

**I БӨЛІМ.
ДҮНИЕЖҮЗІЛІК САЯСАТ ЖӘНЕ ХАЛЫҚАРАЛЫҚ ҚАТЫНАСТАР
РАЗДЕЛ I.
МИРОВАЯ ПОЛИТИКА И МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ
PART I.
WORLD POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

UDC 327.8

IRSTI 11.25.91

<https://doi.org/10.48371/ISMO.2025.59.1.001>

**IMPACT OF SMALL STATES ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS:
KYRGYZSTAN'S RELATIONS
WITH GREAT POWERS**

*Ozdilek S.E.¹

*¹ Ufuk University, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract. This study aims to investigate the course of international relations and the factors affecting the use of power in Kyrgyzstan's interactions with major powers, with particular emphasis on the power dynamics of small states in the field of international relations. Historically, power interactions between states have been an important factor in a field dominated by major powers, serving as a key component in shaping how states establish their positions on the global stage. In this context, small states have often been viewed as ineffective participants in the international arena and have largely been excluded from power dynamics. However, in contemporary conditions, small states have significant potential to assert their identities and prioritize their interests, thus becoming integrated into the power dynamics at play. Consequently, analyzing the power dynamics of Kyrgyzstan, located in the heart of Central Asia, in its interactions with major powers constitutes an important area of research. This study investigates Kyrgyzstan's ability to use force to achieve its goals and protect its interests in the context of its relations with major contemporary global powers such as Russia, China, and the United States. To this end, the four-part analysis will examine the concept of power in international relations in relation to small states, the power dynamics among small states within the international system, and provide a comprehensive examination of Kyrgyzstan in this context.

Key words: international relations, power, small state, great power, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, China, USA

Introduction

The dynamics of international relations in our era, especially in relations involving small states, are witnessing significant changes. This is because the

nature of power in international relations has undergone significant changes over the years, reflecting changes in global dynamics, technological developments and evolving geopolitical landscapes.

Accordingly, while military and economic power continue to be important components of power, the importance of soft power has increased. Soft power, which includes cultural influence, diplomatic initiatives and international cooperation, is increasingly recognized today as a means of shaping global perceptions and creating lasting impact. In addition, other types of power can be discussed such as smart power, structural power, etc. In addition, the rise of information technology and the internet have changed the way power is used in international relations. The ability to control and disseminate information, engage in digital diplomacy and influence public opinion globally has become an important source of power. The interconnectedness of nations in a globalizing world has also changed power dynamics. Interdependence in trade, finance and technology means that no nation can completely isolate itself from international events. Another factor in the changing dynamics of power is that non-state actors, including multinational corporations, civil society organizations and transnational movements, play an increasingly influential role in shaping international relations. Their ability to mobilize resources, influence public opinion and influence policymaking adds complexity to traditional state-centric power dynamics. Changes in the concept of security have also affected the change in the element of power in international relations. It has expanded beyond traditional military concerns to include human security, health, environmental sustainability and social welfare. States that can effectively meet these broad security challenges can strengthen their global position. The evolution of the international system into a multipolar order is also a factor. Regionalism has also come to the fore, as regional organizations and alliances play an important role in overcoming regional challenges and influencing global affairs. In addition, the increasing dependence on digital infrastructure increases the importance of cyber power. States that can secure their cyberspace, conduct cyber operations and take advantage of technological innovations gain a significant advantage in contemporary power dynamics. Finally, the ability to contribute to and shape global governance structures and norms has become an important aspect of power. States that advocate international cooperation, contribute to rule-making and support multilateral institutions improve their diplomatic stance.

Collectively, these changes reflect the complex and dynamic nature of power in contemporary international relations and underscore a comprehensive understanding that goes beyond traditional military and economic indicators. The ability to adapt to these evolving dynamics is crucial for states trying to navigate the complexities of the modern geopolitical environment. In this context, it has become possible to speak of the power of small states.

Today, the nature of the power of small states, traditionally perceived as weak due to their limited resources and power, has gone beyond physical characteristics. Small state power is summarized as the ability to strategically use their resources, diplomacy, and niche capacities to influence, defend national

interests, and contribute to global affairs. Despite their modest size, small states often play important roles in shaping regional dynamics, participating in international organizations, and engaging in diplomatic initiatives. The nature of their power is not based solely on military power, but also extends to economic resilience, diplomatic agility, and the skillful use of soft power elements.

In this context, there are five main factors that affect the behavior of small states. These are; decolonization, depolarization, normative changes supporting democracy, economic policy changes and technological developments such as digitalization. These factors contribute to the small states becoming important actors in international relations and increasing their capacity and influence.

In addition, the evolution of the international system plays a key role in shaping the behavior and foreign policies of small states. Multipolarity, characterized by the rise of new centers of power, challenges the supremacy of traditional powers. Globalization, driven by technological advances, fosters increased interconnectivity, creating an integrated global scene. The complexity of modern threats emphasizes the evolution from national to international security. Normative frameworks and international organizations are becoming influential in shaping international relations. Technology is changing the forms of interaction in the field of information and communication, presenting new challenges and opportunities. The interactions between these factors emphasize the need for effective frameworks for international cooperation and governance.

Therefore, changes in the international system, global geopolitical changes, technological developments and evolving diplomatic strategies contribute to changes in the behavior and foreign policies of small states. This study argues that small states, traditionally perceived as weak due to their lack of power, have the opportunity to actively contribute to and navigate the complexities of the international system rather than adopting a foreign policy focused solely on survival. In addition, the study emphasizes the capacity of small states to create influence, exert power and contribute to international dynamics.

In this changing environment, small states, aware of the natural imbalance in power dynamics, interact with great powers in an asymmetrical approach. In the context of these asymmetric relations, interactions between small states and great powers emphasize the evolving role of small states in shaping global dynamics. In this context, this study analyzes Kyrgyzstan's position as a small state, its foreign policy behavior and its interactions with great powers, revealing a complex network of diplomatic, economic and geopolitical dynamics. On the one hand, this is due to Kyrgyzstan's location in the Central Asian region.

Central Asia is situated at the heart of Eurasia, an extensive landmass that lacks direct access to the world's oceans. This region has historically served as a bridge linking Europe, the Middle East, and both South and East Asia. While Central Asia was not regarded as particularly significant during the Cold War, it has since emerged as a region of considerable importance on the global stage. Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, several factors have contributed to the region's strategic and geo-economic significance: the Caspian Sea, which is rich in oil and gas reserves; the existence of transit and communication routes; the

control over the production of natural resources; the energy corridors that traverse the area; and the shared cultural, historical, and economic interests between Central Asia and its neighboring countries. These elements have intensified the competition among both regional and non-regional powers in contemporary times.

In this context, the significant interest of the great powers of today – namely Russia, China, the United States (USA), and the European Union (EU) - in the region is evident. The primary objective of Russia is to assert its own dominance within the area while simultaneously constraining the influence of external entities, particularly the US and China. The interests of Russia are fundamentally rooted in its aspiration to sustain its influence in the region. Moreover, Russia seeks to safeguard territories that were once part of the Soviet Union, positioning itself among the ranks of formidable states. It is on these lands that Russia can aspire to achieve leadership. Consequently, Russia is forging closer ties with Central Asia through initiatives such as the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), which plays a crucial role in this endeavor, along with other strategies that further enhance interdependencies between the nations involved.

From the viewpoint of China, Central Asia represents a region of significant importance concerning its political, security, energy, and economic interests. Regarding security, the stability of Central Asia is directly linked to China's national security, particularly in relation to the East Turkestan region. Economically, Central Asia is abundant in raw materials and is viewed as a potential market for Chinese products, thereby drawing China towards trade and economic collaboration with the nations in the area.

Broadly speaking, the interests of the United States encompass the prevention of China's expansion, the exclusion of Iran from regional engagements, the reduction of Central Asian states' reliance on Russia, and the mitigation of transnational threats. To align with these objectives, the United States leverages its diverse civil society organizations through various international entities that aid in the promotion of democracy within the Central Asian region, thereby enhancing its influence and coordinating socio-political developments.

