

THE LIMITS OF GOOD INTENTIONS: THE CAUCASUS AS A TEST CASE FOR TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY

The complexity of the challenges facing the Caucasus makes it a litmus test for Turkey's new foreign policy. The region illuminates the strengths and weaknesses of "zero problems with neighbours", as well as the need to encourage "zero problems between neighbours" in pursuit of Turkish interests. Turkey's influence in the Caucasus provides a strong opportunity to help resolve the region's political and security challenges. However Ankara's recent efforts in the region have been largely unsuccessful, due to economic dependencies, domestic politics and the reality of regional geopolitics. Recent diplomacy in the Caucasus demonstrates that 'zero problems with neighbours' is not always a successful approach.

Alexander Jackson*



* Alexander Jackson is Senior Editor of the Caucasian Review of International Affairs. He holds an MA in War Studies from Kings College London, with a focus on Caspian politics and security issues.

“Zero Problems” in Context

Turkish foreign policy as outlined by Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu and Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan emphasises proactive diplomacy (bilaterally and multilaterally). This manifests in peacemaking and soft power in pursuit of peace and development in surrounding regions, with the aim of supporting Turkey’s own progress. Although an admirable concept, “zero problems with neighbors” should be evaluated with reference to truly challenging environments. It is easy to improve relations when the regional environment is conducive to peace (i.e. improvements in Turkey-Greece relations); it is far more challenging to do so in complex and conflicting environments. In the Caucasus, that environment became stark with the August 2008 war between Russia and Georgia.

Turkish foreign policy in the Caucasus since the August War has failed to achieve its aims, and has demonstrated the limitations of the current Turkish foreign-policy doctrine. It is unlikely that any foreign policy approach could have succeeded in the Caucasus during this difficult period; however, this does not alter the fact that the Turkish approach is not succeeding in the Caucasus and is unlikely to do so without major shifts in domestic and geopolitical trends.

Turkish Foreign Policy Theory

The evolution of Turkish foreign policy has been comprehensively addressed elsewhere.¹ It suffices to say that after a close embrace with the Muslim world during the Ottoman Empire, the changes wrought by Atatürk ushered in a staunchly pro-Western and pro-NATO orientation, particularly during the Cold War. The fall of the USSR saw the end of Turkey’s role as NATO’s “frontline state” against the Soviet Union and created new opportunities for Turkey to assert itself in Eurasia. The AKP era has seen a significant shift in Turkey’s foreign policy. Much ink has been spilled over whether the AKP is “turning East,” moving away from its traditional allies and toward states which are viewed with hostility by the West. This shift has been driven by one man, Ahmet Davutoğlu.

As Prime Minister Erdoğan’s foreign policy adviser since 2002 and Foreign Minister from 2009, Ahmet Davutoğlu has had an enormous impact on Turkish foreign policy. He has provided institutional energy and an intellectual framework for Turkey’s relations with the world. His prescription for Turkish foreign policy rests on five pillars.² First, the need to balance security with liberty at home. Second, the “zero problems with neighbors policy.” Third, the related aim of developing and

¹ Graham Fuller, *The New Turkish Republic* (Washington: USIP, 2008).

² Ahmet Davutoğlu, “Turkey’s Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007”, *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 79-83.

strengthening relations with neighboring regions. Fourth, adhering to a multidimensional foreign policy, in which Turkey “considers its membership process to the EU, its good neighborhood policy with Russia, and its synchronization policy in Eurasia as integral parts of a consistent policy that serves to complete each other.”³ The final pillar is “rhythmic diplomacy”: increasing the intensity of Turkish diplomatic activity.

All five pillars support the overall goal of Turkish foreign policy: “help secure and nurture a peaceful, prosperous, stable and cooperative environment that is conducive to human development at home and its neighborhood.”⁴ The Caucasus is not a region which could be described in those terms, raising the question of how successful Turkish diplomacy towards the region has been.

The Caucasus in the AKP Era

The Caucasus has not traditionally been a priority for modern Turkey. To a large extent, relations with the Caucasus have been conditioned by relations with Russia (see below), and despite a brief hope for a “pan-Turkic moment” following the fall of the USSR, Turkey did not behave as a revisionist power in the region throughout the 1990s and early 2000s.⁵ Today, Turkish interests in the Caucasus can be broadly grouped into three categories: ideational, economic, and strategic interests.

