

The Place of Turkestan in the Foreign Political Strategy of Germany in the First Half of the 20th Century

Gulzhaukhar Kokebayeva*

Abstract

The German foreign interests in Western (Russian) Turkestan are explored in this article. The article begins with a short historical review. The strength of German interest during both World Wars and the interwar period is described in the main part of the article, which consists of three chapters. Turkestan became an object of German policy because it seemingly compensated for lost colonies. German authorities considered the possibility of getting concessions in Turkestan from the Soviet government. However, the Soviet authorities sought to strengthen state control and refused the opportunity to mobilize foreign investment in Soviet economy. During the Second World War, the policy of the Third Reich that concerned Soviet republics of Central Asia was connected with the idea of satellite states formation. The period of the active 'Turkestan' policy of Germany ended after the defeat of the Third Reich in the Second World War.

Keywords

Turkestan, Soviet-German relations, Turkic peoples, Great Turkestan, Muslims, Soviet power

* Prof. Dr., Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Faculty of History, Archeology and Ethnology -Almaty / Kazakhstan.
kokebayeva@mail.ru

Introduction

Turkestan – the birthplace of the ancestors of the Turkic peoples – for centuries has been at the crossroads of interests of major powers in the world. British and Russian colonial expansion in Asia led to a confrontation between the two empires in Central Asia, and Turkestan turned out in the collision zone of Anglo-Russian geopolitical interests. However, the contradictions of these two powers subsequently have been placed into the background, and a part of Turkestan, referred to in pre-Soviet literature as the ‘Western Turkestan’ or ‘Russian Turkestan’, was fully captured and incorporated into the Russian Empire (in the post-Soviet period, this region is designated as Central Asia), and Great Britain came to a halt near the northern borders of Afghanistan. The conquest of Western Turkestan considerably strengthened military, political and diplomatic positions of Russia, which came to the Caspian Sea coast inhabited by Kazakhs and Turkmens and to the borders of Afghanistan, China and India.

One of the characteristic features of Anglo-Russian rivalry in the last third of 19th – early 20th century was the aspiration of British and Russian authorities to reach disambiguation through negotiations. In the course of Anglo-Russian talks, some agreements of important historical significance were signed. For example, agreements from 1872-1873, 1885-1887 and 1895 had established borders existing now in Central Asia. These problems have been extensively studied in the world historical science. Most researchers hold the opinion that in the 20th century Turkestan was turned into a ‘closed’ region of the Russian Empire (later the USSR) and the Western countries have lost interest in it. However, in the 20th century, interest in Turkestan surfaced. Interest increased due to the rising new industrial power – Germany.

One of the most studied aspects of foreign affairs is the history of development of Soviet-German collaboration in political, economic, military, scientific and cultural spheres. These research studies include works of S. Haffner, S. Salzman, J. Förster, H.-W. Rautenberg, M. Lutz and other (Haffner 2002, Salzman 2003, Förster 1991, Lutz 2011). We should emphasize two treatises directly concerned with our problem. The doctoral dissertation of Franziska Torma devoted to studying the history of German scientific expeditions to Turkestan in the period of 1890-1930. The researcher emphasized

that economic interests in Turkestan took central place in the foreign policy of the Weimar Germany (Germans desired to participate in cotton production and railway construction). The author gives a detailed description of the expedition of 1928 to Pamir that was a major political and scientific project of the Weimar Republic (Torma 2011). The second work is the doctoral dissertation of Matthias Heeke; one part of the paper is devoted to the story of travel of foreign tourists in Soviet Central Asia (Heeke 2003: 259-268).

I. Premises of the Emergence of Germany's Interest in Turkestan

During the First World War, Germany's alliance with Turkey and the need to ensure favorable conditions for the successful promotion of the armies of the Central Powers in the Caucasus, led by German politicians and diplomats, developed an active interest in the Muslim peoples of the Russian Empire. This is evidenced by 'The project of revolutionizing of the Islamic regions of our enemy', prepared by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany in 1916. This document outlines the strategic and tactical questions used in Germany for the liberation struggle of the Muslim people in the colonies of the Entente. Section six of this paper is devoted to the Islamic regions of the Russian Empire. It was during this period that the foundations of Germany's Turkestan policy were laid out, which later played a significant role in the fight against the Soviet Union. 'In 1910', according to the author, who writes of the project, 'in the European part of Russia, namely in the Crimea and east of it, and in the Urals, approximately 4.66 million Muslims reside. In the Caucasus region, about one-third of the population of 4.83 million, are of Islamic religion. Russian Asia (Khiva, Bukhara, the Kirghiz steppe and Russian Turkestan), with a population of approximately 10 million, is almost entirely Muslim, most of which are Sunnis. Thus, in the Russian state, there are approximately 19 million Muslims, which is about 11 % of the population' (Denkschriften Oppenheim). In the realization of this project a certain role was to be played by the Muslim prisoners of war. Under the provisions of the Hague Convention signed by 42 States on October 18, 1907, military prisoners have complete freedom of worship. To ensure the possibility of performing Islamic religious rituals, they decided to gather all Muslims prisoners from the colonies of the Entente in two camps located at Wünsdorf and Zossen and, later, a common name

was given to these two camps, that of 'Islamic camp'. The 'Islamic camp' contained more than 100,000 Muslim prisoners of war from the colonies of the Entente (Mühlen 1971: 34). Muslim prisoners of war from Russia (the Caucasus and the Volga region) were held in the main camp at Zossen where some fled to Turkey to participate in military operations against British forces in the Baghdad front (Sowjetunion: 104, Spuler 1949: 185).