The interests of the EU in Central Asia are primarily aimed at two key objectives. The first objective is to promote the diversification of energy supply and distribution within the region. The second objective centers on the promotion of human rights. To realize these aims, the EU offers financial assistance for the execution of numerous projects and initiatives in the region, grounded in the principles of partnership cooperation.

In this regard, Kyrgyzstan serves as a notable example for great powers seeking to establish a significant presence in the region. During its transition to a sovereign state following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Kyrgyzstan has successfully positioned itself as a leader among the Central Asian nations. After gaining independence, Kyrgyzstan, having been liberated from central oversight and lacking prior experience as an independent state, endeavored to adopt various development models from the international sphere and has made notable strides in democratic advancement compared to other former Soviet states, driven by its

commitment to reform. As the first country in Central Asia to enact substantial economic reforms – such as exiting the ruble zone, introducing its own national currency, and liberalizing exports, tariffs, and customs – Kyrgyzstan has set itself apart. The nation's adoption of liberal economic policies, coupled with a relatively dynamic civil society and a political environment that is less authoritarian than that of its Central Asian counterparts, has further distinguished Kyrgyzstan from its regional peers.

In this context, as a small landlocked country with a rich historical and cultural heritage, Kyrgyzstan recognizes the importance of balancing its relations with these major powers in order to secure economic opportunities, enhance security, and promote national interests. The multifaceted nature of Kyrgyzstan's relations with major powers, combined with its participation in regional organizations, can pave the way for the potential use of force, allowing the country to navigate complex geopolitical terrain and position itself strategically in the international arena.

In this study, the examination of Kyrgyzstan's interactions with major global powers – including Russia, China, the United States, and the European Union – takes place within the context of a swiftly transforming international landscape. This analysis delves into the complex nature of these relationships, encompassing economic, political, and security aspects, as well as regional dynamics and the role of international institutions, to elucidate the power dynamics at play in Kyrgyzstan's engagements with these significant actors. By concentrating on the diplomatic, economic, and geopolitical facets of Kyrgyzstan's relations with Russia, China, the US, and the EU, this study aspires to enhance the understanding of how smaller states maneuver through and influence the intricacies of the global system. Furthermore, acknowledging that power exists as a multifaceted construct – comprising various resources, strategies, and relationships – this study seeks to shed light on the evolving nature of power in international relations, particularly for smaller states navigating asymmetric relationships with larger powers, through the perspective of Kyrgyzstan.

Materials and Methods

This study employs a qualitative research approach to analyze Kyrgyzstan's position as a small state and its interactions with major global powers, including Russia, China, the United States, and the European Union. The research relies on a combination of primary and secondary sources, including official government statements, policy documents, reports from international organizations, and academic literature. These sources provide insights into the geopolitical strategies, foreign policy decisions, and diplomatic engagements of Kyrgyzstan in the context of an evolving international system.

The methodological framework is based on a comparative analysis of Kyrgyzstan's foreign policy strategies, emphasizing its diplomatic maneuvers, economic dependencies, and security partnerships with major powers. By employing content analysis, the study examines official discourse, treaties, agreements, and policy initiatives that shape Kyrgyzstan's geopolitical positioning.

Additionally, case studies of specific bilateral and multilateral engagements illustrate the dynamics of power asymmetry and strategic decision-making.

A theoretical framework grounded in international relations theories, such as small state theory, structural realism, and complex interdependence, informs the analysis. These theories help explain the strategic choices of Kyrgyzstan as it seeks to balance relations with great powers while safeguarding its sovereignty and national interests. Furthermore, the study incorporates elements of power analysis, including soft power, smart power, and economic leverage, to assess how Kyrgyzstan navigates global and regional challenges.

To ensure a comprehensive understanding, the research also integrates expert opinions from policymakers, scholars, and analysts specializing in Central Asian geopolitics. These perspectives are gathered through interviews, conference proceedings, and expert commentary. Additionally, statistical data from international financial institutions, trade organizations, and security reports are utilized to support the economic and strategic aspects of the study.

By combining theoretical perspectives, empirical case studies, and policy analysis, this research aims to provide a nuanced understanding of Kyrgyzstan's foreign policy behavior and its role in the international system. The study highlights the adaptability of small states in a multipolar world, demonstrating how Kyrgyzstan leverages diplomacy, economic partnerships, and regional cooperation to navigate the complexities of global politics.

Results and Discussion

In the international arena, the number of small states increased after World War I, with the disintegration of the Habsburg Empire in 1919, after World War II, with the disintegration of the British, French and other European empires through decolonization in the 1950s and 1960s, and with the collapse of the Soviet Union after the Cold War. The number of academic studies dealing with this issue has also increased with the spread of small states. These studies have focused first on defining the concept. The problem of defining the concept of small state has been addressed on the basis of studies emphasizing the role of great and small powers in international relations. These studies include the works of Annette B. Fox, David Vital, Robert O. Keohane, Maurice East, Michael Handel, Miriam F. Elman and others [1-6]. Despite the abundance of research, a generally accepted definition has not emerged. This may be due to the fact that the concept of "smallness" is a relative concept, and therefore every scientist who studies small states has chosen certain criteria in defining the concept.

In addition to the definition issue, the subject of the struggle for survival of small states has also been included in the studies. In the studies in question, the struggle for survival of small states in the area dominated by great powers due to the negative environment created by the Cold War and in addition, the concepts of fragility and lack of capacity have constituted the main points of the literature. In short, the focal points regarding small states have been the issues of security and foreign policy implementation in order to ensure their security. For example, Annette B. Fox (1969) investigated how the limited resources of small

states affect their foreign policies [1]. Robert O. Keohane (1971) and Michael Handel (1981) argue that small states need to join alliances in order to survive both politically and economically [3, 5]. According to David Vital (1967), small states, unlike large states, do not have the capacity to gather resources on their own [2].

In the post-Cold War period, interest in new small states increased and studies that had become stagnant were revived. Studies conducted in this context converge on the point that the foreign policy of a small state is largely constrained by systemic factors and international and regional dynamics in which large and medium powers operate. These factors are always at the top of the foreign policy agenda of small states.

Today, it is widely believed that small states that fully exercise their sovereignty have greater opportunities to self-actualize and determine their own foreign policy priorities, thus increasing their authority as important actors in international relations. In addition, there are also views that small states are becoming more active in the international arena due to their power in implementing foreign policy.

Kyrgyzstan, a landlocked country in Central Asia, is an interesting case for examining the power dynamics between a small state and major global players. In this context, Kyrgyzstan has generally been studied in the context of the wider Central Asia and in regional studies on power relations. However, there is a large literature emphasizing Kyrgyzstan as a small state [1-6]. In this context, Eugene Huskey, in his study "Foreign Policy in a Vulnerable State: Kyrgyzstan as Military Entrepot between the Great Powers", emphasized Kyrgyzstan's vulnerabilities and used the concept of fragile state instead of small state [7]. In his work titled "Kyrgyzstan - Regime Security and Foreign Policy", Toktomushev used the concept of weak state as a synonym for the concept of small state [8]. Yaşar Sarı uses the expression "small weak state" in his analysis centered on Kyrgyzstan [9]. Shairbek Dzhuraev, on the other hand, describes Kyrgyzstan as a small state in his work titled "Kyrgyzstan and the Changing Geopolitics of Central Asia and the Caucasus", which reviews important developments in Kyrgyzstan's international relations and emphasizes the strengths and weaknesses of the country's foreign policy approach [10].

In the literature covering Kyrgyzstan's relations with major powers, as a small state, the dominant view is that Kyrgyzstan's foreign policy is centered on its geopolitical position in Central Asia. The literature on Kyrgyzstan's relations with major powers is extensive and multifaceted. However, no studies have been found that focus on Kyrgyzstan's power factors in the context of these relations.

