

2 1/2 WAR STRATEGY

SÜKRÜ ELEKDAĞ

The dissolution of the Soviet Union and the coming to an end of the Cold War led the US and the Western European members of NATO to cut down on defence spending and allocate the saved resources to more productive areas of investment. This, in turn, enabled these countries to realise a faster rate of economic growth and a higher state of welfare. In the West, this significant benefit drawn from peace is referred to as the 'peace dividend'.

Turkey, on the other hand, cannot receive her share of the 'peace dividend' despite the fact that she is in dire need of it. This stems from the fact that the geopolitical realities of the region compel Turkey to increase her defence expenditure in order to be able to protect her territorial integrity and maintain her security. The threats facing Turkey are so diverse and acute that Turkey can only maintain peace by adhering to the age old adage, "Those who want peace, must be prepared for war."

Turkey maintains good neighbourly relations based on a sound footing with several of the eleven neighbours located on the geographical periphery surrounding the country by land and by sea. She does not regard these countries as a source of threat.

However, there are valid reasons for Turkey's regarding other neighbours with scepticism and as a source of threat. Two countries among these neighbours, namely Greece and Syria, who have claims on Turkey's vital interests, constitute an immediate threat for Turkey.

GREEK DESIGNS

Greece is a prisoner of her own expansionist policy regarding Turkey. Greek governments insistently claim that extending the Greek territorial waters in the Aegean to 12 miles is an inviolable right of Greece and that they will implement this right when the conditions are right.

When exactly will the conditions be right for Greece?

The first among these is when the PKK terrorism Turkey is trying to wipe out in southeastern Turkey gains much wider dimensions, develops into a full scale uprising, and forces Turkey to commit a much greater military force and financial resources to this area. Greece reckons that in addition to this development, if Turkey suffered a heavy economic blow and was thrown into social and political turmoil, this would create the right conditions for creating faits accomplis in the Aegean.

To this end, the Athens government is providing heavy financial support to the PKK's campaign of terror in Turkey. The fact that Athens has sent to Turkey PKK terrorists whom she has allowed to settle on her territory to conduct acts of sabotage against the Turkish tourism industry demonstrates the magnitude of the 'national paranoia' and hysterical hostility Greece has submerged herself in against Turkey.

The second prerequisite for Greece is to change the balance of power in the Aegean in her favour.

Athens is trying to change the balance of power in the Aegean in her favour vis-à-vis naval and air forces. She is doing this on the premise that the US and the European nations would not allow a protracted Turco-Greek conflict in the Aegean. Therefore, the air and naval operations to be conducted at the outset of hostilities would be decisive.

THE BALANCE OF POWER IN THE AEGEAN IN AIR AND NAVAL FORCES

A review of the data in the 1989-1995 issues of *The Military Balance*, a publication of The International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) where detailed and reliable information about nations' weapons and military equipment inventory can be found, reveals that although she has not yet been able to change the balance of air and naval power in her favour, Athens has certainly made considerable progress in that direction.

A comparison of the two nations' naval forces reveals that Turkey enjoys a relative qualitative and quantitative superiority.

Turkey has an obvious superiority in destroyers and frigates in particular, which constitute the backbone of surface striking power. As regards fire power, Greece seems to have caught up with Turkey. While Greece has 176 surface-to-surface guided missiles which are considered the most efficient weapon systems against surface targets, comprising Harpoons, Exocets, Penguins and SS-12s, the Turkish navy has 198 of these (Harpoons and Penguins). Turkey's vulnerabilities in the Aegean are in the fields of reconnaissance, surveillance, and over-the-horizon target acquisition.

Moreover, Greece's geographic position allows her to follow an external lines strategy, leaving her own high seas routes open, while at the same time providing her with the ability to cut off Turkey's maritime lines of communication.

On the one hand, the necessity to foil Greece's external lines strategy and, on the other hand, her missions in the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, dictate that the Turkish navy have a significant superiority over that of Greece.

A comparison of the two nations' air forces reveals at first sight that Turkey has a dramatic superiority over the Greek Air Force.

With her high-performance modern aircraft, Turkey has a 60 per cent superiority over Greece. However, in the event of a conflict breaking out over the Aegean, the necessity of the Turkish Armed Forces maintaining a state of vigilance in the southern and north-eastern parts of Anatolia dictates that a significant part of the Turkish Air Force be deployed outside the Aegean Region.