There were no Muslim natives of Turkestan among the prisoners, as they were not subject to conscription into the army of the Russian Empire. However, German authorities were interested in Turkestan – the largest colony of Russia – though not less than the Caucasus colony. Because it served as a raw materials base, Turkestan occupied a special position within the Russian state policy. German embassies and consulates collected information about Turkestan and reported it to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany.

The interest of the German authorities in Turkestan increased in the last year of the war, when the depletion of raw materials and food resources made the continuation of the war problematic. After the conclusion of the Brest Peace Agreement, officers from the German Embassy in Moscow and military intelligence began to collect information on the political and economic situation of Turkestan. German authorities were interested in the reserves of raw materials in the territory of Turkestan, as well as the separatist aspirations of the non-Russian people. On May 13, 1918, Major General Henning sent to the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the General Staff of the Army a summary of the political situation in Turkestan. On June 9, 1918 in the political section of the general staff of the Army in Germany came a report containing a detailed analysis of the prospects of using the economic resources of Turkestan to supply the front and rear fronts with raw materials and food. In June 1918 the German Embassy in Moscow prepared a report on the stocks of raw materials in Turkestan. A report of the Baltic German Tledemann who was in Turkestan, attracted the attention of the Head of Government of Prince Maximilian of Baden. Information also came from military doctors working in prison camps in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Based on this information, on June 22, 1918, members of the General Staff of the German Army had developed for the Chief of Staff a secret speech about the economic, military and political situation of Turkestan (Central-Asien 1917-1918, Central-Asien 1918-1920).

In 1918, in connection with the revolutionary events in Russia and the possibility of the collapse of the Russian colonial empire, the independence of Muslim nations seemed like a probability. Representatives of the Turkic people and the Muslim world were making plans to assist in the realization of these aspirations. On March 1918, Sheikh Abdureshid Ibrahim appealed to the political department of the General Staff Field Army in Germany with a proposal to send the most trusted Tatar prisoners of war to Russia to assist in the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Turkestan (*Die Muhammedaner* 1918-1919). A member of the Central Council of Muslims nations, Osman Tokumbet in Russia prepared a 'Memorandum on the Muslim question' on September 1918. He wrote, 'At the present time in Germany there are 40,000 Turko-Tatar prisoners, among whom, in our opinion, there are 10,000 volunteers who wish to participate in the liberation of their brothers' (*Die Muhammedaner* 1918-1919).

He further suggested that in cases where there was an agreement on the repatriation of prisoners of war to Soviet Russia, volunteers would be sent to Turkey to create a military unit. However, the German authorities did not fully approve of plans to create a Turkish military unit for the Muslim prisoners of war. During this period, Germany strove to prevent the growing influence of Turkey in the Caucasus. Therefore, in 1918, when the Turkish army has successfully moved to the East, German troops violated the Brest Peace treaty and launched an offensive in the Caucasus. Concurrently, German politicians and diplomats were also interested in the Muslim populations of Turkestan, Bukhara and Khiva. To elucidate the possibilities of establishing contact with the inhabitants of these regions, diplomat Werner Otto von Hentig organized trips to Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Bukhara, Kokand, Khiva, Turkestan and the Chinese dominions, inhabited by Muslims.

The special attention given by the German authorities to the eastern outskirts of Soviet Russia resonates with some political and religious leaders of Turkestan. On August 7, 1918 members of the Central Council of Muslims of Russia, Tokumbet and Muzaffar, appealed to the German Foreign Ministry for assistance in the national-liberation struggle of the Turkic peoples. In their letter, they gave a description of the national government established in Turkestan and in other regions inhabited by Turkic peoples. 'If the people of Finland, Poland, Ukraine gained independence and freedom – the

authors write, – the Turkic peoples also have the right to freedom’ (Die Muhammedaner 1917-1918). In October 1918, one of the leaders of the former Turkestan Autonomy, S. Lapin, came to Germany under the pretext of requiring medical treatment. On October 2, 1918, S. Lapin presented a report to the German Oriental Institute on the political situation in Turkestan. Analyzing the policy of the Bolsheviki in Turkestan, he said: ‘The cardinal question – the question of self-determination of Turkestan is not resolved. If Turkestan would be freed from Bolshevism, *Czechoslovak Corps* and the British, it can become an English protectorate. Germany is an ally of Turkey and Turkestan has always focused on Turkey’. As you can see, the hopes and aspirations of the Turkic peoples during the First World War and the postwar period were related to Turkey, and turned to Germany as an ally of Turkey (Central-Asien 1918).