Small States in International Relations

Today, small states have a special position within the discipline of international relations. This position stems from their limited resources and influence, which forces them to adopt different strategic approaches to protect their interests in the international arena. Small states are dominant among the actors of the international system. Despite this, interest in small states is seen to be less when compared to interest in great powers and regional or otherwise

known as middle powers. Thus, small states remain in the shadow of large states. The interest in them is understandable since the effects of great powers on international politics bring wider, more concrete and more serious results. However, it should be emphasized that small states are also actively involved in international politics and relations. In this context, this section provides a comprehensive review of the field of international relations, especially focusing on small states, their definitions and distinctive features.

Definition and Characteristics of Small State

A universally accepted definition of what qualifies as a small state is absent. There is a lack of consensus among scholars regarding the suitable criteria for determining smallness, as well as the terminology used to describe small states. Within this framework, various concepts appear in the literature, including “small powers,” “weak powers,” and “weak states,” which are often used interchangeably to the extent of being considered synonymous. In summary, while there is general agreement among scholars that small states are a tangible and relevant unit of analysis within the field of international relations, there remains disagreement on the precise definition of a small state [11].

Nevertheless, in the last fifty years, the discourse surrounding the definition and classification of small states has profoundly influenced research on this topic. While these discussions have resulted in a “fundamental ambiguity in definitions” that obstructs theoretical development and complicates comparative analysis, they have also established a rich environment for the diverse examination of small states and fostered a continuous dialogue regarding the implications and significance of smallness in policymaking [12].

An examination of the literature concerning small states reveals that definitions predominantly align with three distinct categories. The first and most straightforward category defines small states as those that do not qualify as great powers. This perspective effectively captures the conceptual essence of a small state within the political discourse of numerous nations and is deeply entrenched in historical context. Historically, small states and great powers have occupied markedly different positions in the realm of international relations. As previously mentioned, during the era of the Concert of Europe (1815–1914), all nations aside from Austria, Prussia, Russia, England, and France were classified as small states. While the great powers undertook the obligation of maintaining stability within the international system and formulating international law, small states operated as entities exempt from systemic responsibilities, yet compelled to adhere to prevailing norms, particularly regarding foreign relations, due to their constrained political agency. Thus, this approach defines a small state in relation to the remaining category of states. At present, the standards for attaining the status of great power typically encompass economic strength, military capability, diplomatic sway, technological progress, and a notable geopolitical presence. Furthermore, specific details include permanent membership in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and the possession of nuclear weapons. Consequently, under this framework, entities that fail to fulfill these criteria are categorized as small states. However, this classification poses a challenge, as

it relegates small states—representing the overwhelming majority of nations globally—to a residual group, as noted by Baldaccino and Wivel [12]

Another approach defines small states on the basis of certain qualitative criteria. A modern interpretation of this position involves the claim that small states, regardless of state size, seek to “restructure their international environment.” However, this argument suggests that small states, unlike great powers, are unable to support such efforts. In other words, it has been argued that the weakness of small states makes them ineffective at the international level and that other states ignore or even ignore them. This leads to the conclusion that small states are unimportant.

From a security standpoint, vulnerability is clearly observable in strategic contexts. Threats to the territorial integrity of small states can be categorized into two distinct types: classical military threats and non-military threats, which may arise from private, non-governmental entities. In today’s world, the latter type of threat is more prevalent than the former. By definition, a small state is considered a weak state in military terms. Geographical factors can further heighten the vulnerability of a small state, particularly if it is situated in a strategic area, bordered by more powerful nations, and grappling with unresolved border disputes or minority issues that could be manipulated by external countries. Additionally, economic instability and weakness contribute to diminished security. While great powers or superpowers may face military vulnerabilities from similarly sized nations, small states remain susceptible to threats from all directions.

At this juncture, the discourse surrounding the definition of a small state evolves into a discussion focused on precision and accuracy. The crux of the argument posits that achieving a precise definition, grounded in the rigorous application of measurable criteria, remains an elusive objective; thus, it is far more effective to characterize a small state solely in relative or comparative terms. Alternatively, the notion of a small state is most effectively grasped as a political term - one that is utilized and shaped by the international political landscape. In this context, it shifts away from the need for a precise definition while still allowing for a more nuanced characterization.

Thus, the problem of defining small states has been addressed on the basis of research emphasizing the role of great and small powers in international relations. These include the works of Annette B. Fox, David Vital, Robert O. Keohane, Maurice East, Michael Handel, Miriam F. Elman and others [1-6].

Kyrgyzstan’s Relations with the Great Powers

Kyrgyzstan-Russia Relations

At present, Russia stands as one of Kyrgyzstan’s key strategic allies. The foundations and fundamental principles governing interstate relations between Kyrgyzstan and Russia were established through the signing of the first agreement on June 21, 1991, during President Boris Yeltsin’s official visit to Bishkek. Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the formation of the Russian Federation, there arose a necessity to broaden the legal framework governing the bilateral relations of the two nations. In 1992, Kyrgyzstan and Russia signed protocols that formalized diplomatic relations and facilitated cooperation and

coordination between the foreign ministries of both countries. Shortly thereafter, the two nations concluded the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance [13].

The priority of interstate relations between the two countries can be assessed by the intensity of interstate contacts. In this context, there are frequent official visits of heads of state and other high-level officials. In addition, there is an intensive exchange of letters and messages on various issues. In addition, the parties have the same or similar views and positions on many important international issues. Moscow and Bishkek are in close interaction with international organizations, especially the UN, OSCE, etc., and regional structures (CIS, EurAsEC, CSTO, SCO and EAEU).

As a result, Russia is gradually shifting its strategy regarding Central Asia to enhance its military-political presence. This shift is primarily influenced by Moscow's increasing desire to solidify its standing in the region, particularly in light of the rising influence of the United States in Central Asia. Conversely, Bishkek is also keen on fostering closer security cooperation with Russia. The proximity to Afghanistan, along with the escalating presence of international terrorist groups in Central Asia, prompts the Kyrgyz leadership to advocate for an expanded Russian military footprint within the country and to consider the potential establishment of a second Russian military base [14].

Previously, the area of interaction between the two countries was more military and strategic, but today economic incentives have been added. The economy of Kyrgyzstan is closely linked to maintaining constructive relations with Russia. According to the Central Bank of the Kyrgyz Republic, in January 2019, remittances from Russia to Kyrgyzstan amounted to \$161.7 million. This is the absolute maximum among all sources of cash inflows to the country. Russia is Kyrgyzstan's second trade and economic partner after China. Kyrgyzstan's entry into the EAEU in 2015 contributed to the provision of a wide range of labor assistance to Kyrgyz labor migrants and the increase in Kyrgyzstan's trade and economic presence in Russia, especially in agriculture [6]. For Russia, the establishment of the EAEU is a step forward not only in economic terms, but also in terms of strengthening political ties with member states.

Since Kyrgyzstan does not have its own energy resources today, another very important area of interaction with Russia is energy. Economic projects between the countries are generally carried out in the field of energy. Gazprom, a state company in Russia, provides all-natural gas distribution in Kyrgyzstan. In 2014, Gazprom privatized the shares of the state company Kyrgyzgaz. Later, by purchasing 100% of the shares of Kyrgyzgaz and establishing Gazprom Kyrgyzstan, which became a Russian transnational company, it became the monopoly importer of natural gas in Kyrgyzstan and the owner of gas transportation and distribution systems [15].

In addition, the company also holds an influential position in the oil sector. In February 2011, the Kyrgyz Republic government established a joint venture company called Gazpromneft - Aero Kyrgyzstan. This company supplies aviation fuel and refuels civil aircraft of most airlines flying to the Kyrgyz Republic. In 2006, Gazprom Neft JSC established a subsidiary in Kyrgyzstan called

“Gazprom Neft Asia”. Similarly, Rosneft’s presence in Kyrgyzstan has also been strengthened. In October 2014, Rosneft acquired 100% of the shares of Bishkek Oil Company, a leading national operator of the retail and wholesale petroleum products market, which has its own extensive network of retail gas stations in Bishkek and an oil depot in the Chuy region. Thus, Rosneft acquired an extensive network of gas stations and a number of infrastructure assets in the Kyrgyz capital. These transactions allow Gazprom and Rosneft to take key positions in the country’s promising oil products market and expand sales channels for high-value products [15]. In addition, it should be emphasized that since 2017, Russia has stopped collecting export customs duties on oil and oil products supplied to Kyrgyzstan for domestic consumption [14]. Thus, Russia should be considered the main supplier of Kyrgyzstan, providing almost all of its energy needs. In this context, Kyrgyzstan remains largely dependent on Russia’s energy orbit in political terms.