Nevertheless, with the ability to shift forces afforded with the air-to-air refuelling capability, it can be argued that Turkey has relative superiority in the Aegean Region as regards air power.

The fact that Greece, whose population is about one-sixth of the population of Turkey and whose GNP is about half that of Turkey, has an annual defence spending which is nearly 80 per cent of that of Turkey (according to NATO definitions, the Greek defence budget in 1994 was \$4.34 bn while that of Turkey was \$5.3 bn) and the fact that per capita defence spending in Greece is five times as much as the per capita defence spending in Turkey (in 1994 the per capita defence spending in Greece was \$415, while it was \$87 in Turkey) demonstrates that Athens is engaged in military preparations indicating that she is planning *faits accomplis* in the Aegean which are detrimental to the vital interests of Turkey.¹

The defence cooperation agreement concluded between Greece and Syria in June 1995 has utmost significance in relation to Turkey's security. The fact that Greece and Syria, both of whom have claims over Turkey's vital interests and territory and support a covert war aiming to break up this country are in a total conformity of interest is indisputable proof that the said cooperation agreement is directed against Turkey.

Without a shadow of doubt, Athens is making designs to benefit from the said agreement with Damascus, aiming to realise her obsession of sovereignty over the Aegean.

It is also not possible to explain Greece's military build-up on the eastern Aegean islands and the Dodecanese, in blatant violation of international agreements which demilitarise them, solely on security grounds.

It is also clear that by deploying the Exocet MM-40 missiles purchased from France on the island of Lemnos directly opposite the Dardanelles, Athens aims to prevent the Turkish fleet, whose home base is in the Marmara Sea, from sailing out into the Aegean in the event of hostilities.

The reports which repeatedly appeared in the Greek press stating that the same missiles will also be deployed on the islands of Skiros and Lesbos were not denied by the Greek government. It is believed that such a deployment scheme aims to deny Turkish warships the ability to manoeuvre in a large area in the middle of the Aegean and to cut off Turkey's lines of communication between the northern and southern Aegean.

In a statement he made in September 1995, the leader of the Greek Cypriot community, Mr. Cleridis had said that Greece would build an air base in Paphos in the framework of a Greek-Greek Cypriot joint defence agreement. Although the Greek government did not confirm this statement, Greek fighter aircraft participated in the Nikiphoros 1995 military exercise conducted by the Greek Cypriot National Guard Army despite US protests and used the Paphos air base. This suggests that Athens intends to set up an air base in southern Cyprus.

A Greek air base to be established in southern Cyprus will constitute a direct military threat to Turkey. Such a development will definitely have an impact on Turkey's so far established air supremacy over Cyprus and the air cover Turkey provides to the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) and the Turkish peacekeeping force on the island. This will lead to the Turkish air bases in Diyarbakir and Incirlik to be within the range of long-range Greek A-7 aircraft which will be based on Paphos or will be refuelled from that base.

Greece's realisation of this plan is not deemed probable at this stage. This is because, in the event Greece chooses this course of action, Turkey will inevitably build an air base in the TRNC. This would, in turn, mean that Athens would herself be creating the right environment for dividing the island between Greece and Turkey.

Although Athens does not formally undertake the establishment of an air base at Paphos due to the above concerns, she has been covertly developing the said air base with an aim to using it against Turkey and the TRNC. The fact that Greek aircraft have heavily used the Paphos air base during exercise Nikiphoros-95 as a rehearsal for such operations indicates that significant progress has been achieved in this field.

All these indicate that in order to change the balance of power in her favour, Greece is striving to implement a medium- to long-term plan which has military and political aspects, without deviating in the least from her course, systematically and with maximum sacrifice on her part, and that she has made significant progress in this respect.

THE KEY TO PEACE IN THE AEGEAN

It is common knowledge that Greece's extension of her territorial waters will have grave consequences for Turkey in the fields of maritime and air traffic, economy and security.

Taking the delicate balance in the Aegean into account and considering Greece's intentions and preparations to upset this balance, Turkey adopted a determined stance in 1976. The 1st National Front government headed by the then prime minister Demirel announced unequivocally that Greece's extension of her territorial waters beyond the present six miles would be regarded as casus belli.

In fact, all issues between Turkey and Greece arising from the Aegean Sea are inextricably bound up with each other and constitute an integral whole. Therefore it would be a rational course of action to seek negotiated solutions to these problems by taking them as a whole and maintaining the basic balance struck between the two nations by the Lausanne Treaty.