Core ideational interests include notions of pan-Turkic solidarity, which underpins the fraternal relationship with Azerbaijan; and hostility towards Armenia, in light of the events of 1915 and perceived Armenian irredentism (towards Turkey and, in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, Azerbaijan). Lingering historical memories of repeated wars with Russia also fall in this category.

Turkey’s main economic interest in the Caucasus is energy and the region’s role as a transit corridor for Caspian gas and oil to the west.⁶ To be clear, the Caucasus form only one aspect of Turkey’s aspirations to become a regional energy hub: Russia, as well as Iran and the Middle East, are also key pillars of this strategy. This is in line with Ankara’s broader foreign policy doctrine of multipolarity and developing close ties with all neighbors. Economic cooperation in other fields is growing. Turkey’s trade with Georgia and Azerbaijan grew from 334 million dollars

³ Ahmet Davutoğlu, “Turkey’s Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007”, *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 10, No. 1), pp. 82.

⁴ “Synopsis of the Turkish Foreign Policy”, *Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/synopsis-of-the-turkish-foreign-policy.en.mfa>

⁵ Mohiaddin Mesbahi, “Eurasia between Russia, Turkey and Iran” in Maria Raquel Friere and Roger E. Kanet (eds.), *Key Players and Regional Dynamics in Eurasia* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010) p.170.

⁶ Yusuf Yazar, “Turkey’s Role and Priorities in Enhancement of Security if Oil and Gas Supplies” *SETA Policy Brief*, November 2010, p.6.

in 2002 to 2.3 billion dollars in 2010. Trade with Armenia remains unofficial, via third countries like Georgia, but reached an estimated 300 million dollars in 2009.⁷

In strategic terms, Turkey seeks stability above all: promoting regional peace is central to the Davutoğlu doctrine. However, the shape of this stability and the role of outside powers is still a contested idea, largely due to the enduring influence of Russia.

Turkey and Russia: An Unbalanced Partnership

In the late 1990s Turkey began viewing Russia less as a potential threat and more as a vital partner, largely due to a remarkable growth in economic ties. In 2010, Russia was Turkey's largest import partner (at 21.5 billion dollars) and sixth-largest export partner.⁸ Combined with a resurgence of Russia's geopolitical influence

"The Caucasus form only one aspect of Turkey's aspirations to become a regional energy hub; Russia, as well as Iran and the Middle East, are also key pillars of this strategy"

and growing dissatisfaction with the West, Turkish policymakers conceded that it did not serve Turkey's interests to directly compete with its northern neighbor in their shared strategic backyard of the Caucasus. Instead, Turkish cooperation with the Caucasian states has been carefully balanced by a strategic partnership with Russia and a tacit acceptance of Russia's geopolitical predominance. A high-level cooperation council has been established allowing for institutionalised intergovernmental discussions.

The biggest factor shaping the Turkish-Russian relationship is energy, largely because of Turkey's growing economy and lack of domestic supplies. Russia now accounts for around 70 percent of Turkish gas imports, and both countries are also closely cooperating on various energy projects on Turkish territory. Although Ankara has recently announced plans to reduce its reliance on Russian energy,⁹ and although Turkey retains some leverage on key infrastructure,¹⁰ in the medium-term it will remain dependent on its northern neighbor.

⁷ "Turkey-Armenia trade volume reaches \$300 million" *World Bulletin*, 2 February 2010.

⁸ Turkish Statistical Institute, http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?tb_id=12&ust_id=4

⁹ Şaban Kardaş, "Turkey Unleashes New Energy Strategy Plan", *Eurasia Daily Monitor*, 29 April 2010, [http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews\[tt_news\]=36331&tx_ttnews\[backPid\]=27&cHash=5529642850](http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews[tt_news]=36331&tx_ttnews[backPid]=27&cHash=5529642850)

¹⁰ Author's conversation with Gareth Winrow, January 2010.

In an attempt to avoid over-dependence on Russian energy, Turkey has also supported alternative energy initiatives, in particular the Nabucco project to bring Caspian and Iraqi gas to Europe, as part of its broader strategy to become an energy hub. However, “Turkey struggles with this as its actions irritate neighbors it counts on for energy transit success,”¹¹ notably Azerbaijan. As well as political disputes, commercial disagreements continue to cast doubts on Nabucco.