Another aspect that characterizes bilateral relations is the cancellation of debts by Russia. Russia, which continues its policy in Central Asia and especially in Kyrgyzstan, is said to have canceled Kyrgyzstan’s debts for various reasons. For example, in 2009, Kyrgyzstan’s debt to Russia increased to \$193.5 million, but 95% of this debt was canceled. The remaining part was paid with the 4 million shares of “Dastan A.Ş.” and the establishment of the Russian Federation Trade Mission in Kyrgyzstan. In addition, Russia provided financial assistance in the amount of \$150 million as a grant [16]. In addition, in April 2013, Russia canceled the debt of \$500 million. \$188.9 million was canceled immediately, while the remaining part of \$300 million is expected to be canceled in equal installments within ten years (kommersant.ru). In 2017, the Minister of Finance of the Russian Federation Anton Siluanov and the then Minister of Finance of Kyrgyzstan Adilbek Kasimaliev signed a protocol of agreement on the repayment of Kyrgyzstan’s debt to Russia for previously provided loans. The agreement was signed during the official visit of Kyrgyz President Almazbek Atambaev to Russia and provided for the cancellation of Kyrgyzstan’s debt of \$240 million.

Such generous behavior is unprecedented in Kyrgyzstan’s history, where no multilateral or unilateral loans have been eliminated in this way. However, it is possible that Russia has taken this step because it focuses on developing and strengthening bilateral relations as a strategic partnership.

Kyrgyzstan-China Relations

The importance Kyrgyzstan attaches to its relations with China stems from the fact that this state has gained the status of a rising power in the world and that it is a neighbor to the southeast of the country. China and Kyrgyzstan are neighboring countries that share a border. Historically and geographically, Kyrgyzstan and the West China (Xinjiang Autonomous Region) are located in a single political-cultural region. Due to this proximity, it is natural for political, commercial and economic relations between the two states to develop.

At present, the relationship between China and Kyrgyzstan is characterized by a significant level of intensity. China’s foreign policy is viewed from multiple perspectives, with its influence playing a crucial role in Kyrgyzstan’s development.

In this regard, China is recognized by Kyrgyzstan as a major power, possessing permanent membership in the United Nations Security Council, being part of the nuclear club, and wielding considerable global influence. Furthermore, China serves as an economic and trade partner, as well as a military and security ally in combating international terrorism, separatism, and organized crime. Consequently, the ties between Kyrgyzstan and China are evolving within this framework.

The dynamics of China-Kyrgyzstan relations are influenced by Kyrgyzstan's relatively smaller and weaker position; however, akin to Russia-Kyrgyzstan relations, Kyrgyzstan is pivotal concerning China's national and economic interests within the region. Consequently, despite notable disparities in territory, population, economic strength, and military capability, both nations are committed to creating a mutually advantageous framework for their bilateral relations. In the joint declaration issued on May 16, 1992, Kyrgyzstan and China affirmed their recognition of each other as friendly nations and expressed their intention to cultivate relations grounded in the universal principles governing interstate interactions. This declaration further emphasized that the two parties would address all matters arising between them through peaceful negotiations, avoiding the use of force in a spirit of good neighborliness and camaraderie. China was among the earliest nations to acknowledge Kyrgyzstan's independence. Over the years, a robust cooperation framework has been established through a legal structure comprising over 60 intergovernmental agreements that encompass various domains, including trade and investment, science and technology, air transportation, tourism and health, legal assistance, and additional areas.

Relations between the two states are focused on the economic sphere, particularly energy resource transportation projects, trade activities and regional investments. Kyrgyzstan, which does not have rich natural resources, maintains trade ties with China in particular and also carries out cooperation with this country on security issues.

The development of security cooperation between the two nations is progressing effectively at both bilateral and multilateral levels, within the frameworks of the UN, the Conference on Interaction and Confidence Building Measures in Asia - an intergovernmental forum aimed at fostering cooperation to enhance peace, security, and stability in Asia - and the SCO. In this regard, the SCO takes a prominent role. Established in April 1996 as the Shanghai Five by Russia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan under China's leadership, the SCO was created as a political entity intended to significantly influence the future of Central Asia. Its transformation into the SCO was completed in 2001 with the addition of Uzbekistan. China serves as the architect of the SCO's Shanghai spirit, the initiator of its institutional framework, its economic benefactor, and its primary driving force.

From the outset, Beijing has sought to address the issue of separatism through the framework of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). It is recognized that threats emanating from the Xinjiang Autonomous Region escalated between 1990 and 1997. In light of this, China has aimed to fortify its

western borders by enhancing collaboration with Kyrgyzstan and other Central Asian Republics, focusing on the collective efforts to combat the three threats identified in the SCO Charter: terrorism, separatism, and extremism. For the Kyrgyz government, security concerns hold significant importance, particularly following the Batken events of 1999-2000, which heightened the relevance of this matter. Consequently, the Kyrgyz government is keen on advancing military and political cooperation, prioritizing agreements aimed at bolstering military confidence-building measures and the mutual reduction of armed forces along the border, as established within the SCO framework.

Alongside concerns regarding security, China has demonstrated significant interest in the resource base of Kyrgyzstan, a country with limited natural resources. Kyrgyzstan holds the third position in hydropower potential among the former Soviet Union states. For instance, over 20 hydropower facilities could be constructed along the Naryn River, capable of producing 30 billion kWh. Furthermore, the territory of Kyrgyzstan is abundant in valuable minerals, including fossil fuels such as coal, shale, oil, and gas, as well as non-ferrous metals and gold deposits. In terms of gold extraction, Kyrgyzstan ranks third within the former Soviet Union. Additionally, the country possesses deposits of silver and copper, along with iron ore, manganese, and various rare earth metals.

With the annual increase in China's export potential, the nation requires markets for its goods along with suitable transportation and logistics infrastructure. In this regard, President Xi Jinping introduced the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) in the autumn of 2013. This initiative, which represents a modern iteration of the Silk Road strategy, seeks to enhance connections between China and various regions, including Central Asia, Europe, the Middle East, North America, Southeast Asia, and South Asia. The overarching goals are to create a vast market, support extensive domestic production driven by exports, develop the necessary infrastructure, and consequently rejuvenate the Chinese economy [17]. Within this geopolitical and geo-economic framework, two significant routes facilitate connections between China and both Africa and Europe via land and sea. The first route is the Silk Road Economic Belt, which primarily focuses on land connections to Central Asia and Europe, while the second is the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road, which targets regions in Southeast, South, and North Asia [18]. These routes are regarded as modern adaptations of the historical trade pathways established by the Silk Road. The Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) encompasses five primary objectives: fostering political harmony among the participating nations, enhancing transportation and communication infrastructure, reinforcing overall infrastructure development, facilitating closer connections by diminishing societal distances, and removing bureaucratic obstacles to trade while promoting the use of local currencies. Furthermore, the initiative seeks to achieve the integration of European and Asian markets. These objectives are pursued within the framework of principles that emphasize mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity among the BRI participant countries, aiming to eschew aggressive policies, refrain from interfering in domestic affairs, and promote equality, mutual benefit, and peace. As Kyrgyzstan is included among

the nations involved in this initiative, China views it as a transit country essential for accessing these markets.

