"ŞTEFAN CEL MARE" UNIVERSITY - SUCEAVA



CODRUL COSMINULUI

New Series, Vol. XXI, No. 2,
December 2015

Prin stiinta si toleranta,
spre cooperare si integrare

"Codrul Cosminului" este o publicatie academica bianuala care favorizeaza mai ales rezultatele cercetarii stiintifice inspirate de fenomenele istorice si culturale. Pastrand traditia tolerantei si cooperarii etnice, culturale si confesionale in fostul ducat al Bucovinei si promovand valorile umaniste, publicatia este deschisa spre cooperare cu reprezentantii comunitatii academice, stiintifice si culturale. Fara sa-si limiteze scopul cercetarii la o anumita arie geografica sau la o anumita perioada istorica, "Codrul Cosminului" acopera un spectru larg de abordari, de analize inter si multi-disciplinare, inclusiv abordari de metodologie analitica, instrumentare si interpretare.

Revista saluta trimiterea de manuscrise care indeplinesc criteriile generale de insemnatate si excelenta stiintifica. "Codrul Cosminului" nu accepta materiale ce au fost publicate sau sunt luate in consideratie pentru a fi publicate altundeva.

Through science and tolerance,
to cooperation and integration

"Codrul Cosminului" is a bi-annual academic journal that focuses primarily on the results of scientific research inspired by historical and cultural phenomena. Preserving the tradition of ethnic, cultural, and confessional tolerance and cooperation in the former Duchy of Bukovina and promoting the humanistic values, the journal is open to cooperation with representatives from the academic, scientific, and cultural community. Without limiting the scope of research to a certain geographical area or to a certain historical period, "Codrul Cosminului" covers a wide spectrum of approaches, inter- and multidisciplinary aspects of analysis, including developments in analytical methodology, instrumentation and interpretation. It publishes empirical, theoretical and methodological articles.

The Journal welcomes the submission of manuscripts that meet the general criteria of significance and scientific excellence. "Codrul Cosminului" does not accept papers that have been published or are under consideration for publication elsewhere.

Codrul Cosminului - Analele Stiintifice ale Universitatii "Stefan cel Mare" din Suceava, Seria Istorie, este o revista care a obtinut recunoasterea Consiliului National al Cercetarii Stiintifice (CNCS).

Apare din anul 1995, reluand traditia publicatiei omonime ce a aparut sub egida Universitatii din Cernauti in perioada interbelica (1924-1939).

Continutul revistei este pus in mod gratuit la dispozitia cititorilor. Utilizatorii pot citi, descarca, copia, distribui, imprima, cauta si realiza linkuri catre textele integrale ale articolelor publicate in revista fara permisiunea prealabila a editorului sau autorului.

ISSN: 1224-032X
EISSN: 2067-5860

Studiile publicate in volumele nr. 10-21 pot fi consultate on-line.
Revista este indexata in urmatoarele baze de date internationale:

- Scopus
- Socionet
- Index Copernicus International
- Directory of Open Access Journals
- UlrichsWeb - Global Serials Directory
- ERIH PLUS
- MIAR (Information Matrix for the Analysis of Journals)
- Open Directory Project

Codrul Cosminului a stabilit relatii de licentiere electronica cu EBSCO, unul din cei mai prolifici la nivel mondial colectori de reviste, periodice si alte surse full text. Revista va fi identificata in baza de date EBSCO actualizata odata cu finalizarea procesului de completare a colectiei.

Codrul Cosminului - The Scientific Annals of the University "Stefan cel Mare" Suceava, History Section - is a journal classified by the National Council for Scientific Research (CNCS).

Since 1995, it re-engages a tradition on publishing the Chernovcy University journal, that used to appear in the inter-war period (1924-1939).

All journal content is freely available without charge to the user or his/her institution. Users are allowed to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of the articles in this journal without asking prior permission from the publisher or the author.

ISSN: 1224-032X
EISSN: 2067-5860

The studies published in volumes No. 10-21 can be found online.
The journal is indexed in the following international databases:

- Scopus
- Socionet
- Index Copernicus International
- Directory of Open Access Journals
- UlrichsWeb - Global Serials Directory
- ERIH PLUS
- MIAR (Information Matrix for the Analysis of Journals)
- Open Directory Project

Codrul Cosminului has entered into an electronic licensing relationship with EBSCO, the world's most prolific aggregator of full text journals, magazines and other sources. The journal will be found on EBSCO's upgraded database once the collection is complete.