Specifically, Ankara has sought to be more than just a transit country: it demanded 15% of all the gas for Nabucco transiting Turkish territory, which could be used for domestic consumption or re-export to third parties: this would have made the project commercially unsustainable. However, the increased role of the Turkish foreign ministry in energy policy discussions with Azerbaijan and with the EU has provided a greater awareness of the strategic rationale behind Nabucco, and Turkey eventually suspended its demands.¹² Nonetheless, the project remains distant and Turkey remains heavily dependent on Russian energy. The impact of this lopsided connection significantly affects the broader contours of the relationship between the two; and the Ankara-Moscow dynamic is a key determinant in defining the success of Turkish foreign policy.

Turkey in the Georgia-Russia War

As a result of the conflict between Russia and Georgia in August 2008, core elements of Turkish regional policy “were effectively blown up.”¹³ Ankara’s cautious attempts to accommodate Russian influence, whilst strengthening Turkey’s own role and integrating the Caucasus into the West, were shattered.

The crisis was a serious test of Turkey’s foreign policy. How did the principles of “zero problems with neighbors” and “equidistance” hold up when two of those neighbors were engaged in outright war? Indeed, Ankara found itself in the middle of two conflicting relationships: between Russia and Georgia, but also between Russia and the West. American attempts to send ships through the Bosphorus to Georgian ports were blocked by Turkey – in line with the Montreux Convention governing the straits but also under public pressure from Russia.¹⁴ In other words, Turkey attempted to balance between traditional security allies and its new economic partner.

¹¹ Zeynep Dereli, “Toward a Grander Turkish Energy Strategy”, *Foreign Policy Centre*, <http://fpc.org.uk/articles/476>

¹² Gareth Winrow, “Problems And Prospects For The “Fourth Corridor”: The Positions And Role Of Turkey In Gas Transit To Europe” *Oxford Institute of Energy Studies*, June 2009.

¹³ Igor Torbakov, “The Georgia Crisis and Russia-Turkey Relations”, *Jamestown Foundation*, November 2008, p.6.

¹⁴ Gareth Winrow, “Turkey, Russia and the Caucasus: Common and Diverging Interests”, *Chatham House Briefing Paper*, November 2009, p.6.

The alleged participation of mercenaries from Turkey on the Georgian side also contributed to Russian irritation, leading to the intensification of a trade row that ultimately cost Turkey three billion dollars. Although apparently coincidental, it was believed that the trade row and the crippling of east-west energy routes during the war were intended to underline Turkey's dependence on Russia.¹⁵ In fact the main blow to Turkey's energy links came just before the war's outbreak, when a terror attack hit the BTC pipeline in eastern Turkey – the attack was claimed by the PKK, but the timing and alignment with Russian objectives led to suspicions that Moscow was responsible.¹⁶

The extent to which Turkish officials acknowledged their energy and economic dependency on Russia, and how this dependency constrained their actions in the war, is notable. Prime Minister Erdoğan accepted that Turkey could not afford disputes with Russia – “otherwise, we would be kept in the dark.”¹⁷ This is both entirely realistic and remarkably candid. That assessment succinctly demonstrates the major limitation of Turkey's Caucasus policy – that its reliance on Russian energy has curtailed its freedom to challenge Moscow's actions, allowing Russia to impose its own vision on the region even when this contradicts Turkish interests.

The dilemma created by economic dependence was accompanied by a dilemma created by political independence. Assessments that the Russia-Georgia war indicated a “New Cold War” were off the mark in one sense – Turkey was no longer firmly in the Western camp, as during the Cold War. Although deeply dissatisfied with Russia's invasion, for Turkey to align itself unequivocally with Georgia and the West would have run contrary to the AKP's policy of political multipolarity, and damaged its growing geopolitical independence. Hence the Prime Minister's statement that “It would not be right for Turkey to be pushed toward any side.”¹⁸

In the end, although Ankara joined Western-led calls in support of Georgia's territorial integrity, it did so cautiously. In sum, the conflict was a profound shock and a challenge for Turkey. It demonstrated that Russia was willing to reshape the Caucasus at will and that Turkey's freedom to respond was limited. In a sense, Turkish independence –freedom of action– was shown to be diminished where hard power issues like security and power politics were concerned.