Kyrgyzstan was among the initial nations to endorse the initiative put forth by Chinese President Xi Jinping, subsequently becoming the 37th founding member of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank in 2015. The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) is one of several financial entities established by China to address the substantial costs associated with the execution of projects formulated under the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). For Kyrgyzstan, the BRI represents a significant undertaking that aims to facilitate the re-industrialization of its economy, thereby placing it on a trajectory of accelerated development (www.russian.news.cn). Within Central Asia, there are 261 projects encompassed by the BRI, with 46 currently being executed in Kyrgyzstan. Among these 46 initiatives, which include both BRI and bilateral projects between China and Kyrgyzstan, 17 pertain to trade and industrial advancement, covering areas such as mineral extraction, industry, agriculture, food, finance, and informatics; 11 focus on railway and road connectivity; 5 are dedicated to energy; and 13 involve people-to-people exchanges [19].

China is interested in a stable and prosperous Kyrgyzstan. After Russia, China is Kyrgyzstan's second largest trade and economic partner. In this direction, China's investments constitute an important aspect of the trade and economic cooperation between the two countries. In this regard, joint projects in the fields of energy and transport have been successfully implemented. The most important investment projects in Kyrgyzstan, carried out with Chinese credit funds, were the construction of the Datka-Kemin power transmission line (\$389 million), the construction of the Junda oil processing plant (\$300 million), the reconstruction of the heat and power plant in Bishkek by the Chinese company TBEA (\$386 million) [20]. In the field of transport, projects such as the renovation of the highways "Osh-Batken-Isfana", "Bishkek-Balikchi" and "Bishkek-Naryn-Torugart", the China-Kyrgyzstan-Uzbekistan highway, as well as the alternative "North-South" highway have been implemented. The implementation of the above projects contributed to the strengthening of the energy, transport and logistics potential of Kyrgyzstan, which has ensured the development of the national economy. In addition, the rapid implementation of the project on the construction of the China-Kyrgyzstan-Uzbekistan railway will be an important step towards the full opening of the transit potential of the Central Asian region and an important element in supporting the BRI (russian.news.cn). It is also worth noting that, in addition to loans and direct investments, China has provided Kyrgyzstan with non-refundable assistance worth more than \$300 million for road construction and the supply of drinking water to remote areas [19].

In addition to the security and economic fields, since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries, there has been successful interaction in the cultural and social fields that promote mutual understanding between the two peoples. In particular, in the field of education, in the context of promoting Chinese language education and culture, 4 Confucius Institutes and 21 Confucius Classrooms have been opened in Kyrgyzstan. Departments of Chinese

language and literature successfully operate in Kyrgyz universities, and even a separate secondary school teaching Chinese as a foreign language was opened in Bishkek in 2017. At the same time, more than 4,600 Kyrgyz students study in China [19].

It is important to highlight that Kyrgyzstan's obligation to Eximbank rose from US\$9 million in 2008 to US\$1.7 billion by 2017, representing 42% of the total external debt of the Kyrgyz government and 24% of its GDP. All loans for infrastructure provided by the Chinese government are concessional, featuring effective interest rates ranging from 1.86% to 2.5%, a repayment duration of 20 to 25 years, and a grace period spanning 5 to 11 years. A collaborative evaluation conducted by the IMF and the International Development Association (IDA) indicates that the Kyrgyz Republic is at a moderate risk of debt distress; however, its debt situation remains susceptible to significant external shocks. The debt crisis is among the most contentious topics within Kyrgyz society and is a considerable concern for the public. Many believe that the challenges arising from the substantial debt burden will significantly shape the domestic political landscape in the country over the upcoming years.

Consequently, Kyrgyzstan's transport and logistics capabilities have captured significant interest from China, which is also keen on enhancing trade and economic collaboration. In the forthcoming years, it is anticipated that China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) will emerge as a crucial and prioritized element of the bilateral relationship between Kyrgyzstan and China. While there are inherent risks linked to economic reliance and the possible implications of China's "soft power", there exists an opportunity for cultivating a "strategic partnership" between the two nations founded on the tenets of equality, mutual trust, and reciprocal benefit.

Kyrgyzstan-US Relations

Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Kyrgyzstan emerged, alongside the Central Asian region, as a focal point of geostrategic significance for the United States. For instance, should the economic and political ties between China and the US decline, Kyrgyzstan's importance has notably increased due to its proximity to China, positioning it as a gateway for US access to the Chinese border. Since the early 1990s, the US has regarded the political changes occurring in Kyrgyzstan as a crucial catalyst for democratic reforms throughout Central Asia. Consequently, the initial bilateral and multilateral agreements established between Bishkek and the US primarily sought to facilitate the development of new social movements and political parties, as well as to reform the existing legal and judicial frameworks.

As discussed above, with the liberalization process initiated within the framework of political and economic reforms in Kyrgyzstan, steps were taken to establish a democratic system. The new government supported the strengthening of civil society and the implementation of political reforms in order to comply with international democratic system standards and to develop democracy. During this process, Western countries, including the USA, supported the political and economic reforms carried out by the Kyrgyz government. These

supports were carried out with the aim of helping to establish basic elements such as market economy and pluralism for the development of civil society and democracy, considering that Kyrgyzstan, which had newly gained independence, had no previous democratic experience, and to prevent the return of the autocratic regime. In this context, from 1991 to 2010, the USA spent a total of 1.22 billion dollars on various agendas in the country in order to make Kyrgyzstan the third country that received the most aid per capita among the former Soviet states. Additionally, the US supported Kyrgyzstan's membership in the WTO in 1998 [12].

The United States' democracy-assistance plans have made a significant contribution to Kyrgyzstan's democratic progress. Adequate resources have been devoted to promoting independent media, civic education, fair and free elections, and political participation. Numerous U.S. government agencies, including USAID, and NGOs such as Freedom House, the Soros Foundation, and the National Endowment for Democracy have served to strengthen the country's democracy-related processes. The activities of such organizations constitute important components of the U.S. soft power presence in Kyrgyzstan [21].

One of the loudest statements about the long-term deployment of the US military base in Kyrgyzstan was made by the President of the Kyrgyz Republic A. Atambaev. He stated at a press conference in front of media representatives: "There should be no military element at Manas International Airport. This is my principled position and is not something that was accepted under someone's pressure." The President noted that the presence of the US military has a destabilizing effect on the region. He emphasized that during the 11-year war in Afghanistan, drug production continued to grow not throughout the country, but only in one province. According to Atambaev, it was possible to completely eliminate it during the specified period. The President warned of possible difficulties that the presence of US military personnel at Manas Airport could create for Kyrgyzstan, noting that the presence of another state's armed forces could lead to certain problems for the country, including sabotage attempts. After such statements, interstate relations between the Kyrgyz Republic and the United States cooled. Following this, the Kyrgyz government under Almazbek Atambaev reiterated its intention to close Manas Air Base due to the lease agreement expiring in 2014. This decision was partly influenced by financial incentives and economic aid from Russia. Thus, in 2014, the US military officially evacuated Manas Air Base.

The Manas base functioned as a significant logistics center and acted as a crucial transit location in the battle against terrorism in Afghanistan. Recognized as one of the most active US military installations globally, it boasted state-of-the-art Air Force amenities. Consequently, the shutdown of this military base in Kyrgyzstan adversely impacted US policy in the area [8].

Notwithstanding this, the newly elected President of Kyrgyzstan has initiated efforts to restore relations with the United States. During his official visit to the United States in September 2018, President Jeenbekov noted that the previous administration had unilaterally terminated the cooperation

agreement between the two nations. The United States expresses a keen interest in collaborating with Kyrgyzstan and other Central Asian countries to establish transportation routes that circumvent Russia for the delivery of hydrocarbons to Western nations. Consequently, the current objective of the United States in Kyrgyzstan focuses on executing projects and initiatives related to security, economic growth, and cultural exchange, facilitated by the US government, the US Agency for International Development, the IMF, and the World Bank through grants, short-term initiatives, and loans. It is indisputable that the United States plays a significant role as a global actor in international relations, leading Kyrgyzstan to uphold multilateral diplomatic ties with it. In turn, the United States continues to assert its influence in the region as a major power.

