TURKEY'S RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL IN THE 2000s:
A CONSTRUCTIVIST PERSPECTIVE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

DERVİŞ FİKRET ÜNAL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

JUNE 2016

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. İhsan Dağı	(METU, IR)	
Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür	(METU, IR)	_____
Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı	(METU, IR)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şaban Kardaş	(TOBB ETÜ, IR)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. İlker Aytürk	(BİLKENT, ADM)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Derviş Fikret Ünal

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

TURKEY'S RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL IN THE 2000s:
A CONSTRUCTIVIST PERSPECTIVE

Derviş Fikret Ünal

Ph.D., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür

July 2016, 299 pages

The main aim of this dissertation is to understand Turkey's relations with Israel in the 2000s from the perspective of Turkey's state identity. The research question of this dissertation is whether or not the concept of "state identity" is relevant to the Turkish-Israeli relations, and if so, to what extent. This dissertation also studies if there is continuity or change in Turkey's state identity in the 2000s. To that end, the dissertation compares and contrasts the situation before and after the Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*) term from a theoretical perspective in order to reach a final analysis. This dissertation assumes that the change in the Turkish-Israeli relations in the 2000s from the strategic relations to crises can be explained by the change in Turkey's state identity from the pro-Western stance to *the Middle Easternized Central Country / Heir of the Ottoman Empire* stance.

Keywords: State identity, interest, foreign policy, Turkey, Israel

ÖZ

2000'Lİ YILLARDA TÜRKİYE'NİN İSRAİL'LE İLİŞKİLERİ: İNŞACI BİR BAKIŞ AÇISI

Derviş Fikret Ünal

Doktora, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür

Temmuz 2016, 299 sayfa

Bu tezin temel amacı, 2000'li yıllarda Türkiye'nin İsrail'le olan ilişkilerini Türkiye'nin devlet kimliği bakış açısından anlamaktadır. Tezin araştırma sorusu, "devlet kimliği" kavramının Türk-İsrail ilişkileriyle ilgili olup olmadığı, ilgili ise, ilişkileri hangi dereceye kadar açıklayıcı olduğudur. Bu tez, 2000'li yıllarda Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinde süreklilik veya değişim olup olmadığını da ele almaktadır. Bu doğrultuda, sözkonusu tez, teorik bir çerçevede nihai bir analize varmak amacıyla, Türkiye'de Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi iktidarı öncesi ve sonrasını kıyaslamaktadır. Bu tez, Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerinin, 1990'lı yıllarda "stratejik ilişkiler" tanımlamasından 2000'li yıllarda "krizler dönemine" dönüşmesine yönelik değişiminin, Türkiye'nin Batılı devlet kimliğinin *Ortadoğululaşmış Merkez Ülke / Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Mirasçısı* kimliğine dönüşmesiyle açıklanabileceğini ileri sürmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Devlet kimliği, çıkar, dış politika, Türkiye, İsrail

To Salih Miroğlu, Nurten Ege, Fikret Ünal, Refik Ege, Mahiye Ünal,

my family and the persons who always trust and help me

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

ADL	Anti-Defamation League
AL	Arab League
ANAP	Motherland Party (Anavatan Partisi)
ANZUS	Australia, New Zealand and United States Security Treaty
ASALA	Armenian Secret Army for Liberation of Armenia
CHF/CHP	Republican People's Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası/Partisi)
DP	Democrat Party (Demokrat Parti)
DSP	Democratic Left Party (Demokratik Sol Parti)
DTP	Democrat Turkey Party (Demokrat Türkiye Partisi)
DYP	True Path Party (Doğru Yol Partisi)
EC	European Community
EEC	European Economic Community
EU	European Union
FP	Virtue Party (Fazilet Partisi)
G-8	Group of Eight
GNAT	Grand National Assembly of Turkey (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi)
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IAI	Israel Aircraft Industries
IAF	Israeli Air Force
IDF	Israeli Defense Forces
IHH	IHH Humanitarian Relief Foundation (İnsan Hak ve Hürriyetleri İnsani Yardım Vakfı)