Politicians in Turkestan closely followed developments in the international arena and enthusiastically welcomed the idea of providing the people of the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires with the possibility of creation of free autonomies as described in ‘Wilson’s 14 points’ (the message of U.S. President Woodrow Wilson to the Congress on January 8, 1918). As is known, Wilson’s ideas played an important role in the development of the Treaty of Versailles. After World War I, as a result of the collapse of multinational empires in Europe, new independent states appeared throughout Europe. Representatives of the peoples of Turkestan considered these changes as a fulfillment of the ideas put forward in Wilson’s ‘14 points’, leading them to turn to Wilson for assistance in the struggle for independence. After Soviet Russia’s withdrawal from the war and the signing of a separate peace treaty with the countries of the Tripartite Alliance, some of Turkestan’s immigrants living in European countries asked the German government to send a letter to the U.S. President. ‘Mr. President! – Writes Mirza Ahmed Rahim – when you expressed your thoughts to the US Senate on the future of humankind, you awakened the oppressed people’s expectations. You supported the independence of Poland, which we consider an important motive to end the bloody tyranny that is oppressing nations in Russia. Turkestan, a country of ancient culture and hard-working people who desire independence, is asking you to not deny what you have recognized for Poland’ (Central-Asien 1913-1918).

II. The Place of Turkestan in the Soviet-German Economic

Cooperation in Versailles Isolationism

As a result of territorial changes stipulated by the Treaty of Versailles, Germany lost one-eighth of her territory and the twelfth of her population and all its colonies, which were divided between the major victorious powers on the basis of mandates. Germany also had to give up its rights and privileges in China. Military regulations in the Versailles Treaty set a limit on the size of armies and also restricted voluntary recruitment to 100,000 people. Germany was forbidden to use tanks, heavy artillery, military aircrafts and submarines although it was entitled to a limited navy force. Moreover, having found themselves in international isolation, Germany sought to compensate for the lost colonies. To this end, the German authorities looked toward Eastern Russia.

During this period, the German authorities considered the possibility of obtaining permission from the Soviet government for concession in Turkestan. Specialists were sent to perform an analysis on the effectiveness of using natural resources in Turkestan. Dr. Asmis was developing a project on the structure of the Semirechie railroad, which was designed to facilitate the transportation of cotton from Turkestan to the European part of the USSR. The project's author believed that Turkestan could produce 26 million pounds of cotton (Turkestan 1920-1923). On September, 1923, Dr. Asmis called the People's Commissar of Foreign Trade, L.B. Krasin, with a proposal to build the Semirechie railroad. In addition, private entrepreneurs also sought to finance the construction. In The Hague, Krölller announced his readiness to invest in the construction of the railway in Turkestan. The German press is actively discussing the issue of economic profitability with the cooperation of Turkestan (Turkestan 1923-1936).

Dr. Asmis repeatedly refers to the Soviet Trade Mission in Germany to find opportunities for German entrepreneurs to fund concessions for the cotton industry, in particular the construction of irrigation systems and the creation of markets with the right to purchase Turkestan cotton. Finally, on October 26, 1923, Dr. Asmis receives a response from the Trade Office of the Soviet Union: 'Dr. Asmis! In response to your verbal request we inform you that, on the basis of the material sent to us, we cannot make the

final decision with regard to the concession of cotton production. Furthermore, we emphasize that your desire to create an irrigation system and to modernize the cotton production process have been transferred to Moscow. However, your further offers to the Company for the right to purchase the crops from other manufacturers are denied. The exact wording of these two points may be agreed upon in further negotiations' (Turkestan 1920-1923). Thus, the failure of the Soviet leaders to continue the New Economic Policy (NEP) and the policy of nationalization of the economy increased, reducing the possibility of attracting foreign investment in the Soviet economy. On behalf of the German Foreign Office, the German Consulate in Novosibirsk closely monitored the construction of *Turksib*. For example, a letter by an official, V. Grotskopf at the consulate to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on December 20, 1928 gives a detailed description of the construction of the railway, 'Semipalatinsk – Turkestan', which also names the planned intermediate stations, sidings, the distance between them and other information (Turkestan 1923-1936).

The German Embassy in Moscow and the consulate in Novosibirsk sent to the German Foreign Ministry analytical reports on the socio-economic policy of the Soviet government in Kazakhstan and Central Asia, and the effects of collectivization and repressions in 1937.

The German authorities also encouraged scientists to study the history of Turkestan. In 1928, a member of the German Scientific Society, G. Cleinow made a long journey to Turkestan and as a result wrote a book titled '*Russian Central Asia*' (Cleinows Buch). Between 1928-1932, the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan were also visited by the staff of the scientific department of the Foreign Ministry, namely Twardowski and Pfeiffer. Interest in Turkestan did not cease even after the Nazis rose to power. In 1935, Twardowski visited Kazakhstan a second time and spent two months traveling through the cities and regions of Kazakhstan, where he prepared a voluminous report with a map (Russisch Zentral-Asien).

