you.

Actually, picking up on your last point about what carrots does the West have to shape

this relationship between Turkey and Russia, Kemal, I wanted to ask you a follow-up question on this point. Evren mentioned that we need to keep distinct the boundaries between domestic and international but given that Erdoğan over the last year has moved Turkey in a relatively authoritarian direction and it is at the same time institutionally based in the West one could say, do you see a role for Western institutions to play in challenging these authoritarian steps that Erdoğan has taken? And should we be looking to the European Union or NATO to take these steps, or to Germany, which has come out more firmly against some of the steps that Erdoğan has taken? How do you see the potential carrots as Naz has mentioned, if there are any?

MR. KIRIŞCI: Very good. Very tough questions. But I'd like to start by thanking Naz, as well as Evren. I don't know how Pavel feels about it but I did not realize that we were able to put together a paper that provoked the kind of thoughts and observations that you've done. In many ways I think this is the beauty of this exercise in itself, academic exercise, as well as policy-oriented discussion. I'd like to thank Evren especially, as well as Naz on that. And I'll try to reflect on the questions that Torrey has raised.

I think the answer to your question, Torrey, a simple answer is that Turkey's relationship with the West is increasingly resembling the one with Russia. That there's a lot of uncertainty in it, a confusion and ambiguity even though there are very established, deep trends in this relationship. Naz has pointed out the case of EU as being an economic one, but I would expand it a bit further and bring in the social dimension of it. The cultural dimension. It may not sound evident but also demographic relationship between the two sides in terms of flow of people in both directions.

And I would also argue, Naz, what was very fascinating for me when we began to dig deep into the U.S. leg of Turkey's relationship with the West is that Turkey's economic relationship with the U.S. is stronger than with Russia. Turkey's exports to the United States are almost double that of to Russia and Russia is right next door. And the Turkish exports to Russia are basically agricultural products. To the United States they are manufactured goods. They are not high-tech goods.

The other day it struck me in the context of this paper that I saw one of those very classic, to me, American-looking buses and at the tail end it says TEMSA. And TEMSA is a very familiar

brand to us. It's Sabanci Holding that is producing buses that mostly get exported to Europe. I was shocked to see them here on the roads of the United States. Are there any TEMSA buses -- roads? I doubt it. And the original title of this paper was going to be, on Pavel's suggestion, "Slipping on Tomatoes" because Turkey's failure to export its tomatoes to Russia for the very reason that Evren cited; there are domestic coalitions in Russia that are not looking favorably upon Turkish imports. I mean, importing tomatoes from Russia while interests are encouraging this energy relationship and relationship in other areas.

Why am I underlining this? I am underlining it because it seems to me that again, the writing on the wall for Turkey is very evident in the economic, institutional, and security sense of the word. But it's not going in that direction. It's not going in that direction. It has a lot to do with the domestic changes that have taken place in Turkey, but I think there is also a lot to be said about what Evren has underlined; that there are insecurities in Turkey, one of them being the Kurdish question. What puzzles me as we look forward into that fog and into that uncertainty, it was the U.S. Clinton administration's engagement of Turkey in the 1990s, together with the European Union's engagement that opened the way for reforms in Turkey that improved dramatically the cultural rights of Kurds. And having gone through that period a good 10-15 -- I could go into the details of it, the kinds of levers that the U.S. administration, together with the EU -- I'm getting over excited -- pulled to bring Turkey there.

Just to give you a concrete example, in the mid-'90s, the American Congress was preventing the exportation of Cobra helicopters to the Turkish military, and the Turkish military was getting very nervous and vulnerable in its fight against the PKK. This was also a time when foul language was being exchanged between Turkish MPs and the Germans on the other side over the German decision not to sell Panzer tanks to Turkey. So relations were a little bit where it is these days when you look at these issues. But the Clinton administration adopted a policy that culminated in the delivery of the leader of the PKK in 1999. But that came as a package, and part of that package eventually led to reforms and to Turkey becoming a candidate for membership to the European Union, and you know the rest of the details there.

The reason why I'm bringing this is that I think we have entered a period in world politics

at large where we have drifted away from where the West was in the 1990s. A West in which the United States and the European Union was engaged in policies to strengthen the international liberal order and Turkey was very pivotal to that exercise. Today, we have an administration here in Washington, D.C. that raises big question marks about the United States' commitment to promoting human rights and to standing up for the international liberal order as we have known it since 1945. And when you are creating that ambiguity and when you're creating that uncertainty, I think it's somewhat not surprising that you see countries that otherwise were part and parcel of this alliance beginning to drift away. This is not particular to Turkey. Look at Poland, look at Hungary, to mention EU member states and NATO member states.