IML	Israel Military Industries
IR	International Relations
JDP	Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi)
JTA	Jewish Telegraphic Agency
MAZLUMDER	Association for Human Rights and Solidarity for the Oppressed (İnsan Hakları ve Mazlumlar için Dayanışma Derneği)
MHP	Nationalist Movement Party (Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi)
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NIS	New Israeli Shekel
NSC	National Security Council (Milli Güvenlik Kurulu)
OAPEC	Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OIC	Organization of Islamic Conference
PA	Palestinian Authority
PKK	Kurdistan Workers' Party
PLO	Palestinian Liberation Organization
RP	Welfare Party (Refah Partisi)
SAR	Search and rescue
SP	Felicity Party (Saadet Partisi)
TIKA	Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (Türk İşbirliği ve Koordinasyon Ajansı)
TOBB	Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği)
UAVs	Unmanned aerial vehicles

UN	United Nations
UNIFIL	United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
UNSCOP	United Nations Special Committee on Palestine
US	United States (of America)
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> Though territorial state-nations are little more than 50-80 years old in many parts of the world, there are strong value systems anchored in societies that predate such formations. Turkey is an example of one of those.[1]

This thesis focuses on Turkey's relations with Israel in the 2000s from the perspective of Turkey's state identity. The research question is whether or not the concept of "state identity" is relevant to the Turkish-Israeli relations, and if so, to what extent. This dissertation also studies if there is continuity or change in Turkey's state identity in the 2000s. For that reason, the dissertation compares and contrasts the situation before and after the Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi* - the JDP) term from a theoretical perspective in order to reach a final analysis.

This study does argue that the change in the Turkish-Israeli relations in the 2000s from the strategic relations to crises can be explained by the change in Turkey's state identity from the pro-Western stance to *the Middle Easternized Central Country/Heir of the Ottoman Empire* stance. Although it seems possible to examine the Turkish-Israeli relations from different perspectives like the realist

---

[1] Philip Robins, "Turkish Foreign Policy since 2002: Between a 'Post-Islamist' Government and a Kemalist State", *International Affairs*, Vol.83, No.1, 2007, p. 290.

theory which benefits from geostrategic calculations, the balance of power politics and regional dynamics, the research asserts that state identity provides a valuable approach to understand Turkey's relations with Israel under the JDP rule as there have been only a limited number of studies available until now that study the bilateral relations from this perspective.

1.1.   Literature Review

The Turkish-Israeli relationship has been debated from different angles. For example, one group of writers focuses on the domestic factors shaping the bilateral relations. Ofra Bengio, in her book "*The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*", analyzes the historic, geo-strategic and political-cultural roots of the relations from the establishment of the State of Israel in May 1948 to Israel's offensive in Gaza of December 2008-January 2009.[2] Similarly, Michael B. Bishku, in his article "*How has Turkey Viewed Israel?*", examines the domestic factors in Turkey such as the rise of political Islam and its impact on Turkey-Israel relations.[3] Based on the internal dynamics, they argue that the relationship has followed the path of change including ups and downs.

In addition, there are also studies which take up the bilateral relations from a theoretical perspective. For instance, Tarık Oğuzlu, in his article "*The Changing*

---

[2] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

[3] Michael B. Bishku, "How has Turkey Viewed Israel?", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, pp.177-194.

Dynamics of Turkey-Israel Relations: A Structural Realist Account"[4], and Hasan Kösebalaban, in his article *"The Crisis in Turkish-Israeli Relations: What is its Strategic Significance?"*[5], explore the changing dynamics of Turkey's relations with Israel from a structural realist viewpoint. They try to complement domestic and identity-related factors with structural factors, and discuss that identity-related factors were influential on the climate of the Turkish-Israeli relations during the 1990s and the 2000s.

Moreover, both the regional and international factors in the Turkish-Israeli relationship are analyzed as well. Süha Bölükbaşı, in his articles *"Türkiye ve İsrail: Mesafeli Yakınlıktan Stratejik Ortaklığa"* and *"Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View"*[6], Joshua Walker, in his article *"Turkey and Israel's Relationship in the Middle East"*[7], and Bülent Aras and Salih Bıçakçı, in their article *"Europe, Turkey and the Middle East: Is Harmonization Possible?"*[8], compare and contrast the relations before and after the Cold War. They make an emphasis on geopolitical factors/necessities that have been influential on defining Turkey's policies. On this point, it is useful to indicate that those articles should not be strictly classified

---

[4] Tarık Oğuzlu, "The Changing Dynamics of Turkey-Israel Relations: A Structural Realist Account", *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol.15, No.2, 2010, pp.273-288.