During this period, the works of I. Bentsing, S. Shpuler, G. von Mende and other German scientists on Turkestan and Turkic immigrants were published.

III. The Interest in Turkestan During the Nazi Dictatorship

Germany's continuing interest in Turkestan (after the establishment of the Soviet Union and the Soviet republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan) contributed to the accumulation of documents, information, travel notes, diaries, analytic reviews and other materials about Turkestan. During the Second World War, these materials were used by the Nazis in their anti-Soviet propaganda. Politics of the Third Reich in regard to the Central Asian Soviet republics gave rise to the idea of creating a 'Great Turkestan'. Immigrants from the Soviet East were accused of discrediting the nation-state policy of the Soviet power, for they fought for the secession of eastern republics of the USSR and the creation of a single Turkic state. Thus, in the Soviet Union the myth was born that Nazi Germany, after defeating the Soviet Union, would create a new state, 'Great Turkestan', on its eastern territory inhabited by Turkic populations. But was there really such a plan? In order to comprehend this question, it is necessary to consider it in the context of the history of the national policy of the Soviet and Nazi authorities, without the idealized interpretation of the history of the 'Great Turkestan'.

The famous Russian scientist M.I. Semiryaga writes: 'In the winter and summer months of 1941, on the basis of common guidelines, plans were developed for the groups of armies and branches of the armed forces, and measures were refined for the future management of the occupied Soviet territories To manage the occupied areas, it was decided to create a Reichskommissariats, which would include five Reichskommissariats – Ostland, Ukraine, the Caucasus, Russia and Turkestan' (Semiryaga 2000: 80-81).

However, judging by Germany's historical archives, in the beginning of the Soviet-German war the Nazis had no definite plan for the establishment of Reichskommissariat Turkestan. 'During the reorganization of the Soviet Union, the former Russian state was composed of different parts: the Central Asian Turkic people, the former Soviet Republic of Turkmenia, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. In this respect, the aforementioned areas occupy a special position because control and maintenance of these regions was not provided by the Imperial Kommissariat', as noted in the *Political directives regarding Turkestan*, published on November 25, 1941 (Politische Richtlinien). Consequently, during the war preparations and the

initial period of the war the Nazis had no specific plans for reconfiguring the lands east of the Urals. The area east of the Urals including Turkestan was not occupied by German troops. Moreover, with Turkestan far from the Third Reich, the Nazi government was more concerned with managing the Caucasus and the Crimea than its future reconstructions.

The development of Nazi policy towards the Turkic peoples can be traced in several stages. The first stage is in the making and approval of the racist ideology of Nazism; similarly, the Soviet attitude toward 'Asians' was founded on the idea of a 'subhuman' race ('Untermensch'). The immediate annihilation of all 'Asian' civilians captured in the occupied areas was deemed the solution. Because newspaper articles often exaggerated the 'Mongolian brutality' of Russians, the printed media created a climate that promoted the idea that the Reich sought to protect the West from the 'Asian risk'. Hitler himself spoke of 'the big shaft', which will protect the East from the new 'Central Asian masses', the 'life-shaft', against a sudden wave of new arrivals from Asia – and its 'troublesome reservoir of people' (Dallin 1958: 283). The Nazis' disdain for the Asian people of the USSR is reflected in the 'Directives for the determination of the position of army groups in Russia', developed on May 1941 at the Main Headquarters of Wehrmacht: 'With respect to all those who belong to the Red Army – also to prisoners – extreme isolation and strict vigilance is due...especially Asian Red Army soldiers who are incomprehensible, unpredictable, treacherous and insensitive' (Streit 1991: 49-50). Under these orders signed on July 24, 1941, it was forbidden to bring the captured Asians from the Soviet Union to the German Empire, and as such they were kept in camps in German-occupied eastern European countries (Turanismus: 274).

Throughout the course of international relations history, there are numerous examples of warring parties using ethnic and national factors. The authorities of the Third Reich also decided to use the aspirations of non-Russian populaces of the USSR for national independence. In preparation for the war against the Soviet Union in the Imperial Ministry of Foreign Affairs came the idea of creating the Committee on Russia. The diplomat Wilhelmholtz Georg Grotzkopf led the committee, which was limited to the study of materials in the USSR's history. But the war with the Soviet Union created more specific problems for the committee. In June 1941, the

committee invited experienced diplomats and professionals versed in the history and culture of non-Russian people of the USSR. A specialist on the history of Turkic societies, namely Werner Otto von Hentig, had to deal with 'problems of South Russian nationalities (Caucasians, Kirgiz, Tatars, etc.)' (Turanismus: 45). The committee was required to gather material for propaganda work. The main content of the propaganda against the Soviet Union was a criticism of the weakest parts of the Soviet system including the Bolshevik solution to national problems. Furthermore, it was necessary to use the representatives of non-Russian people who left Europe because of the ideological incompatibility in their views against Bolshevism. Thus, in the first months of the Soviet-German war, Germany's interest in the Turkic immigrants' ideas on Turanism increased.