So I don't want to hijack this exercise, but I'd like to come back to again an aspect of Evren's presentation in which I detected the need to look in the mirror. The need to take stock of what happened in the last two, three decades in Turkey's relations with the West, meaning the EU, as well as the United States taking stock and trying to extract lessons for that moving forward.

MS. TAUSSIG: Actually, picking up directly from this point, Naz, again, you focused on these issues in and out of government, and following up on Kemal's remarks about how the U.S. has approached Turkey and the Kurdish questions and how perhaps we might be seeing a drift of some of these nations that were in orbit, so to speak, moving into developing more independent foreign policies for themselves, how have you seen the U.S. approach toward Turkey shift over time? And how does this approach differ to Russia's relations to Turkey?

MS. DURAKOĞLU: Thank you for the question.

MS. TAUSSIG: And you can take that in many different ways because I know that's a broad question.

MS. DURAKOĞLU: Yeah. No, I mean, first off, I'd like to say, so I tried to -- initially in my remarks I tried to make it as black and white as possible in terms of the economy's security and the personality-driven links, but there is definitely another dimension here. And I think that's one aspect that the U.S. could probably do more in looking at, particularly when it comes to Turkey, because that's -- and this gets to your question, Torrey. That's where you can see a distinct difference between U.S. policies toward Russia in the post-Soviet space and U.S. policies towards Turkey. And that's people-to-people

links.

I think from the Turkish side, you actually see a lot of proactive movement, whether it be from business or education. In fact, I think when I left State, the top foreign nation sending their students to the U.S. was Turkey at the time. I don't know if it's still there.

It's still there? Yeah. And so you have that. You have the need there. You have the door that's been opened on the Turkish side, but I believe there isn't enough investment in people-to-people links, particularly civil society in Turkey, whereas, in the '90s and in the '80s, the U.S. invested a lot in the post-Soviet space to develop those links and to develop those relationships. And some might even say, maybe not so much for Russia, but particularly Poland and the Baltic states, a lot of that vibrant civil society came from those types of investments. And this is -- it's a difficult question because I think countries like Russia, and Russia has outright said this, and to an extent, Turkey as well, even though I don't think they're in that extreme of a boat as Russia just yet when it comes to civil society, but you do have them looking at that as a threat, and that comes from just the dynamic of the authoritarian government, the authoritarian governments that are currently in place in both countries.

So in terms of what the U.S. could be doing more of, it's definitely investing in Turkish civil society, looking at those that are outside of the political, I guess, elite in today's world, or even the loyalists in today's world, and engaging a lot more. And that's not to say that that's not happening, but it's not happening to a level that's necessary. I would say that Europe is trying to develop those links, but of course, there is the obvious issue of an extreme crackdown post-coup, and this is definitely deteriorating any even hope for building that type of relationship.

So when it comes to these levers, or I guess the sticks that the U.S. could use, and I do think the security issue is one in terms of how closely we want to link each other up, because, of course, it is important that the U.S. has Turkey within NATO. It's the second largest military within NATO. These are very important things. It's an integral partner. However, the U.S. is also integral. So it's a mutual relationship here, and Turkey needs to recognize that, too. If you push a little too hard you might lose your partner. And I think these are all areas that the U.S. has to look at with a fresh lens because someone absolutely needs to stand up to do a little bit more about what's going on domestically and it's

not fair to say that we can engage internationally on Turkey for XYZ reason but we don't address domestic issues because they're one in the same. They're linked. And that is a difference because in Russia we actually do very much comment on the domestic situation and we do engage there and there is a strong difference there in the policy.

MS. TAUSSIG: So Pavel, following up on this authoritarian angle that we are on right now, and then moving back to the relationship between Turkey and Russia, you could describe both Erdoğan and Putin as personalist issues of sort, kind of authoritarian strong men who have consolidated power within either themselves or in a small group of individuals. And you discuss in the paper that their personal relationship is fundamentally important to the trajectory of this partnership moving forward. And I was struck by that, and I was wondering if you could elaborate more on the personal dynamics between the two leaders and why these dynamics are so important to the success of this relationship.

MR. BAEV: All right. Let me start with a word of gratitude to our commentators, Evren and Naz. I really expected you would tear apart the report because we are unable fundamentally to sort out all the contradictions and to present one single coherent picture with clear recommendations as a political report should do. We are saying the picture is modeled and contradictory and there is more model ahead and that is our main prediction and who needs that?