CONTENTS

ELITES, RELIGION AND CULTURE

Alica Kurhajcová, *The Representation of Great Moravia and its Fall in Hungarian/ Magyar Historiography during the Period of Dualism* 169

Lorina P. Repina, *Science and Society: Public History in the Context of Historical Culture of the Globalization Era* 189

Ionuț Bran, *The Polish-Ukrainian inter-war confrontation. The Ukrainian political movement in Poland* 203

Andra Jacob Larionescu, *Les maisons paysannes de Marginea (Département de Suceava, Roumanie)* 219

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Валерий Суряев, *Морально-психологическое состояние русских войск Румынского фронта в 1917 году* 239

Olesea Palamarja, *Politics and Tourism in MSSR: a Case Study of the Tourists from the Socialist Republic of Romania (1964-1979)* 261

Natalya Korniyenko, *The Evolution of the U.S. Position toward Democratic Development of Ukraine (2000-2008)* 287

İsmail Köse, *Challenges to NATO's Fifth Enlargement Round: Turkey's Attitude towards Romanian's Admission* 299

POLITICS, CONFLICTS AND SOCIETY

Zbigniew Chmiel, *Military Actions on the Territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1706* 313

Marinel Ovidiu Koch - Tufiș, *Die Staatsrechtlichen Fragen, die der Wiener Hof bei der Integration Siebenbürgens in der Habsburgischen Monarchie Erledigen Musste* 341

Harieta Mareci Sabol, *"Change Your Habits!" Health and Hygiene Issues in Bukovina during the 19th Century* 357

Юлия Левина, *Информационно-пропагандистская поддержка процессов советизации в западных областях УССР в 1939-1941 годах* 369

BOOK REVIEWS

The Influence of Wishful Thinking in Diplomacy, Internal Corruption and Military Unpreparedness upon International Relations (Florin Pintescu) 389

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS 395

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS 399

CHALLENGES TO NATO'S FIFTH ENLARGEMENT ROUND: TURKEY'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS ROMANIA'S ADMISSION

İsmail KÖSE
Erciye Üniversitesi İİBF Öğretim Üyesi, Turkey
ismailkosetr@hotmail.com

Rezumat: Provocările celei de-a cincea etape de extindere a NATO: Poziția Turciei față de aderarea României

Relațiile dintre România – singura națiune latină în Peninsula Balcanică, în sens larg – și Turcia au o istorie lungă care se întinde până în epoca otomană. Aceste relații au fost suspendate într-o oarecare măsură în timpul Războiului Rece. După prăbușirea Uniunii Sovietice, în relațiile turco-române a început o nouă eră. În timpul Primului Război Mondial, Rusia Țaristă a forțat România să fie un aliat pentru a ataca Germania din sud și de asemenea pentru a amenința Austria. Pe această cale se urmărea direcționarea atacurilor Puterilor Centrale în zona Balcanilor pentru a menține războiul cât mai departe de liniile frontului și de Rusia propriu-zisă. Continuând politica țaristă panslavistă, Rusia bolșevică a indicat teritoriile balcanice drept vitale pentru securitatea și apărarea sa. Cu proxima ocazie, după al Doilea Război Mondial, Stalin a inclus aceste state în rândul teritoriilor aflate dincolo de Cortina de Fier. După o perioadă destul de lungă sub Cortina de Fier, după 1989, România, ca și alte țări est-europene, a obținut libertatea, însă atitudinea Rusiei față de Balcani în perioada post-Război Rece a rămas neschimbată.

Studiul de față își propune să analizeze politicile NATO în perioada post-Război Rece și poziția Turciei față de extinderile alianței. În centrul atenției va fi plasată cea de-a cincea etapă de extindere, în cadrul căreia România și alte șase state balcanice și baltice au fost invitate să adere la Alianța Nord-Atlantică. De asemenea, se va insista pe reflectarea rolului Turciei în cadrul extinderii și a sprijinului ferm pentru aderarea României la NATO.

Abstract: *The relations between Romania – the only Latin nation in Balkan Peninsula, in a broader sense – and Turkey has a long history, which is traced back to the Ottoman period. These relations were relatively ceased during the Cold War. After the collapse of Soviet Union, a new era started for Turkish-Romanian relations. During the WWI, Tsarist Russia forced Romania to be its ally, in order to besiege Germany from South, and also to threat Austria. Its aim was intended to direct the Central Powers' attacks to the Balkans, in order to keep the warfare away from the front lines and from the Russian heartland. Following the Tsarist pan-Slavist policy, the Bolshevist Russia designated Balkans territories as vital for its security and defence. At the first opportunity emerged after the WWII, Stalin had included those lands behind the Iron Curtain area. After a fairly lengthy period under the Iron Curtain, after 1989, Romania*

Copyright © 2015 "Codrul Cosminului", XXI, 2015, No. 2, p. 299-312

like other eastern European countries achieved its freedom, but post-Cold War attitude of Russia towards the Balkans has remained unchanged.