[5] Hasan Kösebalaban, "The Crisis in Turkish-Israeli Relations: What is its Strategic Significance?", *Middle East Policy Council*, Vol.17, No.3, 2010 (It is possible to reach from internet).

[6] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Türkiye ve İsrail: Mesafeli Yakınlıktan Stratejik Ortaklığa", in Şaban H. Çalış, İhsan D. Dağı and Ramazan Gözen (eds), *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberté Yayınları, 2001, pp.243-269; Süha Bölükbaşı, "Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.29, No.1, 1999, pp.21-35.

[7] Joshua Walker, "Turkey and Israel's Relationship in the Middle East", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.17, No.4, 2006, pp.60-90.

[8] Bülent Aras and Salih Bıçakçı, "Europe, Turkey and the Middle East: Is Harmonization Possible?", *East European Quarterly*, Vol.40, No.3, 2006, pp.367-381.

under one category. To illustrate, Bölükbaşı tries to enrich his arguments on the relations by taking the domestic factors in Turkey such as the rise of political Islam in the 1990s, too.

Furthermore, there are also historical narratives of the relations without a theoretical framework, and academic studies which concentrate on specific periods of time, particularly the 1990s and the 2000s. To exemplify, Mehmet Mücahit Ekinci, in his book "*Turkish-Israeli Relations: Past and Present*"[9], first provides an overview of the ancient inter-communal ties between the Ottoman Turks and the Jewish diaspora, then examines the state-to-state relations during the Cold War and afterwards, and finally concludes his book with the Mavi Marmara incident without making a final analysis on the relations.

In that regard, Philip Robins' book "*Suits and Uniforms: Turkish Foreign Policy since the Cold War*"[10], Meliha Altunışık's article "*The Turkish-Israeli Rapprochement in the Post-Cold War Era*"[11], Özlem Tür's article "*Turkey and Israel in the 2000s: From Cooperation to Conflict*"[12], Kılıç Buğra Kanat's article "*Continuity of Change in Turkish Foreign Policy under the JDP Government: The*

---

[9] Mehmet Mücahit Ekinci, *Turkish-Israeli Relations: Past and Present*, Ankara: Ankamat Matbaacılık, 2011.

[10] Philip Robins, *Suits and Uniforms: Turkish Foreign Policy since the Cold War*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003.

[11] Meliha Altunışık, "The Turkish-Israeli Rapprochement in the Post-Cold War Era", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.36, No.2, 2000, pp.172-191.

[12] Özlem Tür, "Turkey and Israel in the 2000s: From Cooperation to Conflict", *Israel Studies*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, pp.45-66.

Cases of Bilateral Relations with Israel and Syria"[13], Ufuk Ulutaş' article "*Turkey-Israel: A Fluctuating Alliance*"[14], George E. Gruen's article "*Review of the Year 2003 in for Countries: Turkey*"[15], Hakan Yavuz's article "*Turkish-Israeli Relations Through the Lens of the Turkish Identity Debate*"[16], Ali Balcı and Tuncay Kardaş's article "*The Changing Dynamics of Turkey's Relations with Israel: An Analysis of Securitization*"[17] and Mesut Özcan's article "*From Strategic Partnership to Successive Crises: Turkish-Israeli Relations in the 2000s*"[18] could be given as examples for academic studies concentrating on specific periods of time in the relations. However, different from Ekinci, those writers analyze the relations from a perspective, and make a final analysis on the relations according to their arguments.

On the other side, there are some academicians who try to make predictions on the future of the bilateral relations by focusing on specific cases such as the Davos event of 2009 and the Israeli offensive in Gaza of 2008-2009. For instance,

---

[13] Kılıç Buğra Kanat, "Continuity of Change in Turkish Foreign Policy under the JDP Government: The Cases of Bilateral Relations with Israel and Syria", *Arab Studies Quarterly*, Vol.34, No.4, 2012, pp.230-249.

[14] Ufuk Ulutaş, "Turkey-Israel: A Fluctuating Alliance", *SETA Policy Brief*, No.42, 2010, pp.1-12.