MS. TAUSSIG: They won't tear it apart in public but there is a dinner afterwards.

MR. BAEV: And if I can have a word on tomatoes, it's indeed striking that for Russia and Turkey it turned out to be far easier to agree on the deal about missiles than to lift the ban on tomatoes. It took three years for Russia to negotiate a deal on these missiles with China; it took just three months with Turkey. In fact, for Russia, it's not in any way a profitable deal because Russia is providing Turkey a very substantial credit for that. And it is probably time to say to Turkey beware of the Russians bearing gifts. It's exactly that case because for Russia it wasn't definitely the idea of building up Turkish air defense; it was much more about deepening the tensions in Turkish relations with NATO. That was Russia's main aim what it continues to be and everything possible to exploit those tensions Russia is doing.

And in this regard, we are glad that some of our recommendations are already being followed. Jens Stoltenberg, NATO Secretary General, had a good meeting with Erdoğan a couple days

ago in New York, and that relations are difficult but it is working because yes, it is a difficult partner but the task of socializing Turkish military back into the NATO networks, which was very successfully done for decades and then every severely interrupted with the coup, it is there as important as ties with civil society. I have no denial of that. But I think focusing on rebuilding the relations in NATO with the Turkish military is one of the very significant challenges.

Now to your question about personalities, and in this particular case, yes, you will see how these relations, not just very recently but over the course of the modern decade were very intensely personalized and narrowed down with the dialogue between the two leaders because you start looking at what are the constituencies? What are the interests in this relationship? And you find that in Erdoğan's poor base, if I may speculate on that, there is very little interest in developing relations with Russia, and in Putin's kind of many narrow circles, Turkey is also hardly a priority issue at all. There are also other interests there but not in that one. So it was really very much the highest level dialogue which we're kind of pushing every step in that direction. My feeling is that in that crisis we had in November 2015, what was chemistry, what had been the chemistry in that relation was destroyed beyond repair because the crisis was not only very loud and emotional, it was also very personal. And Putin really went not against some Erdoğan personal character traits only but really making the point that whatever this nasty character is, the main problem is Turkish commitment to political Islam. And that essentially means supporting terrorism and extremism. That is a problem. And that was one of those rare cases where Putin is saying something resembling truth.

So I think, yes, they are trying to repair and rebuild and pretend that nothing happened, but pretenses take you only that far. I think the chemistry is very severely damaged and I think Erdoğan, the political animal that he is, obviously understands that Putin's interests are not really benevolent and charitable. He has his own very particular agenda which doesn't at all coincide with Erdoğan's agenda. It is not even -- we cannot say a partnership of convenience; it's more kind of cabal of convenience if we can find a label with that. But it cannot really go very far and run very deep. It is important to counter it. It is important to engage Erdoğan, and I hope the meeting with President Trump, which will happen tomorrow, will be another step forward after the meeting with Jens Stoltenberg, and probably President

Macron can play his own role trying to go as a kind of go-between because Erdoğan's conflict with Merkel appears to be very emotional and very strong. But in this particular regard, Germany is obviously not able to deliver any leadership which many in Europe start to expect now from that state. In many of the Middle Eastern problems, Germany is not really a significant presence, and in handling the relations with Turkey, I think again we need to find other voices and other possibilities to engage a very tricky character.

MS. TAUSSIG: Thank you.

And final question for you, Pavel and Evren, for you to follow up on and then we'll open it to the audience for your questions, we've discussed Turkey a lot on this panel, and just to keep the focus on Russia and Putin's interests for a moment, one aspect of the paper that I found very interesting which I wanted to push you on was Russia's counterterrorism strategy and national security interests in the region. And you make the case throughout the paper that another area of profoundly diverging views for these two countries is on counterterrorism, and for Erdoğan, it is a domestic, major domestic issues, and for Putin, it's a trademark theme that he has exploited since his first days in office. And you also make the case that Putin has somewhat manipulated the conflict in Syria to boost his own counterterrorism credentials.

So does that mean that Russia doesn't necessarily have a strong, a non-instrumental visceral national security interest in Syria, and how would you look at Russia's national security interests in the region more broadly given that they have reinserted themselves in the region more forcefully for the first time that we've seen in decades? So you mentioned a short answer, and the same for me as well.

MR. BAEV: Do you want to start?

MS. BALTA: It's directed against me as well?