This paper seeks to explore the post-Cold War policies of NATO and the Turkey's attitude towards the enlargements of alliance. It focuses on the fifth round of enlargement, when Romania and other six Balkans and Baltic countries were invited to join the North Atlantic Alliance*. In addition, it will insist on the role of Turkey in the enlargement process, and its firm support for Romania's accession to NATO.*

Résumé : Les provocations de la cinquième étape d'extension de l'OTAN : la position de la Turquie vis-à-vis l'adhésion de la Roumanie

Les relations entre la Roumanie, l'unique pays latin de la Péninsule Balkanique, et la Turquie ont une longue histoire qui remonte jusqu'à l'époque ottomane. On interrompit dans une certaine mesure ces relations pendant la Guerre Froide. Après la chute de l'Union Soviétique, une nouvelle ère commença dans les relations turques-roumaines. Pendant la Première Guerre Mondiale, la Russie Tsariste força la Roumanie à devenir son allié afin d'attaquer l'Allemagne du sud et de menacer l'Autriche. De cette manière, on voulait diriger les attaques des Puissances Centrales dans la zone des Balkans pour maintenir la guerre plus loin que possible des lignes du front et par conséquent, de la Russie proprement-dite. Tout en continuant la politique tsariste pan-slaviste, la Russie bolchevique indiqua les territoires balkaniques comme vitaux pour sa sécurité et sa défense. A l'occasion suivante, après la Seconde Guerre Mondiale, Staline inclut ces États parmi les territoires situés au-delà du Rideau de Fer. Après une période assez longue sous le Rideau de Fer, après 1989, la Roumanie, tout comme des autres pays est-européens, obtint sa liberté, mais l'attitude de la Russie vis-à-vis les Balkans dans la période post-Guerre Froide ne changea point.

L'étude ci-jointe se proposa d'analyser les politiques de l'OTAN pendant la période post-Guerre Froide et la position de la Turquie par rapport aux extensions de l'alliance. On y accorda le plus d'attention à la cinquième étape d'extension, au cadre de laquelle on invita la Roumanie et autres six États balkaniques à adhérer à l'Alliance Nord-Atlantique. On y insista, aussi, sur le rôle de la Turquie au cadre de l'extension et sur l'appui ferme pour l'adhésion de la Roumanie à l'OTAN.

Keywords: *NATO, Romania, Turkey, Russia, Depth Security*

Post-Cold War Security Risks and Romania's Application for NATO Membership

After high tension and lethal rivalry between Western and Eastern Blocks, Cold War was concluded with the collapse of the Eastern Bloc. Romania did not have any land borders with Russia, yet as other post-communist countries was under tentative Russian pressure and felt compelled to find a firm defence alliance. NATO (founded on 1949) was the most extensively and successfully executed defence Alliance of the West. The

Alliance, which originally was the expression of Cold War collective security cooperation, confronted Warsaw Pact (founded on 1955) of Soviet Union (SU) during decades of Cold War. The Alliance – the solely elaborate and adequate defence system of post-Cold War era – had left door open for new members. Membership to the Alliance had been regulated by article 10 requiring unanimous approval of existing members and explicit consent of USA Senate. This means that any of existing members could/can veto admittance of new comers. Turkey has been member of NATO since 1952, and when the Cold War came to an end, it faced with some broadly implicated challenges. Furthermore, Turkey was in favour of former Communist Balkan countries' entry into Alliance; concretely, during the fifth round enlargement, Ankara supported and encouraged Romania's membership. But Russia's attitude and policy towards Romania remained as same as the one that SU had developed.

Post-communist Russia, which a few years after the end of the Cold War formed Russian Federation (RF), was/is not happy with the "open door" policy of the Alliance, exerted a powerful hold on periphery. For instance, Russia will stir its border neighbour Ukraine (in 2014) to prevent its strong readiness on integration to Western Europe. Mirroring the fragmentation in post-communist lands, Russia's intervention in western neighbourhood was/is a vital threat for other Balkan countries likewise. Assessment of said security dilemma, together with other conceivable RF victims forced Romania for NATO membership, thus stability and sovereignty of the country would be secured for future.

Soviet Union was collapsed in six month of the Warsaw Pact's dissolution. Beside their security challenges, post-communist Balkan countries had to cope with economic and democratic problems. The relationship of those countries, lacking a focus on such major challenge with the security limbo, was another issue of the beginnings. A few years after, the first crisis emerged in former Yugoslavia, with which Romania was one of three Balkan countries sharing common borders. This was the first challenge, while the second one came from old-boss SU, extremist and ultra-nationalist political figures such as Vladimir Zhirinovsky who declared that their first aim is to reunite SU and redraw the map of Balkans. This was a vital threat to post-communist Balkan and Baltic countries. The third challenge was the international trafficking in refugees and contraband using Balkans as a bridge in their access to reach Europe.[1] Aforesaid security

[1] Hillary Appel et alia, *The Changing Face of Europe: European Institutions in the Twenty-First Century*, "International Studies Review", Vol. 8, No. 1/March 2006, p. 167.

problems that happened to raise post-communist countries' eyes on NATO, fuelled membership desires.