¹⁵ Bülent Aras “Turkey and the Russian Federation: An Emerging Multidimensional Partnership” SETA Policy Brief No. 35, August 2009, p.8.

¹⁶ Discussions with Western energy expert in Baku, December 2010.

¹⁷ Torbakov (2008) p.15.

¹⁸ Bülent Aliriza, “Turkey and the Crisis in the Caucasus” CSIS Commentary, 9 September 2008, p.2, http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/080909_aliriza_caucuses.pdf

The Caucasus Stability and Cooperation Platform

In an attempt to maintain its balancing policy, in August 2008 Prime Minister Erdoğan called for a Caucasus Stability and Cooperation Platform. The CSCP echoes earlier Turkish initiatives along the same lines, but should be understood in the specific post-war context of August 2008. Notably, the platform was not discussed with Western allies but was abruptly announced in Moscow, which itself demonstrates Ankara's need to be seen working with –rather than against– Russia.

Former Foreign Minister Ali Babacan described the CSCP, bringing together the three Caucasian states along with Russia and Turkey, as a “platform to facilitate the communication between the countries of the region, a framework to develop stability, confidence and cooperation, a forum for dialogue.”¹⁹ Turkish officials were keen to stress that the initiative was complementary to existing structures, notably EU efforts in the region and the OSCE's Minsk Group (tasked with the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict).

The CSCP was an ambitious attempt to actualise Turkey's “zero problems with neighbors” concept. Unlike other Turkish diplomatic or mediation initiatives in the Middle East, this was boldly multilateral. Furthermore, it was an attempt to re-shape the geopolitical discourse in the region, away from a “grand chessboard” of great power confrontation, and towards a region whose security issues were decided through peaceful dialogue, by regional states only.

However, the concept of the CSCP has two fundamental flaws that undermine the success of Turkish foreign policy in the region. First, given the asymmetry of the Turkish-Russian relationship, the proposal's format would cede de facto leadership of the Caucasus to Moscow. Excluding non-regional powers –i.e. the EU and U.S.– would provide justification to block or disrupt the EU presence in Georgia, the UN-mandated Geneva talks between parties to the Georgian crisis, and the OSCE Minsk Group in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Russia's significant influence in all regional conflicts would allow it to shape political processes, including those of peace and war, in the Caucasus. The Russia-Georgia war already demonstrated this reality, but the CSCP would have institutionalised it. Turkish input would remain limited to the extent that Russia permitted. It is therefore unsurprising that Moscow strongly supported the initiative.

¹⁹ Ali Babacan, “Calming The Caucasus”, *New York Times*, 23 September 2008.

Second, although the existence of so many conflicts in the Caucasus creates an urgent need for dialogue, these conflicts also make an effective multilateral platform almost impossible. Georgia was cool towards any platform involving Russia; neither Armenia nor Azerbaijan were enthusiastic. As of February 2011, the CSCP has not progressed beyond the stage of preliminary discussions.

Why then, did Ankara propose this project? Some analysts argue that the proposal was the best that Turkey could do – an attempt to show that, in line with its “proactive” foreign policy, it was doing something rather than nothing.²⁰ If so, then the aim has not been successful.

Despite regular “rhythmic diplomacy”, the CSCP failed to fulfil two of Davutoğlu’s principles. It did not suggest a multidimensional conception of foreign policy, as it excluded other actors – even regional powers like Iran and Turkish allies like the EU. Most significantly, it exposed the blunt truth that enthusiasm to mediate disputes is not enough to solve regional problems. Political will from all parties is essential – the repeated failure of the Geneva talks is clear evidence of this – and in the Caucasus it does not sufficiently exist to support a multilateral platform for dialogue. Proactive Turkish foreign policy and much-vaunted soft power could not change that.

Turkey, Armenia and Azerbaijan

Acknowledging the need for regional peace, Turkey did make energetic steps towards rapprochement with Armenia after the war, although this was done on a bilateral, more manageable basis. Indeed, the complexity of multilateral peace-making is illustrated by the demise of the Turkish-Armenian thaw as a direct result of Azerbaijan’s role in the process.