The idea of Turanism became widespread among the Turkic people of Russia, even though Russian authorities restricted the possibility of promoting Turkic unity. Therefore, the number of known Turanism proponents in the first decade of the 20th century, left for Turkey. In 1911, Yusuf Akchura began publishing the magazine '*Türk yurdu*', and created an organization called 'Turk Oshagy'. Turanism was also glorified by the famous poet and philosopher Zia Gekalyp; his verse included 'Turan', 'Homeland of the Turks – neither Turkey, nor Turkestan, but the great and eternal country of Turan' (Turanismus: 3).

In his letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs J. von Ribbentrop on July 25, 1941, the German Ambassador to Turkey, Franz von Papen, listed Turanism as a viable idea in the fight against the Soviet Union, furthering the propaganda of ideas among Soviet prisoners of Turkic origin. Furthermore, von Papen reported that Nouri Killigil desired to come to Berlin to assist in dealing with the Turkic prisoners of war. Nuri Killigil (Nuri Pasha), on arrival in Berlin on September 1941, had several meetings with the Secretary of Foreign Affairs E. Vermann. In an interview, Nuri Pasha declared that Turkic and Muslim prisoners of war should be assembled in a separate camp. Similar to Wünsdorf Camp in the First World War, it could be possible to generate from these prisoners of war new military units to fight for the implementation of Turanist ideas. On October 2, 1941, E. Vermann received a response from the secretariat of the Foreign Ministry stating that preparatory work was underway to implement the proposals of Nuri Pasha (Panturan,

Büro des Staatssekretärs). However, on the other hand, some experienced diplomats and experts from the East felt that the idea of Turanism would harm the plans to occupy the USSR and impair the future reconstruction of the territory inhabited by Turkic people. In the above-mentioned 'Policy Directives with Respect to Turkestan', it was stated: 'The so-called panturanistic idea is to be overcome by all means. However, the bearer of this idea is not to represent the Turkish government, and, perhaps, nationalistic Turkish circles that support Nuri Pasha, the brother of Enver Pasha. The Panturanist movement aims to unite all the Turkic people under the protectorate of Turkey, which would lead to a union that includes not only Central Asian polities, but Azerbaijan with Baku and also Batumi – they had historical reasons (it was Turkish up to 1878). Conquering Batumi and Baku would enable direct access and possession of the two cities, which were significant in economic terms, because a Transcaucasian road and oil supply area would be created. Thus, a bridge could be built between Turkey and Central Asia, and Transcaucasia, inhabited by the Georgians, would be entirely lost to Germany. Allowing the emergence of a great power in the border of Reichskommissariat Ukraine and the Caucasus would in no way correspond with German interests. The document also proposed, as much as possible, to keep separate legions created from Azerbaijanis, Tatars and representatives of the Turkic people of Central Asia at bay from creating of an 'unwanted Panturanistic movement' (Politische Richtlinien: 111). Turanism was not the predominant way of thinking among the Turkic emigrants (Politische Richtlinien: 111). Mustafa Shokai, Resul Emin-Zade, Ayaz Iskhaki, Rahmati Rashid, Ahmed Zaki Velidi and other well-known Turkic emigrants fought not for the creation of a great country called 'Tur-an' but for the liberation of the Turkic people from colonial rule, Bolsheviks and for the establishment of independent Turkic states. It is worth recalling the above description of Turkic immigrants prepared on June 25, 1941 by A. Idris, a member of the political department of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Nazi Germany. A. Idris, calls them 'separatists', opponents to the idea of Turanism. They want, according to Idris, to create a separate republic of Turkestan, Azerbaijan, Bashkiria, the Crimea and the Volga-Ural republic (Politische Richtlinien: 43-44).

To understand the cause behind the idea of creating a single state of Turkestan, it is necessary to take an excursion into the history of the national

liberation movement of the Turkestan people. The revolution overthrew the monarchy in Russia and led to fundamental changes both in the political and social spheres. Moreover, the revolution accelerated the collapse of the multinational empire, which began even before the February Revolution. In 1919, the Paris Peace Conference announced its aim to create the rights of nations to self-determination. However, this principle was implemented only in some of the European nations that were part of the Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires. Thus only certain countries received international recognition in their secession from Russia and acquisition of sovereignty – Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Burdened with pressing domestic issues, Eastern nations also sought to secede from Russia. In April 1917, the Provisional Government of Russia stated that it supports the independence of individual nations. On April 4-8, 1917 Tashkent hosted the first congress of Muslim nations of Turkestan. The congress discussed the question of the future state of Russia, thereby ruling that Russia should become a democratic society and Turkestan republic should receive territorial autonomy. The Congress decided to create a ‘Turkestan Muslim Council’, which would then: 1) submit to the interests of Turkestan in the revolutionary power; 2) prepare the transition to self-government in Turkestan; 3) defend the religious rights; 4) solve land issues; 5) promote the cultural development of Turkestan; 6) verify the implementation of laws relating to all Muslims of Turkestan. The Congress elected Mustafa Shokay as Chairman of the Board. On more than one occasion, national representatives appealed to A.F. Kerensky with the request for a solution to the problem of Turkestan. Though he gave a reply, no action was taken. Kerensky, who had shown interest in the uprising of 1916 and promised the independence of Turkestan, had neglected all his promises after the revolution (Hayit 1956: 49-50).