[15] George E. Gruen, "Review of the Year 2003 in for Countries: Turkey", in Lawrence Grossman and David Singer (eds), *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol.102, 2004, pp.218-230.

[16] Hakan Yavuz, "Turkish-Israeli Relations Through the Lens of the Turkish Identity Debate", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.27, No.1, 1997, pp.22-37.

[17] Ali Balcı and Tuncay Kardaş, "The Changing Dynamics of Turkey's Relations with Israel: An Analysis of Securitization", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, pp.99-120.

[18] Mesut Özcan, "From Strategic Partnership to Successive Crises: Turkish-Israeli Relations in the 2000s", in Özden Zeynep Oktav (ed), *Turkey in the 21st Century: Quest for a New Foreign Policy*, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011, pp.31-51.

Gökhan Bacık, in his article "*Turkish-Israeli Relations after Davos: A View from Turkey*"[19], studies the Turkish-Israeli relations, which are subjected to social, political and psychological parameters, in the light of social structures, and asserts that the fluctuations in the relations such as the Davos event cannot be understood through simplistic analyses that prioritize personalities or other trivial issues.

Similarly, İlker Aytürk, in his article "*Between Crisis and Cooperation: The Future of Turkish-Israeli Relations*"[20], argues Turkey and Israel still have vested interests in maintaining their close relationship, even in times of crisis. Within this context, Aytürk explores the implications for the future of the relations after the Israeli offensive in Gaza. The following studies can also be evaluated in this regard: Taha Özhan's article "*Turkey, Israel and the US in the Wake of the Gaza Flotilla Crisis*"[21], Banu Eligür's article "*Crisis in Turkish-Israeli Relations (December 2008-June 2011): From Partnership to Enmity*"[22], Nimrod Goren's article "*An Unfulfilled Opportunity for Reconciliation: Israel and Turkey during the Arab Spring*"[23], Efraim Inbar's article "*Israeli-Turkish Tensions and Beyond*"[24],

---

[19] Gökhan Bacık, "Turkish-Israeli Relations after Davos: A View from Turkey", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.11, No.2, 2009, pp.31-41.

[20] İlker Aytürk, "Between Crisis and Cooperation: The Future of Turkish-Israeli Relations", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.11, No.2, 2009, pp.57-74.

[21] Taha Özhan, "Turkey, Israel and the US in the Wake of the Gaza Flotilla Crisis", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.12, No.3, 2010, pp.7-18.

[22] Banu Eligür, "Crisis in Turkish-Israeli Relations (December 2008-June 2011): From Partnership to Enmity", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.48, No.3, 2012, pp.429-459.

[23] Nimrod Goren, "An Unfulfilled Opportunity for Reconciliation: Israel and Turkey during the Arab Spring", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, pp.121-135.

[24] Efraim Inbar, "Israeli-Turkish Tensions and Beyond", *Israeli Journal of Foreign Affairs*, Vol.4, No.1, 2010, pp.27-35.

Umut Uzer's article "*Türkiye-İsrail İlişkilerinde Bunalım*"[25], Mensur Akgün, Sabiha Senyücel Gündoğar and Aybars Görgülü's article "*Politics in Troubled Times: Israel-Turkey Relations*"[26], Gallia Lindenstrauss' article "*Operation Protective Edge: Deepening the Rift between Israel and Turkey*"[27] and Gencer Özcan's article "*Aynalar Galerisi: Türkiye-İsrail İlişkilerinde Yansımalar, Yanılsamalar ve Gerçekler*"[28]. In those studies, for example, Banu Eligür argues what accounts for the radical shift from partnership to enmity in the relations. According to Eligür, the JDP's Islamist foreign policy toward the Middle East and the 2003 US-Iraq War ended the strategic partnership between Turkey and Israel. Eligür provides a comprehensive explanation to understand the shift by taking both the domestic factors in Turkey and the regional developments into consideration. Likewise, this dissertation benefits from such articles which touch upon the domestic factors and the international system/dynamics shaping Turkey's state identity, interests, foreign policy and accordingly relations with Israel.