The last and most vital challenge was soon after quick dissemination of global terrorism distinctive sophisticated 9/11 terrorist attacks in USA. All these challenges and serious security threats forced former Iron Curtain Balkan and Baltic countries to request for NATO membership. Because of the unanimous decision making rule of the Alliance, any of 16 existing members could prevent or encourage membership processes. Turkey, seeking friendly relations with the Balkan countries, encouraged and supported their desire on NATO membership. In this context, the historical and long-lasting cultural ties between Turkey and Romania played a facilitative role, providing an extensive assistance during Romania's admittance to membership.

Among others post-communist Balkan countries, Romania exclusively has a special place. Differing from the rest, Romania ethnically is not Slav, but Latin. In addition, the Orthodox Church had a dominant role in the country though Communism's fear-based oppressive policies. Especially after 1962, the Romanian Government had allowed Orthodox Church get into contact with the Western churches. Because of this reason Romania was one of the eligible countries ready to contact with Western world when the Cold War came to an end.[2] Nowadays, the old communist behaviours, economic and political corruption, resistance to pass democracy and weak militaristic power were main challenges the country had to face with through its integration with the modern world. In that tentative inroad, NATO was the first and the easiest western organization after 9/11 for such an integration turning its door open for participation.

Nine years after the end of Cold War, NATO enlarged in 1999 Washington summit, accepting three post-communist countries into membership namely Hungary, Czech Republic and Poland. By this expansion the number of members had become 19. Before acceptance of new members, NATO was already in Balkans, initially with two missions: one in Bosnia, and other in Kosovo, respectively SFOR and KFOR.[3] The scholars tried to analyse this first expansion through the International Relations (IR) theories, including neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism, organization theory, constructivism and other foreign policy-based approaches. Yet, no one could grasp ground relied on logic for enlargement. Therefore, the scholars were

---

[2] Lucian N. Leustean, *Between Moscow and London: Romanian Orthodoxy and National Communism*, *1960-1965*, "The Slavonic and East European Review", Vol. 85, No. 3/ Jul., 2007, p. 493.

[3] *NATO in Twenty-first Century*, NATO Public Diplomacy Division, Brussels, 2004, p. 13, 16.

discontented because IR theories had failed to predict this expansion.[4] Even some IR scholars thought that the first expansion was ill-conceived, ill-timed and ill-suited antagonizing Russia by strengthening anti-Western tendencies in the Russian political circles. That is why some of them argue that the first enlargement of NATO was one of the most important events of IR after Cold War, while the other part were arguing that NATO was/is the most powerful international alliance in the world. Therefore, the former Iron Curtain countries were trying to become members, looking for sheltering against any possible threat, especially from the east.[5] They were implying but hesitant to name it concretely, no doubt said that the threat was coming from Russia.

Nowadays, the International Relations thinkers and some Western policy makers including Turkish likewise consider that the antagonism of Russia was curious about planned fifth round enlargement that would include other former Warsaw members such as Romania. As in the past, one more time Russia was confronting West, stirred European security approach and NATO policies. NATO tried to calm Russia down by proposing joint activities and operations; yet, thanks to numerous mistrust and challenges, these initiatives never had a chance to work.[6] Meanwhile, there was a defence and security paradox which post-communist Balkan and Baltic countries had to face with.

Post-Cold War period was a process in which the Alliance decided to transform itself against newly emerging threats, as well as ethnic conflicts. The Alliance also had decided to foster democracy, rule of law, economic rehabilitation and solve border disputes among new members. This made new comers had to meet new Western standards of NATO membership determined soon after Cold War.[7] After 9/11 attacks, NATO accelerated modernization process and new rules put in use for combating sophisticated terrorist activities. This new policy was a radical change NATO's founding rules.

Meanwhile European Union (EU) was also trying to establish a new defence system structuring European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). The legal basis for establishing such a common policy was laid out three

---

[4] Robert W. Rauchaus (ed.), *Explaining NATO Enlargement*, Portland, 2001, apud Ted Galen Carpenter, *Review, "*Political Science Quarterly", Vol. 116, No. 4/ Winter, 2001-2002, pp. 665-666; Andrew Kydd, *Trust Building, Trust Breaking: The Dilemma of NATO Enlargement*, "International Organization", Vol. 55, No. 4/Autumn, 2001, pp. 802-803.

[5] Terry Terriff et alia, *'One in, All in?' NATO's Next Enlargement*, "International Affairs", Vol. 78, No. 4/October, 2002, p. 714.

[6] Terry Terrif, *op. cit.,* p. 713.

[7] *NATO in Twenty-first Century*, pp. 21-22.

years after the end of the Cold War in the text of Maastricht Treaty (1993).[8] Continuing EU's enlargement towards post-communist Balkan and Baltic countries would be fastened by NATO membership.