However, since 1981, Greek governments have consistently preferred to reject repeated calls for negotiations Turkey has made by adopting the above attitude.

Greece has maintained that the extension of the territorial waters in the Aegean and the air space above it, militarisation of the islands which have a demilitarised status and the FIR (Flight Information Region) line are all issues concerning Greece's prerogatives of sovereignty and that the negotiation of these issues would be absolutely out of the question.²

Moreover, Greece also rejects Ankara's proposals to start talks in order to develop cultural and commercial cooperation with the aim of creating a *détente* and establishing an environment conducive to holding negotiations between the two countries on basic issues.

For her stance in this matter Athens contends that no solution for the Cyprus issue has been found yet.

Athens' policy towards Turkey results in the issues pertaining to the Aegean to be made pending and leads to the eruption of occasional disputes which could otherwise be settled by negotiations or be temporarily frozen to escalate and gain dangerous proportions due to a lack of dialogue between the two countries.

Despite the potential of such crises to erupt at any time in the Aegean and the fact that they have brought the two countries to the threshold of a conflict with each other on many occasions, Greece has intransigently refused to negotiate these issues with Turkey by claiming that they come under her rights of sovereignty. Mention was made of the designs lying behind this intransigence at the beginning of this article.

This calculated design rests on the expectation that Turkey will fall into a total state of vulnerability and destitution due to the chronic southeastern issue and the associated grave economic ailments which will in turn allow Greece the necessary opportunity to extend her territorial waters.

In order to exploit such an opportunity in the best possible circumstances, Athens is striving to change the balance of air and naval power in the Aegean in her favour and seeking allies who would be in military cooperation with her against Turkey.

Turkey's policy, on the other hand, is to make certain that Greece's *faits accomplis* in the Aegean directed at changing the status quo are prevented until Athens agrees with goodwill and serious intent to start a negotiation process which would encompass the Aegean issues in their entirety.

Turkey's policy announced in 1976 which states that any Greek initiative to extend the territorial waters in the Aegean beyond the six mile limit would be treated as *casus belli* is still valid.

In fact, the final paragraph of the Turkish Grand National Assembly resolution adopted unanimously at its 8 June 1995 session is as follows:

"The Turkish Grand National Assembly hopes that the Greek Government will not take the decision to extend her territorial waters in the Aegean beyond the six mile limit in a way that would disrupt the balance established by the Lausanne Treaty. However, it confers . . .

. all the necessary authority, including military measures, to the Government of the Republic of Turkey to protect and defend the vital interests of Turkey in such an eventuality.”

Turkey's policy of deterrence towards Greece derives its effectiveness from the national political will on this issue as well as the balance of power in the region which favours Turkey.

As mentioned earlier, the balance of power in the Aegean as regards air and naval forces is, relatively speaking, in Turkey's favour.

As for the land forces, however, Turkey has a distinct superiority. It is certain that in the event of a conflict Turkey would reinforce the basically adequate ground forces deployed in Turkish Thrace and the Aegean Region of Anatolia and thus disrupt Greece's scheme.

Moreover, the overwhelming superiority Turkey has in total national might testifies to the fact that no Greek government in its right mind would risk a war in order to seize Turkey's legitimate and vital rights in the Aegean.

To put it in other words, peace with Greece is solely dependent upon Turkey's maintaining an indisputable superiority in the balance of power between the two countries. The key to stability in the Aegean is Turkey's deterrent force.

ATATURK AND THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF CYPRUS

Cyprus has a vitally important place in Greece's strategy towards Turkey. Cyprus, which is situated in a pivotal location in relation to the control of maritime lines of trade in the eastern Mediterranean also has a vital strategic importance as regards the security of Anatolia.

Thus, the British statesman Lord Beaconsfield had said to Queen Victoria, “Cyprus is the key to Asia Minor”. The key importance of Cyprus in Turkey's defence and security was underscored by Atatürk during an exercise conducted along the southern coast of Turkey.

Atatürk had explained to the staff officers that the only coastal opening and supply route of Turkey surrounded by islands in the Aegean coast which were under the sovereignty of foreign states was in the south. He also added that opposite the southern coast of Turkey was the island of Cyprus and consequently, if Cyprus was in the hands of a hostile country all supply routes to Anatolia would be cut off and Turkey's security would be threatened.³

Atatürk had an excellent vision of the future. Today, Greece is pursuing a policy of enveloping Turkey with a strategic control belt. Cyprus is the cornerstone of this policy.