Thus, Kyrgyzstan, as a small state, demonstrates mastery in its relations with major powers by carefully balancing geopolitical considerations, economic interests, and regional security dynamics. The closure of the Manas Air Base and subsequent diplomatic initiatives underscore the complex nature of Kyrgyzstan's foreign relations in the evolving environment of a multipolar world.

Kyrgyzstan-EU Relations

Kyrgyzstan attaches great importance to the European orientation in the country's multifaceted foreign policy, as well as other key foreign policy areas. Diplomatic relations between Kyrgyzstan and the EU have developed significantly over the years, encompassing political, economic and cultural dimensions.

In accordance with its general strategy for promoting democracy, the EU is implementing a developmental approach to promoting democratic values and principles in Kyrgyzstan. In this context, EU assistance to the country aims to reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development without ignoring democracy, good governance, the rule of law and human rights. Socio-economic development and democratic political reforms are integral and equally important parts of the EU policy towards Kyrgyzstan. The combination of development and democracy support can be traced in certain EU-funded projects. Almost all projects combine development-oriented initiatives with democratic elements [22].

Several years following the initiation of the TACIS program, the political engagement between the EU and Kyrgyzstan began to gain traction. In 1995, the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) was signed by the EU and Kyrgyzstan, which became effective in 1999. This agreement facilitated the creation of shared structures that served as platforms for dialogue and mechanisms for European political influence in Bishkek. Consequently, the Cooperation Council, the Cooperation Committee, and the Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation Committee were established. These entities played a significant role in Kyrgyzstan's accession to the WTO in 1998, with Brussels providing support, marking it as the first Central Asian nation to achieve this status. Nearly concurrently, there was a notable increase in the activity of the OSCE within the Kyrgyz Republic. A clear indication of this is the establishment of the Academy of this organization in Kyrgyzstan in 1999.

In conjunction with this agreement and other sectoral accords aimed at fostering collaboration between Kyrgyzstan and the EU, the European Union

has been recognized as a principal donor to Kyrgyzstan. The EU has extended grant assistance across multiple domains, such as environmental protection, the advancement of democratic reforms and human rights, support for socio-economic, humanitarian, and educational reforms, enhancement of border and regional security, efforts to combat drug trafficking, and the assurance of food security [20].

For Kyrgyzstan, this strategy holds significant importance as it elevates the relationship between the EU and the nation from a traditional “recipient country – donor country” dynamic to a more advanced partnership model encompassing all Central Asian states. The primary objective of the strategy was to outline the framework and trajectory of collaboration between the EU and Central Asia. To fulfill the aims of this strategy, the EU leveraged its existing partnership and cooperation agreements alongside its permanent representations. Of the 750 million Euros earmarked for the implementation of the strategy within Central Asia, Kyrgyzstan received 171 million Euros for the period from 2007 to 2013. Out of this total, 110 million Euros were allocated to various projects focusing on poverty alleviation (44 million), education (25 million), rural development (15 million), and administrative support (26 million). Furthermore, 61 million Euros were designated to bolster the country’s budget. It is important to note that this figure does not encompass bilateral initiatives from EU member states, projects funded by NGOs, or the contributions made by the EU to several international organizations operating in Central Asia. As an illustration, 70% of the budget for the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) is allocated by the European Union to support the organization’s initiatives in the region. Furthermore, the European Union, along with its member states, contributes 62% of the capital pledged to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). Excluding the oil and gas sector, the EBRD stands as the largest multinational investor in Central Asia, having provided approximately €3 billion in direct project financing. In Kyrgyzstan, for instance, the EBRD has facilitated 120 projects amounting to €535 million.

Within the framework of this strategy, the main aid programs used by the European Commission in Kyrgyzstan are: Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI), Instrument for Stability (IfS), European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) and Humanitarian Aid Office.

Kyrgyzstan-EU security cooperation is developing mainly under the auspices of the OSCE. However, bilateral security cooperation gained additional momentum with Kyrgyzstan’s participation in NATO’s Partnership for Peace (PfP). In 1994, Bishkek signed the NATO PfP Framework Document. At the same time, a separate document “Kyrgyzstan-NATO” was put forward, reflecting the priorities and areas of cooperation. In addition, the set of measures implemented in Kyrgyzstan within the framework of PfP is recorded in the Partnership Work Program, which is updated every 2 years and includes conducting exercises, courses, seminars, symposiums, conferences, training, etc. PfP also allows some EU Member States to continue cooperation with Kyrgyzstan on environmental and scientific issues, peacekeeping training, search and rescue and humanitarian

operations, emergency planning and civil-military relations between the countries.

Since gaining independence, Kyrgyzstan and the EU have enhanced their bilateral relations and engaged in a progressively expansive dialogue regarding cooperation. Consequently, Kyrgyzstan generally views the EU as a benevolent external entity that does not present a significant threat, either in the short or long term, unlike China, which is associated with financially “conditional” investments, or Russia, which has geopolitical interests. Additionally, the EU is predominantly regarded as a donor, a role that is favored domestically over that of a geopolitical actor [23].

Thus, cooperation with the EU is based on the growing interest of both parties in the continuous deepening of this cooperation. The basis of long-term cooperation between Kyrgyzstan and the EU is related to the solution of urgent problems for the country related to the democratic and economic reconstruction of society and the creation of a new regional security system that takes into account the interests of the Eurasian states.

On 17 June 2019, a new strategy for Central Asia was adopted by the European Council, which aligns EU policies with emerging opportunities in the region. This strategy is marked by a distinct arrangement of perceptions, interests, and implementation methods. It outlines new priorities for the EU within the region, including “partnership for resilience,” “partnership for prosperity,” and “working better together.” Similar to its predecessor, this strategy has faced criticism for its generality, which may hinder its potential to effect change in the region. Nevertheless, this articulation of EU priorities reflects a recent trend wherein the EU perceives Central Asia as a battleground for influence against Russia and China. In this context, the EU seeks to set itself apart from these two powers by addressing the needs of Central Asia rather than enforcing its own regulations [23].

Thus, the progressive development of relations between Kyrgyzstan and the EU is supported within the framework of the strategic partnership as outlined in this strategy, which in turn affects the political and economic development of the country, forming a long-term priority of Kyrgyzstan’s multifaceted foreign policy.

Conclusion

The definition and characteristics of small states are emphasized, and the economic, geopolitical and political vulnerabilities of these states are examined. In addition, small states are analyzed in the context of international relations theories and their roles are discussed. The strategies and goals that small states follow to increase their effectiveness in the international arena are discussed. Strategies such as forming alliances, adopting a policy of neutrality, and economic diplomacy are examined, and the roles of these states in international relations are emphasized. In addition, asymmetric dynamics in relations with great powers are discussed, and various dimensions of the power of small states are emphasized. Beyond their material resources, their potential to use power through diplomatic initiatives, strategic alliances and areas of expertise are emphasized. In line with

this, the study argues that small states can show their influence by using internal, derivative and collective power. Regarding internal power forms, it is emphasized that small states, despite their inherent fragility, can benefit from certain internal powers. It has been determined that small states can develop effective foreign policies by adopting smart and soft power strategies compatible with their unique vulnerabilities.

Kyrgyzstan, which had no experience of becoming a sovereign state after the independence period and was freed from centralized governance, made efforts to follow international development examples, but faced political turmoil and difficulties. This study, which also examines the historical development of the country, highlighted the development of independent Kyrgyzstan following the collapse of the Soviet Union, which was marked by a series of political and economic transformations. In this context, the challenges faced by the country, such as political instability, ethnic tensions, economic difficulties and regional security problems, were highlighted. In addition, the complexity of the political and economic environment in Kyrgyzstan, marked by multifaceted challenges, power struggles, corruption, regional divisions and popular discontent, was emphasized. Thus, Kyrgyzstan continued to struggle with these problems while advancing on the path to stability and development.