MS. TAUSSIG: Sure.

MS. BALTA: Yeah, I mean, maybe a couple of words. I think it's, again, a real security trap for Russia because Russia has a significant Muslim population, and also in some of the areas, especially in the Caucasus and Central Asia you see a lot of Islamic radicalization and it's a domestic issue. I mean, I was suggesting that Kurdish issue is basically Turkey's chief vulnerability and if you consider Russia's chief vulnerability, it's the radical Islam and radicalization of Islam and this and that. So

I think it's not just a regional issue but also a domestic issue for Russia and how to counter that. And I think we have to consider the issue of Syria and what Russia is doing in Syria with that lens as well. I mean, we have to consider what Turkey is doing in Syria with the lens, with a domestic lens, like how Turkey perceives its domestic threats and its security environment and that's true for Russia as well, I guess.

MR. BAEV: Yes, I have to confess that in parallel with working on this report I was also working with another, specifically on the Russian counterterrorist policy for IFRI in Paris. It will be out in the next month so many --

MS. TAUSSIG: That's a good plug.

MR. BAEV: -- elaborations will be there. But it is indeed striking how different is the core meaning of counterterrorism for Russia and for Turkey. For Turkey, it is primarily the Kurdish issue. For Russia, it is primarily the issue of regime stability, preserving the regimes against counterrevolutions. So in this regard, in the Russian list of counterterrorist organization, PKK is not there. The Muslim Brotherhood is because they are seen as a threat to regime stability as one of the actors who I really hold in all this revolutions of whatever color.

I think an important proposition in Putin's counterterrorism which he was doing from day one of his era was that Russia has won its war on terror. They've had a very difficult situation in the North Caucasus lasting for many years and there is a victory and this is something which is very different from what (inaudible) is experiencing now in which no victory, no victories in sight. So Russia knows how to do that and it doesn't really need to worry about much from the domestic aspects.

And there is a lot of denial in this triumphalism because it's not really a victory because many of the root causes of terrorism are still there and the Russian readiness to open doors and kind of pave the way for potential rebels to go towards Iraq and Syria is a sign of that. And each time something happens now in Russia, the first response is a denial of sorts that this is a part of the same problem. In other words, a stabbing attack in Surgut and President Macron sends his condolences. And Russia still is unable to admit that, yes, a terrorist attack happened. Only in a couple of days when ISIS really put out a video, Russia then says yes. But it wasn't that bad.

So for Russia, presently, the main point in selling its counter-terrorist agenda is Syria. And very openly again and again, Russia leadership and Foreign Minister Lavrov comes with that message, it's time to put aside all our artificial disagreements such as sanctions and focus on the real important task as counterterrorism, while the real picture is exactly the opposite. The disagreements are profound indeed and the possibilities of cooperation in counterterrorism are really nonexistent. At this moment in time when the Russian planes struck on targets in Syria very close to U.S. troops, and in fact, on U.S. allies, the United States didn't shoot down the Russian plane. They did shoot down the Syrian plane some time ago, not the Russian plane. That's considered very good, very positive. That's probably the extent of this cooperation in counterterrorism.

MS. TAUSSIG: Thank you very much, Evren and Pavel.

So with that we will open it up to the audience. It is my understanding that there are microphones being passed around, so just wait for a microphone and introduce yourself briefly and please make sure that your comment ends in a question, and direct it to one of the panelists on the stage.

Sure. We'll start with the gentleman standing up. Please wait for a microphone to reach you.

SPEAKER: From the World Bank. I also worked in the Turkish government for several years.

I'm glad that Professor had some discoveries recently. Probably his list was a bit short. If I may, I will add to his list a few things.

One is Mr. Kissinger's book published last year, "World Order." In that book, he made some observations about Russia. He said, since the 18th, 17th centuries (inaudible) regime, Congress of Vienna, and so on, Russian policy has been expansionism. The reason is Russia is circled by many countries, more than any other country, probably. In case there is some problem with those neighbors, the best is to expand, to make them silent, not to create problems for Russia. It has, I think, some important implications. For example, the Ottoman Empire had more wars with Russia than any other country. The second is Iran.

MS. TAUSSIG: And sir, if you can just wrap these implications into a question just so we

can get to the rest of the audience. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Of course.