As it has been pointed out above, Greece's plan in the first instance is to establish Greek sovereignty at sea and over the Aegean. The most significant consequence of this would be to cut off Turkey's northern and western coast from her Mediterranean coast.

In the second phase, in addition to the 12 mile territorial waters, Greece intends to declare in the triangle constituted by Rhodes, Crete and Cyprus her 'contiguous' and 'exclusive economic zone'. Thus, she aims to envelop Turkey with a strategic belt from the island of Lemnos opposite the Dardanelles all the way to the Bay of Iskenderun and bring all supply routes leading to Anatolia under her control.

This explanation underscores the fact that, in addition to her responsibility towards the fate of people of Turkish origin on the island of Cyprus, in view of her vital interests Turkey would never allow solutions that would keep the door ajar for Enosis.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE TURKISH TROOPS ON CYPRUS TO STABILITY IN THE AEGEAN

At this juncture we need to emphasise yet another point. The fact that a Turkish army corps has been deployed in the northern part of the island is deeply disturbing for Athens who has schemes for the Aegean.

This is because Athens is aware that in the event that she resorts to faits accomplis detrimental to Turkey's vital interests, this will lead Turkey to take every measure in the Aegean to defend her rights in addition to drawing Cyprus into the theatre of operations.

Greeks are cognisant of the fact that in the event that they escalate the crisis in the Aegean to a hot conflict, this will force Turkey to take military measures in Cyprus. Greece is aware of her vulnerability in Cyprus. This assessment in turn leads Greece to be cautious in the Aegean. In other words, the presence of Turkish troops in Cyprus is an additional and effective deterrent compelling Greece to think twice concerning her initiatives in the Aegean.

SYRIA: GREECE'S NATURAL ALLY

However, under certain circumstances Greece may disregard Turkey's deterrent trump cards. A state of war between Syria and Turkey would create such circumstances. In such an eventuality, there is a greater probability for Greece to implement her plans concerning the Aegean. For this reason, Greece regards Syria as her natural ally.

Let us take a look at Turkey's relations with Syria at this juncture. Despite all efforts Ankara has spent since 1946 -when Syria gained her independence- to found Turkish-Syrian relations on the basis of good neighbourly relations, friendship and cooperation, Damascus never adopted a friendly attitude towards Turkey.

Syria's hostile stance stems from her territorial claims over Hatay. Damascus regards Hatay as a territory Turkey has stolen from Syria, and its recovery is a national objective priority.

The Hatay issue was placed on the back burner for a while after Israel's occupation of the Golan Heights during the 1967 war. However, with the hope of regaining the Golan Heights through Syrian-Israeli negotiations, Hatay regained its significance in the eyes of Damascus as the top national objective priority.

The other priority objective of Damascus has to do with the waters of Euphrates. Syria is concerned that the waters flowing from Turkey into Syria by Euphrates will, in time, be significantly limited as the Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP), and its irrigation projects in particular, are implemented. Syria, therefore wants to impose on Ankara a long-term agreement guaranteeing water rights. Iraq has similar demands.

If the demands of these two countries, who have formed a united front against Turkey, are met, Turkey will have to forfeit 70 per cent of the waters of Euphrates to these countries while she will have to make do with the remaining 30 per cent. This will, in effect, lead to the disruption of the GAP project.

Damascus and Baghdad refuse Turkey's proposal that Euphrates and Tigris river basins are taken up along with the entire water sources in this area and that the issue be settled in the framework of an equitable and reasonable arrangement based on technological methods and means that would optimize the use of water.⁴

Syria has fanned a civil war in Turkey by using the PKK in order to hamper the GAP project and impose on Turkey her demands concerning Euphrates. Syria expects that the threat of an independent Kurdish state being formed in Turkey's southeastern provinces will break Ankara's resistance on the water issue.

SYRIA IS CARRYING OUT A COVERT WAR IN TURKEY

Since 1982 Syria has been insistently and with perseverance carrying out her policy of dividing Turkey.

For the past 12 years, the mastermind and resources of subversive terrorism have been finding shelter in Syria and in areas under Syria's control.

Since 1982 the Syrian government has provided shelter to the PKK, provided it with arms, trained PKK militants and used them against Turkey. Syrian officials have helped terrorists infiltrate Turkish territory with their light and heavy weapons.