In September 2008 Turkish President Abdullah Gül travelled to Yerevan to watch a football match, a breakthrough following years of infrequent, largely unsuccessful meetings between officials on both sides, as well as the quiet development of business links. The “football diplomacy” paved the way for over a year of relative thaw between Ankara and Yerevan which culminated in October 2009 with the signing of protocols discussing the normalization of relations, the opening of borders and discussion of “the historical dimension” – i.e. the events of 1915. The atmosphere around the signing was tense, with a long delay over the intended statement which would be made by the Turkish delegation; in the event, no statements were issued by either side. Following repeated delays and recriminations, the protocols were formally suspended by Armenia in April 2010.

²⁰ Author’s conversation with Gareth Winrow, January 2010.

The difficulties faced in the rapprochement comprised two overlapping factors. First is the domestic reaction. Despite the AKP's strong popular mandate, and despite growing liberal support for a rapprochement with Armenia, opposition was fierce. In late March 2009, the AKP saw a decline in its share of the vote compared to the 2007 general election (from 46.6 percent to 38.9 percent, although the results are not strictly comparable). In this political environment, the AKP was understandably sensitive regarding backlash to its Armenia policy.²¹ Opposition parties accused the government of selling out Turkish interests, and in Armenia, domestic hostility was even fiercer. Both governments in turn accused each other of introducing new conditions, leading to the stalling of the process.

This demonstrates that a healthy, functioning democracy is not always conducive to a complex foreign policy. Davutoğlu's approach prioritises "total performance in foreign policy", drawing in actors including business, NGOs, and civil society. This is in line with the emphasis on soft power in Turkey's new strategic discourse. However, it does not sufficiently consider the role of independent domestic constituencies in hindering foreign policy goals. Given the polarised, confrontational nature of Turkish politics, this is a serious factor.

The second factor that stalled the protocols is the linking of the thaw with the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Turkish links with Azerbaijan run deep at both the ideational (linguistic and ethnic) and strategic (energy and military cooperation) levels – shared historical memories of conflict with Armenia helps to shape both.²² When Ankara announced the thaw with Yerevan, it therefore provoked fury in Baku for seeming to ignore the linkage with Nagorno-Karabakh. In other words, Armenia would gain the political and economic benefits of relations with Turkey without having to concede anything on Nagorno-Karabakh.

"Ankara's foreign policy paradigm is impressive and in other regions has shown the merits of historically aware, multipolar, pro-active and "full spectrum" policy. However, the Caucasus demonstrates the limits of the paradigm"

²¹ Şaban Kardaş, "Turkey's Local Elections Forces Reconsideration of Domestic and Foreign Policies", *Jamestown Eurasia Daily Monitor*, 1 April 2009.

²² Fuller (2008), p.135.

In the face of threats to its energy supply²³ and to its political friendship with Azerbaijan, Ankara changed tack and announced that the normalisation of relations was dependent upon progress in Nagorno-Karabakh. This pattern of denying and insisting upon linkage continued, reflecting Turkey's binary choice between relations with Armenia or Azerbaijan. The Turkish-Armenian thaw is therefore likely to be stalled without further progress on Nagorno-Karabakh to soften Azerbaijan's pressure on Turkey. However, it is unlikely that the domestic atmosphere in Armenia would permit withdrawal from Karabakh and rapprochement with Turkey at the same time.

In any case, Turkey's influence in Nagorno-Karabakh is limited. Ankara is not trusted as an impartial mediator by Armenia and has almost no leverage over it, unlike Russia, which has overshadowed the US in pushing for a settlement of the conflict. Military threats or cutting the existing informal economic ties would jeopardise other foreign-policy priorities like Russia and the EU. Given the ideological hostility of some Armenian constituencies towards Turkey, this would also probably backfire, hardening hostility towards "Turks", including Azeris, rather than encouraging compromise.

The Armenia-Azerbaijan-Turkey triangle further demonstrates that Turkish foreign policy in the Caucasus is not succeeding. Turkey's deep historical, ideational and strategic involvement in this three-way relationship is a severe impediment to its ability to promote peace. The AKP cannot achieve a bilateral peace with Yerevan without risking electoral losses and alienation of Baku, which runs contrary to Turkish aspirations to be a regional energy hub and gain strategic access to Eurasia; nor can Turkey influence the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict (and thus help to advance its own bilateral peace with Armenia).