Now, another list I would add to his list, an observation, is a statement by our late (inaudible). He said making a partnership or alliance with a superpower is like sleeping next to elephant, an elephant. It has, I think, some ramification for some of the things you mentioned here. Russia, U.S., other countries. To strengthen that point I would like to add the statement from the U.K.'s statement (inaudible). He said nations have no friends. They have interests. Interests sometimes is (inaudible), sometimes terrorism, sometimes other things, probably. But among those countries we should add also Turkey. Turkey has also national interests.

MS. TAUSSIG: I'm going to cut you off in a few seconds.

SPEAKER: Turkey has also national interests. Currently they may have short memories, but our institutions' histories have long memories. They mention what happened in Russia during past centuries, how Russia was built by invading all the countries in the geography, including Crimea, Ukraine, and so on, is there any difference between current policies, actions of Russia compared to past years? That's a question that I think --

MS. TAUSSIG: So your question is are there any differences in current Russian policy in the region compared to more the Imperial and Soviet past?

SPEAKER: Yeah. Syria --

MS. TAUSSIG: And would you like to direct that question to Pavel?

SPEAKER: Syria, I think, is a complex situation. I don't want to talk about that because it's a mess. Nobody can make any meaningful statement, I believe, about Syria. Thank you very much. I don't know. Whoever could answer I will be glad.

MR. BAEV: We were really struggling with one another about how to cut the historical background short. We were both very eager to go into every detail in the Russia-Turkey relations because it was very rich relations, particularly recent wars, definitely. Nearly two and a half centuries of conflict leaves some heritage. It is also interesting how it was possible to leave that all generally behind, to open a new page in the relations, and to what degree that history comes now back in a different format.

I don't really think Russia at the moment is a revisionist expansionist power. I think it's still very much a power in decline. It's revisionism from weakness, which is a kind of rare historical phenomenon, and we do have overstretch already. I don't think we need to worry about Russia expanding any further. I do think we need to worry about the consequences about what has already happened. For that matter, from Syria, I think Russia not only can, but probably will step back fairly soon without much effort. That's a big difference from Turkey which cannot really step away from that neighborhood.

MR. KIRIŞCI: All maybe fascinating points you've raised. We'll talk about them. We could talk about them forever, but the notion of institutions have memories and the ones that individuals have is a short one I think is reflected very much in the S-400 missiles deal. These days, unfortunately in Turkey, there's very little free discussion and the media is dominated by a government line. However, through the grapevine and through personal contacts, we do hear how whatever is left of the Turkish state and institutions and the people who work in them are very uncomfortable with this S-400 deal for the very reasons you are citing there. So, thanks.

MS. TAUSSIG: Thank you very much.

Why don't we go over here to the gentleman in the gray shirt? Thank you.

MR. SANCHEZ: Alex Sanchez. I'm a defense analyst with a number of institutions.

Quick question. I read last month that Turkey was planning to apply today to the Croatian Customs Union and also was thinking of applying to the Eurasian Economic Union. Do you think this is going to happen, and if so, what will be the consequences? Thank you.

MR. KIRIŞCI: You know, I couldn't hear very well the --

MS. BALTA: Croatian Economic Union, whether Turkey wants to join and what would be the consequences.

MR. KIRIŞCI: Right now, going back to institutions and going back to experts and going back to business interests, including business interests that have traditionally voted for the governing party in Turkey, upgrading the Customs Union is the real issue, the one that these interest groups are pushing. The president's position is a more ambiguous one and a reference was made to his relationship with Angela Merkel and one of her reactions has been -- one of her reactions to the kind of language that

Erdoğan uses and the policies that he's followed towards Germany on a variety of issues has led her to advocate the idea the Commission, the European Commission should put a hold on those negotiations. However, the demand for those negotiations in Turkey, it's my personal humble judgment, is very high. In civil society, as well as in bureaucracy. When it comes to the European -- the Eurasian Union, it's very interesting that in the last year or so the president of Turkey has suddenly stopped his requests towards Putin that Turkey should become part of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and leave the European Union.

One of my discoveries actually that I didn't raise in the first round is the way in which Putin is not particularly very keen to respond positively or constructively to these demands for Turkey becoming a member of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. We can go into details if there's interest, but I doubt he would be very enthusiastic about Turkey becoming part of the Eurasian Customs Union either. It's not possible to be a member of two customs unions at the same time, but if Turkey was to become a member of the Eurasian Customs Union, I think Russian products would face serious competition in Kazakhstan, Kirgizstan, and he is already doing that in Armenia as well, even though Armenian and Turkey do not have direct relationships. So to cut a long story short, I don't see those avenues as realistic avenues, but do serve a domestic political agenda of the kind that Evren brought up earlier on.