One point needs to be emphasised: although the void of authority in northern Iraq and Iran turning a blind eye to terrorists roaming in this area allows the PKK to find shelter in these countries' territories and launch their attacks from there, it is an indisputable fact that the chief protagonist in supporting the covert war in southeastern Turkey is Syria, who provides shelter to the PKK both in her own territory and in the territory under her control.

World history clearly testifies to the following fact: if terrorism and uprisings in one country are being conducted by a leader finding shelter and support in a neighbouring country, the said acts of terror cannot be eradicated before the foreign country in question unequivocally stops the support she is providing the terrorist leader and his staff.

Why, then, for the past 12 years, have Turkish governments abstained from implementing a policy of deterrence that would force Syria to stop PKK activities on her own territory and on territories under her control and extradite the leader of the terrorist organisation, Abdullah Öcalan, and his followers to Turkey?

Why has Turkey refrained from exercising the right of self defence afforded by international law and failed to take counter measures aimed against Syrian interests and escalate these measures until she got a result?

By saying, 'War is the continuation of politics by other means', the well-known military strategist, Clausewitz, tried to point to a wide range of alternatives that could be resorted to before reaching the stage of using military force in resolving problems between nations. There are several effective means of applying pressure on Syria that Turkey possesses -which preclude direct resorts to force. Why hasn't Ankara made use of any of these in order to deter Damascus?

By the support she provides the PKK, Syria has caused Turkey to wind up with a covert war aiming to snatch territorial gains from Turkey.

So far, 4700 civilians including women, the aged and children, and 2400 Turkish security forces personnel have lost their lives as a result of PKK attacks.

Likewise, the PKK terrorists have destroyed countless villages, sub-provinces, schools, mosques, commercial premises, vehicles, TV stations, railways, bridges and power lines.

Moreover, the covert war in southeastern Turkey has caused immeasurable suffering among the local population, collapsed the local economy, brought about the necessity to commit a 270,000 thousand strong security force to the struggle with terrorism, which in turn, devastated the economy already in dire straits and the resultant measures taken by Turkey to combat terrorism brought Turkey's relations with the West to breaking point.

One of the most damaging effects of PKK terrorism has been the way Turkey's social fabric was frayed due to the internal population movements caused by widespread acts of terror, whereby the resultant displaced persons have become terror-oriented.

The chief protagonist and responsible party for Turkey's grave losses in manpower, damage to property, intangible and spiritual sufferings is none other than Syria.

Syria has used force against Turkey's 'territorial integrity and political independence' in violation of Article 2(4) of the UN Charter.

In accordance with the UN General Assembly Resolution 380 (V) 'Peace Through Deeds', Syria has committed 'the gravest of all crimes against peace and security'.

Under paragraph 3(g) of the UN General Assembly Resolution 3314 (XXXIX) on 'Definition of Aggression', Syria's acts vis-à-vis Turkey have constituted aggression.

Syria has a population of less than one fourth of that of Turkey, her GNP and exports is one sixth as large as that of Turkey, she has no industrial base to speak of and, until recently, she had Israel breathing down her neck. She has not been receiving Soviet military aid since 1990. When the situation we have in hand is as such, how is it that Turkish governments have failed to deter Syria from conducting a covert war against Turkey? Why is it that the Turkish state is in such a state of inefficiency and disability?

The answer to this question should be sought in the assessment that it would be wrong to consider the probability of a direct conflict with Syria in isolation from other threats.

To put it more clearly, Turkey has reckoned that creating a political crisis with Syria which would escalate to a hot conflict would provide Greece with the opportunity to realise her objectives in the Aegean, and would, in turn, put Turkey in a position where she would have to conduct operations in two separate fronts.

It is this assessment that has prevented Turkey from pursuing an active policy of deterrence against Syria.

Syria, who was aware of this situation and who has exploited it fully, has continued to conduct a covert war in Turkey as well as deterring Turkey from taking measures against Syria on self-defence grounds.

SYRIA'S MILITARY POWER

Let us now take a look at Syria's military strength. From the data on Syria appearing at serious and reliable publications⁵ providing information on nations' military forces and their structures, it is evident that this country is among the leading military powers in the Middle East.

Syria has a 315,000 strong land force. This land force has an impressive armour inventory. It has 4600 Russian built main battle tanks (1500 of which are the latest model T-72s and T-72Ms, whereas 1000 are T-62Ms and 2100 are T-54s and T-55s).