Apart from those taking a variety of factors in the Turkish-Israeli relations, there are also scholars who focus on how the relationship is examined from different perspectives. To illustrate, Bülent Aras, in his article *The Academic*

---

[25] Umut Uzer, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkilerinde Bunalım", *Ortadoğu Etütleri*, Vol.2, No.2, 2011, pp.137-168.

[26] Mensur Akgün, Sabiha Senyücel Gündoğar and Aybars Görgülü, "Politics in Troubled Times: Israel-Turkey Relations", *TESEV Foreign Policy Program*, 2014, pp.1-12.

[27] Gallia Lindenstrauss, "Operation Protective Edge: Deepening the Rift between Israel and Turkey", in Anat Kurz and Shlomo Brom (eds), *The Lessons of Operation Protective Edge*, Tel Aviv: Institute for National Security Studies, 2014, pp.173-177.

[28] Gencer Özcan, "Aynalar Galerisi: Türkiye-İsrail İlişkilerinde Yansımalar, Yanılsamalar ve Gerçekler", *Ortadoğu Analiz*, Vol.2, No.18, 2010, pp.36-44.

Perceptions of Turkish-Israeli Relations, studies different academic perceptions to the relationship. Aras pays attention to analysts who take special interest in the Turkish-Israeli relations. Aras proposes to explore and elucidate the different perspectives of those analysts and their input on the relations. Aras comes to the conclusion that the answer to the question of whether or not enhanced Turkish-Israeli relations lead to a more stable and peace Middle East differs according to the perceptions of analysts.[29]

As argued above, the Turkish-Israeli relationship has been studied form different perspectives. However, this dissertation will provide a constructivist perspective by putting the concept of state identity into the core of the research in order to analyze the bilateral relations with a particular emphasis on the JDP rule in Turkey. On this point, the study refrains from only focusing on a specific period of time or a matter of subject in the relations. Rather, based on a comprehensive literature review, this thesis first takes up the legacy of history, then examines the Turkish-Israeli relationship from May 1948 to December 1991 under the Cold War conditions, and afterwards by dividing the post-Cold War period into two main terms: December 1991-November 2002, and November 2002-December 2011 (in other words, the JDP rule). The state-to-state relationship which has lasted more than 60 years is argued within a theoretical framework by looking at Turkey's state identity.

---

[29] Bülent Aras, "The Academic Perceptions of Turkish-Israeli Relations", *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, Vol.1, No.1, 2002, pp.1-17.

1.2.   Theoretical Framework: Constructivism

After the Second World War, international relations gained disciplinary momentum, and the realist school of thought seemed a new and very powerful way of thinking that transformed the discipline.[30] However, the constructivist theory challenged the realist discourse on the Cold War, which now became an important subject matter for the disciplinary discussions. For example, Alexander Wendt argues that the Cold War was such a structure of shared knowledge that governed great power relations for forty years, but once the relations stopped acting on this basis, it was over; therefore, social structures are real and objective, not just talk.[31] In other words, the fundamental structures of world politics are social rather than strictly material. According to this argument, states are the principal units of analysis[32] and their identities are constructed within the social environment of both domestic and international politics.[33] Similarly, Turkey was not independent from the social environment of the Cold War and chose to become a member of the

---

[30] Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert, "Constructing Constructivism", in Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert (eds), *International Relations in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 1998, p.9.

[31] Alexander Wendt, "Constructing International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.20, No.1, 1995, p.74.

[32] State identity refers to a set of relationships in which states base their chosen identity on their recognition of other states as friends, enemies, or rivals. Thus, state identity plays a basic role in defining relationships between states. Adel Altoraifi, *Understanding the Role of State Identity in Foreign Policy Decision-Making: The Rise and Demise of Saudi-Iranian Rapprochement (1997–2009)*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation submitted to the London School of Economics and Political Science, 2012, p.45.

[33] Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics", *Annual Review of Political Science,* Vol.4, No.1, 2001, pp.399.

Western alliance. Similar to Turkey, Israel acted together with the Western camp. Hence, this dissertation at first examines the Turkish-Israeli relations under the Cold War conditions shaped by the bipolar system.