However, the geopolitical location of the post-Soviet states presents various opportunities and challenges. In this context, Kyrgyzstan, which is geopolitically located in the heart of Central Asia, has strategic importance affecting regional dynamics, security concerns and economic interactions. However, although Kyrgyzstan's military and economic capacities are limited, its international cooperation and participation in regional organizations have contributed to its importance in shaping regional dynamics. In this context, it has been emphasized that international cooperation is among the priority areas of Kyrgyzstan's foreign policy, in addition to ensuring its independence, territorial integrity, socio-economic development and strengthening democratic reforms. In general, Kyrgyzstan's foreign policy is characterized by a pragmatic, balanced, open, multi-faceted and consistent approach aimed at maximizing global opportunities for the country's development. Kyrgyzstan's foreign policy, which has been shaped in this direction, has been formed within the context of interactions with major powers such as Russia, China and the United States and has reflected balancing efforts between these powers. The multifaceted analysis of the relations with these powers covered economic, political and security dimensions as well as regional dynamics and international institutions. Thus, the study examined Kyrgyzstan's relations with major powers such as the USA, China and Russia, and emphasized the multifaceted nature of these interactions.

The power dynamics in Kyrgyzstan's relations with major powers are complex and multifaceted. The country's ability to balance its interactions with the US, EU, China and Russia demonstrates its diplomatic agility in responding to evolving geopolitical environments. A multifaceted approach guided by the pursuit of national interests and avoiding excessive dependence on a single power reflects the essence of Kyrgyzstan's foreign policy. The country's strategic geographical

location, relatively democratic governance and regional stability form the basis of its internal strengths, which underpin its international commitments. Derivative power, which is manifested through military cooperation, economic partnerships and strategic alliances, demonstrates Kyrgyzstan's adeptness in utilizing foreign relations in its own interests. The collective power gained through active participation in regional organizations offers Kyrgyzstan good opportunities to increase its regional and international influence.

In conclusion, by explaining Kyrgyzstan's strategic choices and diplomatic maneuvers in its relations with major powers, this study contributes to a better understanding of how small states gain influence and navigate complex international environments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Annette B. Fox *The Small States in the International System, 1919–1969* // *International Journal*. – 1969. - Vol. 24, No. 4. P. 751–764.
- [2] Vital D. *The Inequality of States: A Study of the Small Power in International Relations*. - Oxford University Press, 1967. - 198 p.
- [3] Keohane Robert O. *The Big Influence of Small Allies* // *Foreign Policy*. – 1971. – N 2.
- [4] East M.A. *Size and foreign politics behavior: a test of two models* // *World Politics*. – 1973.- Vol. 25 No. 4. - P. 556-576.
- [5] Handel M. *The Inequality of States: A Study of the Small Power in International Relations*. - Oxford University Press, 1967. - 198 p.
- [6] Elman M. *The Foreign Policies of Small States: Challenging Neorealism in Its Own Backyard* // *British Journal of Political Science*. – 1995. - Vol. 25, No. 2.
- [7] Huskey E. *Foreign Policy in a Vulnerable State: Kyrgyzstan as Military Entrepot Between the Great Powers* // *China & Eurasia Forum Quarterly*. – 2008. - N 6 (4).
- [8] Toktomushev K. *Kyrgyzstan-Regime Security and Foreign Policy*. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- [9] *Yaşar Sari*. *Foreign Policy of Kyrgyzstan under Askar Akayev and Kurmanbek Ba-kiyev* // *Perceptions*. – 2012. - Vol. 17, No. 3. – P. 131-150.
- [10] Dzshuraev S. *Kyrgyzstan and the Changing Geopolitics of Central Asia and the Caucasus* // *Central Asia-Caucasus Analyst*. August 30, 2022. (<https://www.cacianalyst.org/resources/pdf/220830-FT-Kyrgyzstan.pdf>)
- [11] Willis J. *Breaking the paradigm (s): A review of the three waves of international relations small state literature* // *Pacific Dynamics: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*. - 2021. - Vol 5, No. 1. – P. 18-32.
- [12] Baldacchino G., Wivel A. *Small states: concepts and theories* / In Baldacchino, G., & Wivel, A. (Eds.), *Handbook on the politics of small states*. - Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2020.
- [13] Зверев П. Ю., Савин И. С., Беляев В. Ю. *Российско-киргизские отношения: история и современность* // *Россия и новые государства Евразии*. – М., 2018. – С. 106-125.

[14] Рыжов И. В., Бородина М. Ю. Основные приоритеты внешней политики Кыргызстана / В: Россия и новые государства Евразии. – М., 2019. – С. 142-157.

[15] Грозин А. Российско-киргизские экономические отношения и топливно-энергетический сектор экономики Киргизии // Геоэкономика энергетики. - 2019. - N 5(1). – С. 160-178.

[16] Осмоналиев К. О текущем состоянии внутренней и внешней политики Кыргызстана // Международное сотрудничество евразийских государств: политика, экономика, право. – 2020. – N 2. - С. 85-96.

[17] Aoyama R. One Belt, One Road: China's New Global Strategy // Journal of Contemporary East Asia Studies. – 2016. - Vol. 5, No. 2. – P. 3-22.

[18] Deepak B. R. Global Rebalancing: Will It Reshape the International Political and Economic Order? - Singapore: Springer, 2018.

[19] Nicharapova J. Cooperation of China and Kyrgyzstan within Belt and Road Initiatives: Construction of Roads in Kyrgyz Republic / In Alix, Y. et al., Logistics & Diplomacy in Central Asia. - Paris: Editions EMS, 2022.

[20] Лу Ч. Проблемы сотрудничества экономических отношений Кыргызстана и Китая в рамках проекта «Экономический пояс Великого Шелкового пути // Вестник Кыргызско-Российского Славянского университета. - 2018. – N 18(3). – С. 27-31.

[21] Javid F., Qadri S. The Rise and Decline of US Interest and Influence in Kyrgyzstan // Pakistan Journal of International Affairs. - 2021. - Vol. 4, No. 1.

[22] Sharshenova A. The European Union's assistance to Kyrgyzstan: Good intentions, mixed results / In: Axyonova V. (Ed.). European Engagement under Review: Exporting Values, Rules, and Practices to the Post-Soviet Space. - Columbia University Press, 2016.

[23] Fawn R., Kluczevska K., Korneev O. EU–Central Asian interactions: perceptions, interests and practices // Central Asian Survey. – 2022. - Vol. 41, No. 4. - P. 617-638.

REFERENCES

[1] Annette B. Fox The Small States in the International System, 1919–1969 // International Journal. 1969. Vol. 24, No. 4. P. 751–764.

[2] Vital D. The Inequality of States: A Study of the Small Power in International Relations. Oxford University Press, 1967. 198 p.

[3] Keohane Robert O. The Big Influence of Small Allies. Foreign Policy. 1971. N 2.

[4] East M.A. Size and foreign politics behavior: a test of two models. World Politics. 1973. Vol. 25 No. 4. P. 556-576.

[5] Handel M. The Inequality of States: A Study of the Small Power in International Relations. Oxford University Press, 1967. 198 p.

[6] Elman M. *The Foreign Policies of Small States: Challenging Neorealism in Its Own Backyard*. British Journal of Political Science. 1995. Vol. 25, No. 2.

[7] Huskey E. Foreign Policy in a Vulnerable State: Kyrgyzstan as Military Entrepot Between the Great Powers. *China & Eurasia Forum Quarterly*. 2008. -N 6 (4).

[8] Toktomushev K. *Kyrgyzstan-Regime Security and Foreign Policy*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

[9] *Yaşar Sari*. Foreign Policy of Kyrgyzstan under Askar Akayev and Kurmanbek Bakiyev. *Perceptions*. 2012. Vol. 17, No. 3. P. 131-150.

[10] Dzshuraev S. Kyrgyzstan and the Changing Geopolitics of Central Asia and the Caucasus. *Central Asia-Caucasus Analyst*. August 30, 2022. (<https://www.cacianalyst.org/resources/pdf/220830-FT-Kyrgyzstan.pdf>)

[11] Willis J. Breaking the paradigm (s): A review of the three waves of international relations small state literature. *Pacific Dynamics: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*. 2021. - Vol 5, No. 1. P. 18-32.