Even before the Bolsheviks came to power, they had put forward the slogan of recognizing the rights of nations to self-determination. The German researcher, J. Dülffer stated that the idea of people self-determination (declared by V. Lenin) was not targeted on the democratic deal of the problem. V. Lenin and Bolsheviks appealed to the mass of people and the proletariat for a world revolution (Dülffer 2011: 118). However, the declaration of this principle was intended for a smaller target group.

Nevertheless, they used this slogan to attract people from colonial outskirts in the struggle against the Provisional Government and later against the White Army. The 'Declaration of the Rights of Peoples of Russia', adopted a week after the Bolsheviks seized power, proclaimed the right of the Russian people to self-determination up to secession and the formation of independent States. In fact, from 1917-1922 the Bolsheviks fought against the establishment in the Ukraine and the Caucasus, Turkestan and Belarus and any independent or autonomous state entities.

In the European and Russian scientific papers, and in foreign and domestic historiography, the disintegration of the Russian Empire is not perceived in the same sense as the collapse of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires. If the separation from Russia and the establishment of the sovereign states of Poland, Finland and the Baltic countries have been recorded in international documents, the defeat of the Bolsheviks' independent or autonomous states have been perceived by other nations as an internal problem of Russia, i.e. these events are considered a 'civil war'. Hence, it is in this context that the events that took place in 1918-1922 in Kazakhstan and Central Asia were described. But in fact the struggle of the people of Ukraine, the Caucasus, Kazakhstan and Central Asia has a different character than a civil war between the Reds and the Whites.

In parallel with the struggle of the Bolsheviks to expand and strengthen their power, there also was the formation of a national liberation movement in the national borderlands of the Russian Empire. The self-determination of the people became a reality and the Russian empire was disintegrating into self-governing units. Thus, in late 1917 in Turkestan, there were two Khanates and two autonomous republics (Turkestan Republic with its center in Kokand and Alashorda with its center in Orenburg and later in Semipalatinsk). However, the Reds and the Whites who fought against the creation of independent states of Turkestan could not let this happen, even in the form of autonomy. After the defeat of the national state formations in Turkestan, a number of well-known Turkic politicians immigrated first to Turkey and then to Europe, where they continued to struggle for the national independence of the Turkestan people. They can be considered the first representatives of political exile from the Soviet Orient, since they have contributed to the development of the ideological foundations of the national liberation struggle of the Turkic people in the USSR.

In 1919, when the Paris Peace Conference was held, the representatives of the Turkic immigrants turned to Western countries to help people remain and exercise their right to national self-government based on Woodrow Wilson's '14 points' plan. However, the Western powers were neither inclined to diplomatic forays nor inclined to provide technical assistance to people in the eastern branch of Russia. J. Dülffer correctly noticed that the principle didn't concern the people of colonies (Dülffer 2011: 126). At the Paris conference, when the right of people to self-determination was proclaimed, the Entente did not even discuss the issue of granting independence to the eastern nations, or granting the colonies of Great Britain and France recognition. Apparently in the Eurocentric world, Turkestan and the Caucasus were regarded as belonging in the same category as the colonial East. On the one hand, the Bolsheviks quickly took advantage of this opportunity and got rid of the young state polities in the Caucasus and Turkestan by force and on the other hand, promised to provide rights to self-determination up to secession and the creation of an independent state.

However, further history of the Soviet Union demonstrated that these promises had a declarative nature (in this case, we wouldn't represent the discussion among Soviet establishment concerned with federation and confederation).

The territory of Turkestan was divided between the eastern republics, which formed part of the USSR and the Turkic leaders, who emigrated before the implementation of this division, were still hoping to create a single state of Turkestan. Apparently, these dreams were expressed in the title of 'Great Turkestan'.

The Eastern Department of the Third Reich nurtured a plan of creation of a 'cordon sanitaire' against Russia, which was to include Ukraine, Belarus, Baltic States, Caucasus and Central Asia. This plan of creation would be controlled by and dependent upon the central powers of the German Empire. What Central Asia would be called as one of the links of the cordon, 'Turkestan' or 'Great Turkestan' or even some other way was of no matter for the Eastern Department. However, by association with the Legion and the National Committee it often used the name 'Turkestan'. Because of the great distance from the front line of Turkestan, the Wehrmacht had no specific plans to capture this area. Therefore, there was no urgent need to adopt the decision on the future restructuring of the Soviet Union – the idea of