Turkey, as a member to NATO whose relations with the EU was/are practically complicated, sought to strength the mutual cooperation with post-communist countries. In this context, there was a mutual cooperation between Turkey and Romania. Turkey supported and encouraged Romania's participation into NATO though its worries about Russian conduct to newly emerging situation. Turkey's firm support has been underlined by Turkish President Ahmet Necdet Sezer through his meeting with Romanian President Ion Iliescu in Ankara. In this meeting, President Sezer during his speech said that: *"Turkey and Romania jointly will contribute to the peace and stability in the region [Balkans] and [the region's] integration to Europe"*.[9] Both countries have close historical ties: there was Turkish minorities living in Romania albeit Turkey had not isolated Romania from its foreign policy during the period between two wars and Cold War.[10] Hence Turkish media had published several news regarding with SU oppressions in the country.[11]

Beside historical Russian activities and the very existence of Kaliningrad enclave, there were several other factors forcing Balkan countries to seek NATO membership. Participation into Alliance would foster military, economic and political importance, encouraging stability and assisting the combat against transnational crime and global terrorism. Two of the most important contributions would be (1) the acceleration of democratization and (2) the civil control over the army. The influence especially would be effective in case of Romania and Bulgaria, trying to cope with precarious political situation and relatively slow economic development.[12]

On the other hand, NATO also was ready to grant the membership to the post-communist countries, but was reluctant to accept problematic countries before their eligibility for membership. In connection with this po-

---

[8] *Front Matter,* Foreign Policy, No. 152/Jan. -Feb., 2006. pp. 2-4.

[9] *Romanya ile Karşılıklı Güvcence* [Mutual Assurance with Romania], "Cumhuriyet", 29 September, 2005, p. 6; *Sezer'den Romanya'ya Öneri* [Sezer's Proposal to Romania], "Cumhuriyet", 5 December 2003. p. 6.

[10] *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri* [State Archives of the Prime Ministry of the Republic of Turkey], 14/04/1936/Fon 301812, Kutu 63, D. 28, S. 18.

[11] *Romaya'da Ayaklanma Başladı* [Uprising Begun in Romania], "Akın", 19 September 1951, p. 1; Abdi İpekçi, *Demirperde Aralığından Romanya ve Bulgaristan* [Romania and Bulgaria through Iron Curton Daylight], "Milliyet", 9 September 1956. p. 3.

[12] Terry Terrif, *op. cit.,* p. 715.

licy, five years after the end of the Cold War, in September 1995 NATO issued an official set of political and military criteria for new members, including stipulation that all countries entering Alliance must adhere to democratic principles and procedures, and must resolve any kind of standing border disputes with their neighbours.[13] On Washington Summit (1999) at the fiftieth anniversary of Alliance, it was declared that further enlargement would have been considered in up-coming summit held in Prague, in November 2002. After Washington Summit, 10 former Iron Curtain countries – including Romania – had applied to NATO for membership. The Alliance, despite its "open door" policy, declared that it was reluctant to accept new members in order not to antagonize Russia soon after the Cold War. But two years after, NATO preferences would have an unforeseeable radical change.[14] Thus, post-communist countries had an accelerated chance to be a member to NATO.

Under this conditions Romania was facing with a handful series of problems. One year before the planned next NATO summit, December 2000, the presidential elections of Romania had resulted with the victory of neo-communists, implying a serious problem for democratization process. Additionally, economic and political reforms were slowed down.[15] Also, Romania was facing with massive corruption reaching to the highest echelons of political power.[16] Nowadays, together with Bulgaria, it was supporting NATO operations near Balkans, being one of the key countries for rehabilitation and stability process of the area.

Bearing in mind above mentioned realities and challenges on decision making process, after the fourth round enlargement, it seems that Romania and other Balkan countries heading for membership. But, 9/11 attacks had a "Bing-Bang expansion" effect on NATO; during the Prague Summit it was decided to admit seven new members (Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia) to the Alliance implying that the new numbers of members reached 26.[17] After discussions and negotiations in March of 2004, seven new members including Romania were granted with membership status. Before their accession new members had benefited from Membership Action Plan (MAP) to rehabilitate their economy, democracy,

---

[13] Mark Kramer, *NATO, the Baltic States and Russia: A Framework for Sustainable Enlargement*, "International Affairs", Vol. 78, No. 4/ Oct., 2002. p. 736.

[14] *Ibid*., p. 732.

[15] *Ibid,* p. 738; Appel, *op. cit.,* p. 168.

[16] Hillary Appel, *op. cit.,* p. 172.

[17] Paul Cornish, *NATO: The Practice and Politics of Transformation*, "International Affairs", Vol. 80, No. 1/Jan., 2004, p. 64; Hillary Appel, *op. cit.,* p. 172.

state-people relations, rule of law, and defence expenditures.