[12] Baldacchino G., Wivel A. Small states: concepts and theories. In Baldacchino, G., & Wivel, A. (Eds.), *Handbook on the politics of small states*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2020.

[13] Zverev R. Y., Savin I. S., Belyaev V. Y. *Rossiysko-kirgizskie otnosheniya: istoriya i sovremennost'*. Russian-Kyrgyz relations: history and modernity. M., 2018. S.106-125 [in Russ.].

[14] Ryjov I. V., Borodina M. Y. *Osnovnye priority vneshnei politiki Kyrgyzstana* [Main priorities of Kyrgyzstan's foreign polic]. M., 2019. S. 142-157 [in Russ.].

[15] Grozin A. *Rossiysko-kirgizskie ekonomicheskie otnosheniya i toplivno-energeticheskiy sektor ekonomiki Kirgizii* [Russian-Kyrgyz economic relations and the fuel and energy sector of the Kyrgyz economy]. *Geoeconomica energetiki*. 2019. N 5(1). S 160-178 [in Russ.].

[16] Osmonaliev K. *O tekushem sostoyanii vnutrenney i vneshney politiki Kyrgyzstana* [On the current state of domestic and foreign policy of Kyrgyzstan]. *Mezhdunarodnoye sotrudnichestvo yevraziyskikh gosudarstv: politika, ekonomika, parvo* [International cooperation of Eurasian states: politics, economics, law]. 2020. N 2. S. 85-96 [in Russ.].

[17] Aoyama R. One Belt, One Road: China's New Global Strategy. *Journal of Contemporary East Asia Studies*. 2016. - Vol. 5, No. 2. P. 3-22.

[18] Deepak B. R. *Global Rebalancing: Will It Reshape the International Political and Economic Order?* - Singapore: Springer, 2018.

[19] Nicharapova J. *Cooperation of China and Kyrgyzstan within Belt and Road Initiatives: Construction of Roads in Kyrgyz Republic*. In Alix, Y. et al., *Logistics & Diplomacy in Central Asia*. - Paris: Editions EMS, 2022.

[20] Lu C. *Problemy sotrudnichestva ekonomicheskikh otnosheniy Kyrgyzstana i Kitaya v ramkah proekta "Ekonomicheskiy poyas Velikogo Shelkovogo puti"* [Problems of cooperation between economic relations of Kyrgyzstan and China within the framework of the project "Economic Belt of the Great Silk Road"]. *Bulletin of the Kyrgyz-Russian Slavic University*. 2018. N 18(3). S. 27-31 [in Russ.].

[21] Javaid F., Qadri S. The Rise and Decline of US Interest and Influence in Kyrgyzstan. Pakistan Journal of International Affairs. 2021. Vol. 4, No. 1.

[22] Sharshenova A. The European Union's assistance to Kyrgyzstan: Good intentions, mixed results. In: Axyonova V. (Ed.). European Engagement under Review: Exporting Values, Rules, and Practices to the Post-Soviet Space. Columbia University Press, 2016.

[23] Fawn R., Kluczevska K., Korneev O. EU–Central Asian interactions: perceptions, interests and practices. Central Asian Survey. 2022. Vol. 41, No. 4.- P. 617-638.

ШАҒЫН МЕМЛЕКЕТТЕРДІҢ ХАЛЫҚАРАЛЫҚ ҚАТЫНАСТАРҒА ЫҚПАЛЫ: ҚЫРҒЫЗСТАННЫҢ ҰЛЫ ДЕРЖАВАЛАРМЕН ҚАРЫМ-ҚАТЫНАСЫ

* Оздилек С.Э.¹

*¹ Уфук Университеті, Анкара, Түркия

Андатпа. Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты халықаралық қатынастардың барысын және Қырғызстанның ірі державалармен өзара іс-қимылында күш қолдануға ықпал ететін факторларды, халықаралық қатынастар саласындағы шағын мемлекеттердің күш динамикасына ерекше назар аудара отырып, зерттеу болып табылады. Тарихи тұрғыдан мемлекеттер арасындағы күштік өзара іс-қимыл ірі державалар үстемдік еткен салада маңызды фактор болды, бұл мемлекеттердің әлемдік аренада өз позицияларын қалай құратынын қалыптастырудың негізгі құрамдас бөлігі болды. Бұл тұрғыда шағын мемлекеттер көбінесе халықаралық аренаның тиімсіз қатысушылары ретінде қарастырылды және көбінесе күш динамикасынан шығарылды. Алайда, қазіргі жағдайда шағын мемлекеттер өздерін мойындату және өз мүдделеріне басымдық беру үшін айтарлықтай әлеуетке ие, осылайша ойындағы күш динамикасына енеді. Демек, Орталық Азияның қақ ортасында орналасқан Қырғызстанның ірі державалармен өзара әрекеттесуіндегі күш динамикасын талдау зерттеудің маңызды саласын білдіреді. Бұл зерттеу Қырғызстанның Ресей, Қытай және Америка Құрама Штаттары сияқты ірі заманауи әлемдік державалармен қарым-қатынасы аясында өз мақсаттарына жету және өз мүдделерін қорғау үшін күш қолдану қабілетін зерттейді. Осы мақсатта төрт бөлімнен тұратын талдау шағын мемлекеттерге қатысты халықаралық қатынастардағы билік тұжырымдамасын, халықаралық жүйедегі шағын мемлекеттер арасындағы билік динамикасын қарастырады және осы тұрғыда Қырғызстанды жан-жақты зерттеуді қамтамасыз етеді.

Тірек сөздер: халықаралық қатынастар, билік, шағын мемлекет, ұлы держава, Қырғызстан, Ресей, Қытай, АҚШ

ВЛИЯНИЕ МАЛЫХ ГОСУДАРСТВ НА МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ: ОТНОШЕНИЯ КЫРГЫЗСТАНА С ВЕЛИКИМИ ДЕРЖАВАМИ

* Оздилек С.Э.¹

*¹ Университет Уфук, Анкара, Турция

Аннотация. Целью данного исследования является изучение хода международных отношений и факторов, влияющих на использование силы во взаимодействиях Кыргызстана с крупными державами, с особым акцентом на динамику силы малых государств в сфере международных отношений. Исторически силовые взаимодействия между государствами были важным фактором в области, в которой доминировали крупные державы, выступая в качестве ключевого компонента в формировании того, как государства устанавливают свои позиции на мировой арене. В этом контексте малые государства часто рассматривались как неэффективные участники международной арены и в значительной степени исключались из динамики силы. Однако в современных условиях малые государства обладают значительным потенциалом для утверждения своей идентичности и расстановки приоритетов в своих интересах, таким образом интегрируясь в динамику силы в игре. Следовательно, анализ динамики силы Кыргызстана, расположенного в самом сердце Центральной Азии, в его взаимодействии с крупными державами представляет собой важную область исследований. Данное исследование изучает способность Кыргызстана использовать силу для достижения своих целей и защиты своих интересов в контексте его отношений с крупными современными мировыми державами, такими как Россия, Китай и Соединенные Штаты. С этой целью четырехчастный анализ рассмотрит концепцию власти в международных отношениях по отношению к малым государствам, динамику власти среди малых государств в международной системе и предоставит всестороннее исследование Кыргызстана в этом контексте.

Ключевые слова: международные отношения, власть, малое государство, великая держава, Кыргызстан, Россия, Китай, США

Information about authors:

Ozdilek S.E. – Assoc. Prof. PhD, Ufuk University, Ankara, Turkey, e-mail: elif.ozdilek@ufuk.edu.tr

Автор туралы мәлімет:

Оздилек С.Э. – қауымдастырылған профессор, PhD, Уфук Университеті, Анкара, Түркия, e-mail: elif.ozdilek@ufuk.edu.tr

Сведения об авторе:

Оздилек С.Э. – ассоциированный профессор, PhD, Университет Уфук, Анкара, Турция, e-mail: elif.ozdilek@ufuk.edu.tr

Received: February 2, 2025