'Great Turkestan' was moved by the Nazis within the scope of propaganda. In all the documents to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of East Third Reich, the Supreme Command Staff of the Wehrmacht used the name 'Turkestan'. The word 'Grossturkestan' ('Great Turkestan') occurs only in one document titled 'State of the Agrarian, Religious and Ethnic Problems in the Eastern Occupied Areas', which represents instructions on how to enhance the effectiveness of propaganda work. The third section of this document sets out the following guidelines to promote the national policy of the Third Reich: 'Regarding non-Russian nationalities, who were attached to Russia, respectively, the Soviet Union, ... the principles of 'separate development' are important, which were set forth in a speech by Minister Rosenberg at a reception in honor of the press on November 18, 1941. Simultaneously, in relation to different groups, this task will be performed in different ways depending on the degree of importance of the corresponding nation to the Russians, their attitude toward Germany and its new order in the East. With respect to the most important ethnic groups who are still in the realm of Bolshevik power, on which Germany has to exert propaganda and influence, the following takes precedence; Crimean Tatars, who, to some extent, are an outpost of the Turkic people, were in the German sphere of power and as such should be given principal courtesy. Of course, there is a dire financial situation that has escalated as a result of hostilities in the Crimea, and has damaged the German efforts. However, at the same time, the German side tends to promise independence to who is currently close to the front of our non-Russian people (it primarily refers to the Caucasus and the Turkic people). Promoting Panturanism as an expedient step is not considered. It is best to combine, on the one hand, the Caucasian people, despite their ethnic and religious differences. On the other hand, the second union in the East nation would be the people of Great Turkestan, namely, Uzbeks, Tajiks, Turkmen, Kazakhs and Kyrgyz. They do not need to be joined by the Bashkirs and Volga Tatars, they, as a particularly protected people, will be allowed to have regional autonomy within the settlement of the Russian people' (Aufbaumeldungen).

Consequently, to the Third Reich the Turkic immigrants and their dreams of independence of Turkestan were only a means of weakening their immediate enemy – the Soviet Union. The defeat of the Third Reich during World War II ended the period of an active 'Turkestan' policy of Germany.

Conclusion

Turkestan became an object of geopolitical interest of Germany in the period between two World Wars when Berlin found itself in isolation. The intensity of Soviet-German relations in the 1920s reflected on Turkestan. After WW II, Turkestan (five Soviet republics) transformed into a 'closed' region of the USSR. The native process of integration of Turkestan into the world economic system was interrupted because of the defeat of national state formations in Western Turkestan, and the establishment of Soviet republics, the monopoly of foreign trade, and the conduction of forcible collectivization. This region became an experiment of conjugation of all Soviet nations and nationalities in 'soviet people,' where the Slavs and the Turks were the dominant groups. Despite a widely declared right of nations to self-determination, central and state bodies effectively controlled and limited the rights and powers of republics up to the collapse of the USSR. In addition, Soviet republics of Central Asia were completely isolated from the world until they attained independent status.

References

- Aufbaumeldungen des Reichsministers für die besetzten Gebiete* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (Berlin), R 105170, Bd. 6.
- Büro des Staatssekretärs. Türkei* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (Berlin), R 29778, Bd.4.
- Central-Asien. 1913-1918. Bd.7* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (Berlin), R 11071.
- Central-Asien. 1917-1918. Bd.8* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (Berlin), R 11072.
- Central-Asien. 1918. Bd.9* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (Berlin), R 11073.
- Central-Asien. 1918-1920. Bd.10* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (Berlin), R 11074.
- Cleinows Buch. Russischen Zentralasien* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (Berlin), R 86394.

- Dallin, Alexander (1958). *Deutsche Herrschaft in Rußland 1941-1945. Eine Studie über Besatzungspolitik*. Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag.
- Denkschriften Oppenheim über die Revolutionierung der Islamischen Gebiete unserer Feinde* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts (Berlin), R 26319.
- Deutschland und das bolschewistische Rußland von Brest-Litowsk bis 1941 (1991)*. Mit Beitr. v. Jürgen Förster u. a. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Die Muhammedaner in Russland. 1917-1918* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts (Berlin), R 11125.
- Die Muhammedaner in Russland. 1918-1919* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts (Berlin), R 11125.
- Dülffer, Jost (2011). Die Diskussion und das Selbstbestimmung und die Friedensregelungen nach dem Weltkrieg des 20. Jahrhunderts // *Die Verteilung der Welt. Selbstbestimmung und das Selbstbestimmungsrecht der Völker*. Hrsg. JörgFisch, München: Oldenburg Verlag. 113-140.
- Haffner, Sebastian (2002). *Der Teufelspakt. Die deutsch-russischen Beziehungen vom Ersten zum Zweiten Weltkrieg*. Zürich: Manesse-Verlag.
- Hayit, Baymirza (1956). *Turkestan im XX. Jahrhundert*. Darmstadt: Leske.
- Heeke, Matthias (2003). *Reisen Zu Den Sowjets: Der Ausländische Tourismus in Russland 1921-1941*. Munster-Hamburg-London: Litverlag.
- Lutz, Martin (2011). *Siemens im Sowjetgeschäft. Eine Institutionengeschichte der deutsch-sowjetischen Beziehungen 1917-1933*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Mühlen, Patrik (1971). *Zwischen Hakenkreuz und Sowjetstern. Der Nationalismus der Sowjetischen Orientvolker im Zweiten Weltkrieg*. Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag GmbH.
- Panturan* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts (Berlin), R 29900.
- Politische Richtlinien hinsichtlich Turkestan* // Bundesarchiv (Berlin), R 6/247.
- Russisch Zentral-Asien politisch und wirtschaftlich. 1923-1929*. Bd. 1. // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts (Berlin), R 86392.