MS. DURAKOĞLU: And Torrey, if I could actually add --

MS. TAUSSIG: Yeah, absolutely.

MS. DURAKOĞLU: And that's true that that debate has kind of been cut off with the Shanghai Cooperation, but in March, Presidents Putin and Erdoğan in one of their visits did announce a venture to do a joint investment fund together, so it's obviously not necessarily a trajectory or a direction but it's still an interesting deal to back both of them together and it would be one billion dollars. And I don't think it's gotten off the ground just yet, but it's something to definitely watch.

MS. TAUSSIG: Thank you.

Why don't we go to the very back, the gentleman there? Thank you.

SPEAKER: Thank you. I hoped to hear but I didn't hear, I probably missed it, as all of

you know, a significant part of jihadist fighting for ISIS and Jabhat Al-Nusra in Syria come from Russia or the former Soviet Union. They are all basically more or less known to FSB. However, FSB lets them leave easily. They go to Turkey, and Turkey easily lets them go across the border and go to fight against the enemy, the Assad regime. My question is, is there any chance for collusion between Russia and Turkey in order to get rid of those people and in order to support Turkish goals in Syria? Thank you.

MS. TAUSSIG: Okay. Why don't we take one more question before turning back to the panel just in the interest of time? So the gentleman in the orange shirt back there. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Thank you. (Inaudible)

I would like to ask about the dilemma that exists between Turkey and Russia. You mentioned in detail but I want to add some perspective. Right after they shoot down the Russian fighter jet in Syria there was a small incident in the Aegean Sea. Normally, the Greek warships and Turkish fishing boats back and forth chase each other in some cases but the first time a Russian warship opened fire against a Turkish fishing boat, there was a report created in that time about (inaudible) expressed concern about a deepening Russian encirclement of Turkey and military positioning. On one side we have cooperation between Russia's S-400 purchase, but on the other hand Russia deepens its military positioning at the expense of Turkey. Can you explain a little bit more about it? Thank you.

MS. TAUSSIG: Evren, would you like to address that last question on the Russian-Turkey defense contradictions?

MS. BALTA: Well, the thing is that the military balance, I mean, Russia has been strengthening its naval presence in the Black Sea. That's true. In the Mediterranean as well. But recently, we have, I mean, witnessed attempts like that as the event that you were citing, attempts that Russia is trying to strengthen its presence in the Aegean as well. And I mean, but it's not as striking as what we see in the Black Sea and in the Mediterranean. I mean, I don't know the event so I don't remember that, and that's pretty much what I want to say. But in terms of the question, I mean, in responding to the question, the first question, well, that's what the Astana Process is all about, the escalation zones. I mean, the negotiation is like, I mean, you have the Russian security threat, that's the jihadists, and the people going from Russia through Turkey to Syria. And you have the Turkish

vulnerability or Turkey's security interests of the Kurds, and you have, I mean, the negotiation is over that. I mean, it seems to me that -- and the report is actually citing these facts. Russia -- I mean, Turkey, has agreed to control the groups that it used to support. Right? And the ideal of the escalations zones is kind of, you know, doing that, I think, I mean.

MR. BAEV: Yes. I think as far as the situation with -- where the security situation is concerned, particularly as far as the Russian Navy is concerned, I think there is a need for a very sober look at what is the real Russian capabilities there. Because it's not really an almighty navy, nothing resembling even what was there in the Soviet Era, and it is stretched very thin. The intervention with Syria, it is a huge strain on the Russian Navy which is involved in delivering all sorts of supplies there, and that one incident the Russian Navy had near the Bosphorus when an intelligence ship had a collision and it was sunk is a small indication that the problems are there and they're running deep. And the Russian Navy is set to be a loser in the next round of defense budget cuts. So it is not really such a colossal challenge. I think as far as naval balances are concerned, Russia is not really a super power, particularly since NATO is really investing efforts now not only on the Baltic theater but on the Black Sea Theater, et al, and Russia is stretched there because it cannot concentrate on the Black Sea Theater alone. It needs to go all the way down to Syria and the Eastern Mediterranean.

And as far as the ISIS matter is concerned, yes, a remarkable number of fighters arriving from the North Caucasus and from Central Asia, and probably partly because unlike Europe where there was every effort done to stop that flow of potential recruits, Russia was really very much indifferent and even encouraging for the potential rebels to leave saying, okay, you want to fight? Go fight there instead of here. And there is no way back, essentially. And to what degree that policy might backfire remains to be seen because it's not only the persons who go travel there; it is also a question of networks, family connections, the feeling of being victimized of losses over defeat which leaves a very bitter taste. I think for Russia in that kind of situation, more so in post-Raqqa, there might be a greater security challenge than presently its leadership is ready for.