Turkey's Attitude towards New Members: particularly, Romania

Soon after the collapse of the Communist Bloc, in the London Summit in 1990, NATO had invited post-communist Balkan countries to establish partnerships and cooperation with the Alliance. This was the first hand of friendship extended to the former Warsaw Pact members, inviting them to form a new relationship with the Alliance. Warsaw Pact had not been dissolved at that date officially. One of the basic aims was to achieve sustainable cooperation and stability in post-communist areas. It was important to rehabilitate the post-Cold War world against any kind of undesirable radical threats. Thus, NATO leaders had also envisaged cooperation through political and military activities. It was also planned that, beside cooperation opportunities, relations should be built through the establishment of regular diplomatic liaison with post-communist countries. One year after the London Summit, NATO, the Soviet Union and 11 other post-communist countries formed the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC).[18] The trigger point of NACC was that, through this move Russia would also have a chance to form good neighbourhood relations with its old rival Western Block countries. On the other hand, about one year had passed since Communist Block collapsed or started to dissolve and the picture in post-communist Balkans, Baltic Region, Central Asia and Russia was not clear defined. The existing picture of world was more or less similar to the post WWII politics and it was impossible to predict how the new world's order will be shaped. Assessing this situation, NATO had moved forward to block any kind of radical change or lethal conflict as experienced after the WWII.

As it is seen, the unexpected sudden dissolve of Communist Block had created a power vacuum remained at the former Iron Curtain space, that was shaped by Stalin soon after the WWII. Lacking any peaceful attempt would cause numerous problems such as ethnic conflicts or clashes and border fights between post-communist countries. Moreover, a few days after the end of the Cold War, a civil war had already broken out in former Yugoslavia, which was a part of the Iron Curtain area. Serbians was committing a brutal ethnic cleansing against Bosnian Muslims and there was a widespread war threat over Balkans.[19] Considering above said facts, a forum has been created

[18] http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_116133.htm [accessed 08/11/2015].

[19] *CIA Documents, National Inteligence Estimate, Yugoslavia Transformed,* Doc. No.: 1990-10-01-NIE 15-90, 18 October 1990, p. 5.

by NACC, broke new ground by enabling multinational political consultation and cooperation, and confidence-building measures between NATO and post-communist countries. Initially, the NACC had focused on residual Cold War security concerns, but as cooperation developed, the council led to the creation of Partnership for Peace (PfP), a NATO programme of collaborative and practical cooperation, signed by Russia and most of other former Soviet and Warsaw Pact countries in 1994.[20] Meanwhile, the rise of interest in the relations with post-communist countries, and a membership process of Romania and other Balkan and Baltic countries has started.

Turkey, together with Greece was a member to the Alliance as they granted membership during first round enlargement, in 1952. After this date, through Cold War it was Turkey that shouldered south-eastern defence of the Alliance. Yet when Cold War came to an end, all strategic and militaristic priorities had changed. It was not possible to predict the possible consequences of post-Cold War period's politics and enlargement initiatives; especially for this case it was more difficult for Turkey that has been a wing country of the Alliance for about 38 years. During the Cold War, Turkey had conducted comprehensive experiments empowering its capacity to cope with militaristic offensives. Nevertheless, Ankara was thinking that enlargement of NATO, especially the fifth round, which seven Balkan and Baltic countries planned to be a member to the Alliance, would foster and accelerate Europe's integration and Turkey's accession process to European Union (EU).

Therefore the fourth and especially the fifth round enlargements provided important positive effects on Turkey. Three aspects in particular are worth mentioning for their broader implications, respectively: (1) Membership of Southern European Countries, namely Bulgaria and Romania would create a strategic depth and would provide important conveniences for Alliance's operation capabilities. (2) Due to enlargement towards eastern and south-eastern Europe, Europe-Atlantic Security area's eastern front would shift towards Baltic's and Turkey. Under existing threat and risks, Turkey's role in Transatlantic Security relations would gain importance. (3) Due to Alliance's enlargement towards Balkans and Black Sea, the Alliance's sphere of interest would inevitably focus on Black Sea, Caucasus and Central Asia where Turkey has vital interests and historical relations.[21]

As it was underlined above, since the very beginning, Turkey has been supporting NATO enlargements and unyieldingly in favour of Romania's membership to the Alliance. Meanwhile, after the first round enlargement

[20] http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_116133.htm [accessed 08/11/2015].
[21] *TBMM [TGNA),* 10/06/2003, Period: 22, Legislative Year: 1, Number: 227.

(1999) of post-Cold War period and fourth during Alliance's whole history, the Alliance decided to achieve new members. According to decision taken in Brussels on March 26, 2003 it has decided that, invitations would be sent to seven candidates including Romania by the General Secretary of the Alliance, George Robertson (UK). After its receipt of official invitation, in accordance with Article 10, each candidate should send its participation document to USA, and for participation to the Alliance. After the completion of 19 existing members' approval, Romania and other six will become members of NATO.[22]

Contrary its support to the participation of new members, there was confusion in Ankara. Some of decision makers were thinking that Balkan enlargement was a risky process for Turkey because it could diminish the balance between USA and Europe, and even could undermine a long-lasting strategic importance of Turkey. As further, new aspirations and new anxieties after Cold War were propelled Turkish decision makers. Those distrusts had been questioned in Ankara; yet there was a strong sentiment for membership of seven post-communist Balkan and Baltic countries. Despite that worries, Ankara overwhelmingly was thinking that Alliance's enlargement would ease NATO's militaristic operational capabilities, contribute Turkey's Trans-Atlantic strategic importance and foster the security relations. It was also expected that, as it was mentioned above, the planned fifth round enlargement including Romania differing from past four enlargements, will focus Alliance's sphere of interest to the peripheral vulnerable areas namely Balkans, Black Sea, Caucasus and Central Asia.[23] Russia was still in these areas and has not changed its approaches for power politics. Balancing Russian desiderata was only possible by NATO participation.