- Salzmann, Stephanie (2003). *Great Britain, Germany and the Soviet Union: Rapallo and After. 1922-1934*. Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer.
- Semiryaga, Mihail (2000). *Collaborationism. The nature, typology and display During the Second World War*. Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Sowjetunion* // Die Bundesbeauftragte für die Unterlagen des Staatssicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (BStU), RHE 28/88 SU, Bd. 1.
- Spuler, Bertold (1949). Die Wolga-Tataren und Baschkiren unter russischer Herrschaft, *Der Islam* 29: 142-216.
- Streit, Christian (1991). *Keine Kameraden. Die Wehrmacht und die sowjetischen Kriegsgefangenen 1941-1945*. Bonn: Dietz.
- Torma, Franziska (2011). *Turkestan-Expeditionen. Zur Kulturgeschichte deutscher Forschungsreisen nach Mittelasien (1890-1930)*. Bielefeld: Verlag für Kommunikation, Kultur und soziale Praxis.
- Turanismus* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts (Berlin), R 901/61174, Bd.1.
- Turkestan. 1920-1923*. // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts (Berlin), R 84362.
- Turkestan. 1923-1936* // Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts (Berlin), R 86386.

XX. Yüzyılın İlk Döneminde Almanya'nın Dış Politik Stratejisinde Türkistan

Gulzhaukhar Kokebayeva*

Öz

Bu makalede Almanya'nın Batı Türkistan'daki (Rusya Türkistanı'ndaki) dış politika çıkarları incelenmektedir. Makale tarihi sürecin kısa özeti ile başlamaktadır. Üç kısımdan oluşan makalenin ana kısmında, Almanya'nın dünya savaşları döneminde ve iki savaş arası dönemde Türkistan'daki çıkarlarının pekiştirilmesine odaklanmaktadır. Savaş arası dönemde Türkistan, Almanya'nın kaybettiği sömürgeleri telafi etmek istemesi nedeniyle Almanya politikasının önemli nesnelerinden biri haline gelir. Alman hükümetleri Sovyet yönetiminden tavizler konusunda izin alma olasılığını değerlendirirler. Ancak Sovyet yöneticilerin ekonominin devletleştirilmesine yönelik bir istikamet belirlemesi, Sovyet ekonomisinin yabancı yatırımları çekme olasılığını ortadan kaldırdı. İkinci Dünya Savaşı döneminde Üçüncü Reich'in Orta Asya Sovyet Cumhuriyetlerine yönelik politikası, SSCB topraklarında Üçüncü Reich'e tâbi olan 'devletler' kurmak düşüncesi ile bağlantılı idi. Üçüncü Reich'in İkinci Dünya Savaşını kaybetmesi ile Almanya'nın aktif Türkistan politikası dönemi sona erdi.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Türkistan, Sovyet-Alman ilişkileri, Türk halkları, Büyük Türkistan, müslümanlar, Sovyet yetkililer

* Prof.Dr., El-Farabi Kazak Milli Üniversitesi, Tarih, Arkeoloji ve Etnoloji Fakültesi - Almaty/Kazakistan
kokebayeva@mail.ru

Туркестан во внешнеполитической стратегии Германии в первой половине XX века

Гульжаухар Кокебаева*

Аннотация

В статье исследуются внешнеполитические интересы Германии в Западном (Русском) Туркестане. В начале статьи дан краткий историографический обзор. В основной части статьи, состоящей из трех разделов, основное внимание акцентируется на возрастании интересов Германии в Туркестане в период мировых войн и в межвоенный период. Ввиду поисков Германии возможностей компенсации утраченных ею колоний, в межвоенный период Туркестан становится одним из важных объектов германской политики. Власти Германии рассматривали возможность получения разрешения у Советского правительства концессий в Туркестане. Однако курс советских руководителей на огосударствление экономики перечеркнул возможность привлечения иностранных инвестиций в советскую экономику. В период второй мировой войны политика Третьего Рейха по отношению к центральноазиатским советским республикам была связана с идеей создания на территории СССР «государств», подвластных Третьему Рейху. С поражением Третьего Рейха во второй мировой войне завершился период активной «туркестанской» политики Германии.

Ключевые слова

Туркестан, советско-германские отношения, тюркские народы, «Большой Туркестан», мусульмане, советское руководство

* Проф. док., Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, факультет истории, археологии и этнологии - Алматы/Казахстан
kokebayeva@mail.ru