MS. TAUSSIG: Thank you. Thank you for those two questions.

In the few minutes that we have left, I think it's about three minutes, I wanted to give you

each an opportunity, perhaps just one minute to provide any more insights you might have on final recommendations for looking at this relationship and looking at the trajectory of this partnership moving forward, particularly as was alluded to in the report, Russia seeks to exploit U.S. weaknesses or insecurities in the Middle East and there is the potential for Turkey to join this you called as a spoiler act. And so how should we be thinking about inhibiting Turkey from joining some sort of Russian spoiler act in the Middle East? And do you have any other recommendations writ large for looking at this relationship?

And why don't we start with Naz and we'll work our way back down.

MS. DURAKOĞLU: Sure. Again, as I said, I think the Turkey-Russia partnership is not grounded in a firm foundation, so over time I think you are going to see that eroded. But, of course, policymakers don't have a ton of time to just watch and see what happens. So I think a lot of the recommendations in the report particularly solidifying some of those economic ties, whether it be through trade -- of course, that's a little difficult right now with our current president's views on trade, but I think those are definitely avenues to look at to basically strengthen those pillars, whether they be security, whether they be people-to-people ties or the economies. But at the same time, I would definitely have to add, I think it is important for Turkey's leadership, not necessarily the people of Turkey but Turkey's leadership to understand that, again, they are really investing a lot in the tolerance of the West, particularly when it comes down to their own behaviors domestically and how they are presenting the West to their own people because this will backfire. It already has in many ways. And so I would say that they probably should rethink that, but as they rethink those policies and the rhetoric, it's probably important for the United States and for Europe, the EU as a collective, to kind of look at where they could distance the relationship so that it is a reminder to Turkey that this is a necessary partnership with the West. There is a natural trajectory for many reasons aside from just feelings and anger. And so I think it is important to develop those sticks along with the carrots.

MS. TAUSSIG: Thank you very much.

Kemal?

MR. KIRIŞCI: Kissinger's book was cited and taking a cue from here I'd like to recall what I heard from a great U.S. ambassador who served in Baghdad and in Ankara but I believe has also

a Marine background, Jim Jeffrey, last July, at the Washington Institute -- you can look it up on the video recording of the event -- made the following remark that struck me. It was a very categorical remark and he warned the audience about it. And he said that there is no way that we, meaning the U.S. and the West, could have won the Cold War without Turkey. And he said also that Turkey could have not maintained its national sovereignty and territorial integrity without being part of the West. Then he took one more step. He said that today when you will look at the agenda of world politics, with the exception of North Korea, Columbia -- and then he cited one or two more examples -- he said, all the other challenges and conflict problems that dominate the Western agenda are around Turkey. So to me it seems both sides need to cooperate and overcome their differences. Yet, I also recognize and acknowledge that Turkey is indeed creating challenges for the West, the kind you are making references to, and I have to say that as a retired professor and a citizen of Turkey, the bit of tolerance that really hurts me the most is that Turkey now is in a league with North Korea and Iran holding citizens of Western countries as hostages. And this is not going to last very long, and you have to appreciate that there is another Turkey. The other Turkey made itself very clear at the referendums and also previous election results. And that other Turkey, you know, is not a pinkish Turkey. I appreciate it. But it's a Turkey that has come to adopt maybe not all, but some of the liberal democratic values. But I would say most importantly, the workings of a liberal market. And Naz earlier on cited this one billion dollar investment fund and that it's not really working. It's not really working because Turkish business people are coming to invest here in the United States across the Atlantic and in the European Union independently of the conflicts between the leadership and part of the society let's say because there is the rule of law and they know that this is not the case when it comes to some of the other countries around Turkey. And it's very important to remind us of this other Turkey and to try to manage the challenges in the meantime along the lines that maybe Pavel cited earlier on, the NATO Secretary General meeting Erdoğan, but also the position that Federica Mogherini, the vice president of the European Commission, but also the high representative of the European Union's external relations, have taken. And that's one of engagement because at the end of the day, the leadership that's running Turkey knows that it's economics that counts when it comes to winning elections. Even if they are rigged elections, it's the economy that's going to

(inaudible). So I would say on Naz's heels that trade and economic relationships boosting it, supporting it, is going to be the critical approach.