Additionally, Syria has 4750 armoured infantry vehicles and armoured personnel carriers, 100 armed helicopters and what seem to be high caliber anti-tank and artillery units.

According to the same sources, the Syrian air force looks quite capable as well. Among the 579 aircraft in its air force comprising 40,000 personnel, nearly 200 aircraft are high performance modern aircraft and medium performance aircraft (20 MIG-29s, 36 MIG-25s, 20 SU-24s and 134 MIG-23s). The weapon systems mounted on these aircraft also reflect an advanced technology.

Syria also has an air command independent of the Syrian Air Force proper. This command comprising 60,000 personnel has an impressive array of weaponry as well. In addition to a large number of anti-aircraft artillery units subordinate to the said command there exists a

heavy concentration of surface-to-air guided missile units. These units have 450 SA-2/3, 48 SA-5, 200 SA-6 and 60 SA-8 missiles.

Syria also possesses a significant surface to surface missile inventory (SCUD Bs with 300km range, SS-21s with 120km range and surface-to-surface FROG-7s with 70km range).

Based on these data a comparison of Syrian and Turkish land and air forces reveals a near balance between the two sides.

However, this could be a misleading comparison. This is due to the fact that since the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Syria has not had a chance to renew her weapons of Warsaw Pact origin. It is believed that a significant portion of the Syrian weapon inventory is out of commission since Soviet military aid came to an end and the supply of spare parts has stopped.

Also, Syria's rather limited national resources (Syria's GNP is one sixth that of Turkey and her defence budget is half that of Turkey) prevent her from maintaining such a large armed force. Therefore, in the years to come, Syrian armed forces may run into serious deficiencies first and foremost in the air force and air defence forces.

Taking the above facts into consideration it can be said that Turkey has a clear superiority over Syria as regards a comparison of the two countries' armed forces.

THE IMPACT OF THE SYRIAN-ISRAELI PEACE ON TURKEY

Let us now turn our attention to the southeastern Turkey theatre of operations. When making a comparison of military strength in this area one has to consider the fact that a significant portion of Syrian forces are committed against Israel while some are deployed in Lebanon.

This being the case, in the present circumstances it would not be wrong to suggest that in the southeastern theatre, there is a balance of power between the Syrian and Turkish military forces. In fact it could be said that Turkey enjoys a relative superiority.

However, if the dispute over the Golan Heights is settled and a Syrian-Israeli peace accord goes into effect, this balance will immediately change against Turkey.

When peace is struck between Syria and Israel, Damascus can be expected to pursue her objectives concerning Syrian demands over Hatay and the waters of Euphrates much more actively. This would inevitably lead to strong tensions in Turkish-Syrian relations.

In the event that Turkey's relations with Syria develop in this direction, it is highly probable that Greece's adventurist and unrealistic tendencies will increase.

Greece and Syria are the arch supporters of the PKK. There exists a tacit alliance between the two countries against Turkey. In any case, it would be realistic for Turkey to assess the possibility of a hot conflict with any one of these countries with the assumption that the other one would open a new front against Turkey.

DOES RUSSIA CONSTITUTE A PRIORITY THREAT?

Let us now take a look at the Russian Federation's place in Turkey's threat assessment.

In relations between Turkey and Russia, competition and cooperation are competing with each other.

The fact that there exist no questions of sovereignty between the two countries, that both sides desire to maximise the benefits to be drawn from the great potential of cooperation afforded by the complementary nature of the two countries' economies, that there is a substantial and promising increase in trade and that Turkish contractors find extensive business opportunities in Russia are bringing Ankara and Moscow closer to each other.

In contrast, Russia's placing of obstacles in the way of Turkey's efforts to develop relations with the Turkic Republics, her attitude concerning the route of the pipelines which will transport the Caspian Sea petroleum and the transport of this oil through the Turkish Straits, her efforts to violate the balance of power foreseen in the CFE agreement and her initiatives to pressure the Caucasus republics to deploy Russian troops in these republics, are developments which cause deep concern in Ankara.

Despite these developments, it is observed that the two countries have a strong political will to expand their mutual area of interest, to minimise points of contention and to be careful and respectful to the sensitivities of each other.

In the light of the above it would not be wrong to state that Russia does not constitute an urgent threat for Turkey.

In fact, the Russian armed forces which still maintains its power and effectiveness on the former Soviet Union territories, seems unable to resort to power projection beyond these borders.