In addition, despite its energetic support there were some drawbacks for approval of the new seven members. Turkey has an about 40 year long-lasting full-membership process with EU which the participation Agreement had been signed in the year of 1963, some days after Greece, but in so far never given the chance to be a full member. There was a standstill and discontinuity in Turkish-EU relations the process never working in a desired road for both sides. Apart from this, after the Cold War, EU had transformed its security and defence policies. The Union was requesting to use NATO facilities and capabilities under EU flag. In contrast, although neither EU countries were ready to grant Turkey full membership, ironically they

---

[22] *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Resmi Gazete* [Official Journal of Turkish Republic], 08/11/2003, No. 25283.

[23] *TBMM Dışişleri Komisyonu Raporu* [TGNA Report of Foreign Affairs Commission], No. 227, 15/07/2003.

compelled to use NATO capabilities. Turkey – a member to NATO, but not to EU – had some difficulties in its relations with the Union, could use its veto on EU's right about NATO capabilities. Bearing this case in mind and the standstill of membership process, Turkey had to cope with; it was essential not to handle NATO and EU enlargement round apart. Turkey, USA and UK, more or less traditional strategic partners of WWII and Cold War era, sought to produce a midway between Turkish challenges and EU's ironic desires.

Considering Turkey's mistrust and challenges, NATO already had decided and endorsed that harmonization shall be realized during EU and NATO enlargements, providing some guarantees for Turkish-EU relations. Nevertheless, some Turkey parliamentarians were thinking that those seven candidate countries when admitted NATO membership, economically could enter into rivalry with Turkey, benefiting EU funds and introducing an unfair competition against Turkey.[24] This idea was a kind of exaggeration of existing facts because there were good working economic relations between Turkey and candidate members. As it is seen some of the mistrusts had relied on a series of conjectures.

Moreover, despite NATO's endorsement of integrity and harmonization for both processes, membership acceptances to EU and to NATO were different cases. If Turkey had used its veto right to prevent participation of seven new members, this would do nothing for EU membership of those countries. Hence the reservation of some parliamentarians actually just a brain storming which Turkey had no means to block. Furthermore, for seven candidates to NATO membership would accelerate participation to EU and any accident on this road would have indirect effect on EU integration process. Also *vis é vis* the seven new members, after their participation to EU may use their veto right to prevent Turkey's participation to Union. This was a serious danger but already Southern Cyprus Greek Administration and Greece were blocking agreed pre-accession payments of EU funds to Turkey and opening of necessary chapters for membership. The question was deceptively simple. It was clear that both countries would veto Turkey's full-membership when – if ever possible – the necessary chapters of *acquis* completed. In addition, there was a strong opposition to Turkey's full-membership by central-western European countries, such as Germany and France. Therefore, there was no ground to wonder about new seven members' probable veto in the unforeseeable future.

Apart from those doubts, there also was a high expectation in Ankara to preserve advantages achieved in NATO's 1999 Washington Summit. In

[24] *Ibid*.

case of any cooperation between NATO and EU, the Turkey's existing rights should be considered and the unanimous decision making process should be preserved. Washington Summit had afforded some guarantees for Turkey. As it was told before, EU had a strong desire to use the NATO facilities and capabilities. EU – through Alliance's capabilities – could arrange operations in Aegean Sea and Cyprus. Turkey also had/has vital interests in this region and as a member to NATO should be invited to take part in those operations. But there was a deadlock Turkey had to face with. Southern Cyprus Greek Administration was a member to EU, but not NATO could veto EU decision making process for Turkey's invitation to NATO leaded periphery operations. Such possibility should be removed from agenda and Turkey's participation to such NATO operations should be guaranteed. Ankara Document signed by Turkey, USA and UK (in 2001) and signed by EU Countries (in 2002) allowing non-EU countries, exclusively Turkey, to take part in the decision making process.[25] Turkey and EU had different defence conceptions; hence Ankara Document was a cornerstone, preserving Turkey's existing rights in NATO, it should be an inarguable ground for all negotiations. If this rule was undermined, Turkey would be ousted from peripheral NATO operations and its membership to NATO would be a symbolic alliance, only visible on paper.