MS. TAUSSIG: Thank you very much. The two clarion calls for economic, social, and trade engagement between Turkey and the West.

Evren?

MS. BALTA: I second them but, I mean, let me say that nothing is really wrong with partnering with your neighboring state. I mean, multilateral -- I mean, multilateral --

MR. KIRIŞCI: Absolutely. I don't want to give the wrong impression. Yes.

MS. TAUSSIG: It depends on who the neighboring state is.

MS. BALTA: That fact is that multilateral -- that's true -- multilateral foreign policy is really good for national interests, not just for Turkey, for any country, but what is alarming is, and I think what we have been talking here is that this is happening in a context of anti-Westernism. So it's not really, you know, like it's kind of a triangulation. You know, like these two, Russia and Turkey coming together in kind of balancing the rest, but in a way, harming Turkey's national interest. So, I mean, what the report is actually saying or is actually underlining that. And I kind of, you know, this period is kind of similar to the interwar period where the Soviet Union and Turkey has really, I mean, really has this very good intense relations. They exchanged economic models. They signed trade deals and this and that. There was a real intense relationship in the period and it only changed and some of the, you know, like commentators writing in that period, for example, the famous historian Arnold Toynbee saying that this is a marriage of convenience and this relationship is not going to go forever. It's not going to last. And they said that is, you know, like states' access of --

MR. BAEV: Excluded.

MS. BALTA: Excluded. I mean --

MR. BAEV: That's Fiona Hill and --

MS. BALTA: Yeah, I saw the term in the interwar period which referred to the relationship between Russia and Turkey. And they really didn't talk about, you know, how to -- about secularism or anything else or communism or state models, but mostly what they were considering or

what they were carrying in that period was how to counter the Western dominance, how to restore their status. So in a sense this is really, I mean, the sentiment that I feel in this period is pretty much similar to that period with a lot of differences, of course, and we discussed those differences and that's why I'm not citing them. And restoring the bond with the West. Finding ways to include without stepping back from normative commitments. And making the core institutions, like the European Union and the Council of Europe every disciplined and rigid while, you know, like creating or strengthening the bridging institutions more flexible and accommodating to the states' needs would be an important thing but what Professor Kirişci was saying about, you know, like looking at the mirror in that relationship is going to be, I mean, is really going to be very helpful in terms of restoring the bond. So we need, I mean, just this, I guess.

MR. KIRIŞCI: Torrey, before you turn to Pavel, just one minute.

MS. TAUSSIG: Okay, 30 seconds.

MS. KIRIŞCI: We must not forget that Turkey engaged its neighborhood very constructively, very positively under this government and it was called zero problems with neighbors. And it was a time when EU-Turkish relations and the ones with the rest of the West was at its best. So both sides have an interest in bringing that about, and I think Pavel may disagree, but Putin would have an interest in a Turkey that is prospering and that is purchasing its natural gas at a time when prices are falling and a Turkey that is stable.

Sorry, Pavel, I interrupted.

MS. TAUSSIG: The final word goes to you, Pavel.

MR. BAEV: Yes, I think that's probably a disappointing feature of our panel for the audience that we don't really have any disagreements. There is no capacity for quarrel here and I will not

--

MS. TAUSSIG: Refreshing during this time.

MR. BAEV: -- disagree with anything which was said. I want to make as a final observation there is a striking difference that Putin is able to present his foreign policy as a chain of victories and successes. From the victory over Georgia to annexation of Crimea, to building of alliance with China, since every one of these victories turned out into -- even Syria can be presented as a victory

now. Each of these victories then bear fruits which become extremely burdensome and heavy and turn the victory into a self-made trap. That's a different story. With Erdoğan, it is setbacks and failures and fiascos and nothing really works in foreign policy. So maybe, maybe just as an idea, it is possible to somehow help Turkey at least to score some sort of resembling point in foreign policy, and through that rebuild a little bit damaged relations. One place where it might be possible is Qatar. That crisis is currently unfolding and developing. Turkey plays a big role there. Nobody needs this crisis. And at least Turkey's role there has a potential of if not giving it a big victory but at least giving it something of a constructive role.

MS. TAUSSIG: Great. Thank you.

So with this final set of very insightful remarks, there's still a lot to think about, a lot to discuss. I hope you have a chance to review the paper. As you see, it's very interesting and worth a read. And please thank me in joining our panelists -- thank you all for coming.

(Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2020