This fact was clearly stated in a report submitted to the Defence Committee of the German parliament by the Federal German Foreign Ministry. German Foreign Ministry. The German report said, the Russian military was suffering from a shortage of manpower and funding, poor training, excessive use of war stocks and a decline in the manufacture of major weapon systems. Consequently, Russia's current power projection capability must be considered insufficient to operate outside the former Soviet Union.⁶

Nevertheless, Turkey must include the Russian Federation in her threat assessment rating. The main reason for this precaution is the possibility that due to social and political instabilities, the likes of Jirinowski may come to power and pursue expansionist policies.

NATO HAS NO CONTRIBUTION TO MAKE TO TURKEY'S DEFENCE

Let us for a moment assume that Russia has embarked upon a massive attack against Turkey. In such an eventuality Turkey can no longer rely on NATO. With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, NATO has totally lost its function of providing support for Turkey's defence.

However, since such an attack would alter the entire strategic balance of power in the region, the concern that this would completely open the Persian Gulf to Russian influence would, at some point in the conflict, urge the US to take action and come to Turkey's assistance.

In any case, in the event of such a conflict, Turkey will have to fight it out against the aggressor for a considerable length of time solely through her own means.

We must point out though, Moscow's resort to such an attack, which would mean a change in the entire global strategy and one which would cost Moscow dearly in political terms, is highly unlikely.

The threats to be included in Turkey's threat assessment rating are undoubtedly not confined to the above. However, the limited scope of this article has made it imperative that only the highest priority threats be taken up and conclusions be drawn from them. It

would not be wrong to suggest that a study encompassing a wider range of threats would cause little change in the conclusions arrived at here.

TURKEY'S NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY AND HER TWO-AND-A-HALF WAR STRATEGY

The explanations provided above lead us to the following significant conclusions and principles:

1. The multi-directional threat of armed conflict Turkey is presently faced with is much more urgent and multifaceted compared with the threat the Warsaw Pact directed against the NATO nations under the leadership of the Soviet Union during the Cold War era,
2. Turkey benefiting from NATO's collective defence should not be counted on any more. From now on Turkey has to fight against any threat directed to her survival and security solely by her own national means.
3. In the event that Turkey is forced to engage in armed conflict with any of her neighbours, external support to the PKK must be expected to increase and the internal threat must be expected to tie up a much greater military force.
4. Greece and Syria, who have claims on Turkey's vital interests and territory, are united by joint interest against Turkey. These countries have been providing every possible aid to the PKK in order to bring Turkey to heel. There exists a tacit alliance between the two countries against Turkey. Turkey must build her strategy of defence against these countries on the assumption that she would be forced to fight against them simultaneously on two separate fronts.
5. Although her strategic location allows Turkey to conduct a strategy of interior lines defence against Greece and Syria, Turkey cannot base her defence plans on a concept of operations whereby, following a decisive victory on one front, she would then shift her forces to the second front to win a decisive victory there. This is because the potential aggressors would most probably synchronise their operations.
6. In other words, reliable defence compels Turkey to adopt a strategy based on adequate, deterrent and rapidly reinforcing forces in both the Aegean and the southern fronts.
7. In the face of a threat directed from the north, the most appropriate course of action for Turkey would be to conduct operations based on area defence where she would be able to employ her forces in depth, using extremely mobile units with effective fire power. One of the two basic tasks of this force would be to effectively compensate for the unfavourable force ratio between forces in the event of an attack to be launched from the north, by delaying actions and active defence. The second task would be to constitute a reinforcement for the southern front.
8. All these add up to the necessity of Turkey effecting its defence planning on 'two-and-a-half campaigns', i.e., conducting two full scale operations simultaneously along the Aegean and southern fronts while at the same time being prepared for a "half war" that might be instigated from within the country.

Drawing up a force structure accordingly and equipping this force with high-technology weapons and equipment will necessarily require Turkey to significantly increase her defence spending.

For Turkey, war is the last resort for maintaining her security. Therefore, she regards a foreign policy of deterrence as the front line defence for maintaining her security.

However, no matter how capable a foreign policy might be, it cannot be stronger than the military might it relies on.

Therefore, Turkey's ability to live in peace in her region and realise the welfare of her people depends on her possession of a strong and deterrent force.

As can be observed, while we are about to enter the 21st century, the top priority for Turkey is to be able to strike a sound balance between her survival and her welfare. Clearly, this can only be achieved by a stable economy with a dynamic structure.