Despite these reservations and worries, Turkey's support to Balkan Countries and to Romania – that already contributed to NATO operations – never ceased. Because of this policy, the Euro-Atlantic Council and NATO members, the Partnership for Peace Programs, which built cooperation with those countries, and other initiatives addressing Russia, Ukraine and Mediterranean countries were supported by Turkey.

Because of its firm support, soon after Brussels decision the necessary formalities for Romania and other six post-communist countries' participation to the Alliance immediately begun in Turkey. For approval of the Turkish Government, Turkish Grand National Assembly's (TGNA) consent was needed. The issue initially was discussed in Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Defence after hard talks and controversial debates. On July 10 of the same year, Foreign Affairs Commission of TGNA discussed Romania's participation. In 2003, there were two parties in the TGNA, respectively the Ruling, Justice and Development Party (AKP) and the Opposing, Republican Party (CHP). Foreign Affairs Commission had consisted 17 members four from CHP and 13 from AKP. Representatives from both National Defence Ministry and Ministry of Foreign Affairs also

[25] *Ibid*.

attended to the meeting.[26] Above said worries and doubts were comprehensively discussed during the approval talks of new members.

However, during discussions in the Foreign Affairs Commission it was seen that both opposing and ruling parties were unanimously agree for Romania's and other six candidates' membership to the Alliance. Both political parties were thinking that NATO membership would be one of the most important steps for the post-Cold War world to realize the target of free, democratic and integrated Europe.[27] After discussions, the new seven's admittance to the Alliance was endorsed by Turkish Parliament on the year of 2003.[28] On March 2004, Romania and other six Baltic and Balkan countries participated to NATO in Washington, and in April of the same year at Brussels there was a joint ceremony addressing the fifth round enlargement.[29] It is expected that Romania and Bulgaria would afford about 70.000 land soldiers to the Alliance; yet their armies have urgent need for modernization. After its participation, Romania had firm and close relations with the Alliance.[30]

Putting its worries and short-sided doubts aside, Turkey provided a strong support to the new members. It was clear that integration to NATO would contribute to the rehabilitation in the Balkans and the confidence building majors could have a chance to blossom. Post-communist world's premier needs were peace, democratization, rule of law, free market and economic development. It is expected that membership to NATO will contribute realization of those ideals.

Conclusions

The Cold War and especially the terror balance during this period was a lethal threat against the world's peace. When it was ended, new security problems emerged and the only surviving militaristic alliance NATO had to shoulder and produce solutions to that newly emerged threats. Enlargement to post-communist Balkan and Baltic countries should be assessed considering post-Cold War period facts. Actually when Cold War come an end, the world politics were not clear, and NATO's capability to cope with handful set of conflicts and its grasp of post-communist periphery

[26] *Ibid*.
[27] *TGNA* [Report of Foreign Affairs Commission], No. 227, 15/07/2003.
[28] *TCRG*, 08/11/2003, No. 25283.
[29] http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-054e.htm [accessed 03/11/2015].
[30] *Ibid*.

unforeseeable. If the Alliance had decided not to expand or minimize its security approaches due to the dissolve of its rival Warsaw Pact, the post-Cold War world would have numerous security risks. In case of such event there would be confusion in Ankara and Turkey's future position in NATO would be unclear.

Turkey acquired a distinctive policy and produced a cumulative effect that gave courage to the post-communist countries during their membership to NATO. Same approach should be granted to Turkey during its EU membership process although neither EU countries are sincerely ready to arrange. The unintended result of NATO enlargements caused distrust between Russia and Alliance. Having to rely on fragmentary mutual trust mechanism it was impossible to use confidence building majors.

As it is seen, some Turkish decision makers have numerous reservations on NATO enlargements after the Cold War, but those doubts were mostly inflated conjectures. Having analysed the challenges faced with by Turkey, we may conclude that Turkey, ignoring its challenges and mistrusts, played a key role through the post-Cold War NATO enlargements. This preference recalled the hesitant unwelcome and one more time heightened the security confrontation between Russia and West. Russia struggled to reconcile the different security aspects and decided to go on its traditional way. Perhaps if NATO had moved slowly, a peaceful conversion of Russia into a peaceful environment could be possible. The corollary of this move is that we will never be able to have a chance to test the ridiculous idea, because NATO policies left some questions unresolved.

The conclusion driving from a handful set of results is that even though it is not visible, Turkey played a facilitating role through NATO membership. Having historical and cultural connections with Balkans, it contributed to the rehabilitation of the post-communist countries; its support and encouragement to new members, exclusively Romania deserves appreciation.

Despite the radical changes in the world's order and the emergence of new global threats, Russia continued to consider Balkans as a region belonging to its one of interest, namely "western depth security". Post-communist countries, aware of their security and inadequate defence vulnerabilities, extended to compel to find an ally against sophisticated threat they had to face. In connection with this expectation, the aim of NATO membership supplied a key factor for post-communist countries' security worries. Turkey had to solve its challenges and newly emerged post-communist countries had to investigate the relation between nuts and bolts of their NATO approaches.