Turkish policy is essentially held hostage by domestic politics: in Armenia, in Azerbaijan, and in Turkey itself.²⁴ These constituencies and their ideologies reinforce the zero-sum nature of regional politics, preventing Turkey from playing a constructive peacemaking role. Consequently, Turkey has paused its rapprochement with Armenia until domestic politics in Ankara and Baku allow it to do otherwise, and left the settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict to the Kremlin – another illustration of Turkey's strategic subordination to Russia in the Caucasus.

²³ Shahin Abbasov, "Azerbaijan: Is Baku Ready To Cause Geopolitical Problems Over Turkish-Armenian Thaw?" *Eurasianet*, 13 April 2009. <http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/insightb/articles/eav041409.shtml>

²⁴ Alexander Jackson, "The Internal Dynamics of Armenia's Karabakh Policy", *Caucasus Update*, 20 July 2009, http://cria-online.org/CU_-_file_-_article_-_sid_-_55.html

The Limits of Good Intentions

Three main issues have affected the Caucasus since the Russia-Georgia war from the Turkish perspective. Firstly, the fallout from the Russia-Georgia war itself. This not only shattered the regional status quo, which was to Turkey's advantage, but also forced Ankara into accepting the Russian action as a *fait accompli*, explicitly because of Turkish dependency on Russian energy – a vindication, if ever there was one, of Russia's strategy of using energy to further its political goals. Despite Turkish concerns over Russia's military intervention, recognition of Abkhazian and South Ossetian independence, and threats to the Caucasus energy corridor – which all challenged Turkish interests– Ankara was unable to act.

This should be considered a failure of Turkey's foreign policy. The drawback of a "multipolar" foreign policy, in this instance, was that Turkey was neither aligned with its traditional Atlantic allies nor cooperating with Russia. It gained no geopolitical benefits from this position, nor did it help Turkey to promote stability and peace in the neighborhood.

Secondly, Turkey's longer-term response, the CSCP, was announced in Moscow to underline Ankara's awareness of the new reality. The CSCP had little chance of operating, as was clear to most analysts at the time, and was intended mainly to show Turkey's willingness to build stability. The fact that the CSCP only exists on paper indicates that Davutoğlu's appetite for Turkey to act as a regional peace broker is not enough.

In fact, proximity to a region can be a hindrance as well as an aide for diplomacy. This is demonstrated by the third main issue, the Armenia-Azerbaijan-Turkey triangle. The Georgian war created new urgency regarding the settlement of this tangled situation, and Turkey's initial outreach to the Armenian leadership was a successful example of the power of Turkish diplomacy. However, like the CSCP, this seemed short-sighted: the leadership in Ankara had not consulted Azerbaijan sufficiently and were caught off guard by Baku's reaction. Like the approach to the Russia-Georgia war, this also required Turkey to make a binary choice between abstract concepts of multilateral peace and tangible interests like energy. Acknowledging that Azerbaijan was more important than Armenia, and that domestic constituencies at home as well as in Baku and Yerevan were holding back the process, Turkey accepted a return to the status quo and the threat of instability.

Turkish foreign policy is not unique in its inability to build peace in the Caucasus. Since the fall of the Soviet Union outside actors have tried and failed to resolve the region's conflicts. The OSCE Minsk Group has been attempting to foster a peaceful solution to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict since 1994, for instance. Neither

the U.S., Iran, nor the EU have possessed the geopolitical capability to engineer a peaceful settlement, largely because these conflicts are not just geopolitical. As the Armenia-Azerbaijan-Turkey triangle shows, regional conflicts are grounded in historical perceptions and elite politics.²⁵ Foreign policy cannot easily erase or counteract these concerns, particularly when the active state is negatively perceived by one of the conflict parties.

Ankara's foreign policy paradigm, based on Ahmet Davutoğlu's intellectual framework, is impressive and in other regions has shown the merits of historically aware, multipolar, pro-active and "full spectrum" policy. However, the Caucasus demonstrates the limits of the paradigm. Calling for peaceful development is challenging when dependent on one of the conflict parties; advocating regional stability is difficult when historical, political and security tensions are so complex. Above all the Caucasus's diametrically opposed, binary security relationships demonstrate that hard choices must often be made. Contrary to Mr Davutoğlu's oft-repeated belief, security in the Caucasus remains, for the most part, a zero-sum game.

²⁵ Houman Sadri, *Global Security Watch: The Caucasus States* (California: Praeger 2010), pp.138-139.