However, the end of the Cold War has brought a new interest in the search for explanations for state behaviors in the international system. In this framework, "how ideas define the international structure; how this structure shapes the identities, interest, and foreign policies of states; and how state and non-state actors reproduce that structure and at times transform it"[34] have constituted the major concerns of the constructivist theory. Pertaining to the interconnection between identity, interest and foreign policy, the theory claims that the identities of states are not fixed or pre-given. Instead, state identities are variable because of the fact that states continuously define and redefine their identities by interacting with other states. Within this context, identities are accepted as the basis of interests.[35] Likewise, there are no constant interests. States firstly define their identities, and then form their interests and finally their foreign policies.[36] Consequently, interests are neither identical nor taken for granted but constructed according to the culture, norms and identities of the state in question.[37] In the same way, foreign policy is

---

[34] Michael Barnett, "Social Constructivism", in John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens (eds), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008, p.162.

[35] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is what states make of is: the social construction of power politics", *International Organization,* Vol.46, No.2, 1992, p.398.

[36] Birgül Demirtaş, "İnşacılık", in Şaban Kardaş and Ali Balcı (eds), *Uluslararası İlişkilere Giriş: Tarih, Teori, Kavram ve Konular*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2014, p.113.

[37] Hasan Ulusoy, *A Constructivist Analysis of Turkey's Foreign and Security Policy in the Post-Cold War Era*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation submitted to Middle East Technical University, 2005, p.9.

regarded as an act of construction and it is what the actors decide it will be.[38] On this basis, how a state perceives the external world and constructs its identity is as important as how this state is perceived and constructed by other states in the international system. In short, foreign policy is formed by mutual constructions among states in interaction.

In this vein, constructivism forms this dissertation's theoretical framework in which the role of state identity in the Turkish-Israeli relations is particularly examined. Here, the JDP term is the center of attention. To understand its foreign policy approach, this dissertation also looks at the arguments made by the leading figures of the JDP. To exemplify, Ahmet Davutoğlu, who wrote the book titled "*Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*" (Strategic Depth: The International Position of Turkey), presents a new foreign policy vision stressing Turkey's historical and geographical depth. Consequently, this dissertation tries to make a connection between state identity being transformed under the JDP rule and its impact on the bilateral relations.

1.3.   The Concept of State Identity

The concept of identity did not occupy a central position in the field of International Relations during the Cold War but studies on identity, the concept of state identity[39] in particular, have gained importance in the post-Cold War period.[40]

---

[38] Steve Smith, "Foreign Policy is What States Make of it: Social Construction and International Relations Theory", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.38.

[39] According to David Snow, there are at least three conceptually different kinds of identity: personal, social, and collective. Although they often overlap, one cannot be inferred from the others.

According to the constructivist theory, states interact with each other and gain an identity for themselves. In this process, they also attach an identity to other states. Therefore, state identity is to a large extent formed by the international system[41] although there are domestic factors as well defining what kind of entity a state might become.[42]

Within this context, states constitute the social structures of world politics. These social structures, in turn, constitute states by defining their roles and position in the international system, and consequently their identities. The constructivists accept that the concept of identity is central to understand a state's behavior in the international system. In fact, states represent a corporate actor for international politics. Moreover, they are organizational actors embedded in an institutional-legal order that constitutes it with sovereignty and a monopoly on the legitimate use of organized violence over a society in a territory.[43] This situation is also regarded related to the question of what forms the interests of a state. Wendt argues

---

In this dissertation, the focus is on the collective as represented by the state. David Snow, "Collective Identity and Expressive Forms", *CSD Working Papers*, University of California Center for the Study of Democracy, 2001, p.1.

[40] Birgül Demirtaş-Coşkun, "Identity: Turkish and German Responses", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, pp.32-33.

[41] Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp.20-21.

[42] Birgül Demirtaş-Coşkun, "Identity: Turkish and German Responses", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.33.

[43] Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp.213-215.

that the identity of a state informs its interests, and in turn, its actions.[44] Hence, state identity is a significant concept as it directly affects the kind of foreign policy that a state will pursue.[45] In this vein, it seems possible to say that state identity is formed in relationship to other states, and is profoundly influenced by the actor's interaction with others. So, the identity of a state arises out of interaction and participation of actors in institutional contexts both at the international and domestic levels.[46]

As regards to the definition of the concept of state identity, there are a number of studies that have tried to conceptualize it. Based on those works, we can define state identity in different ways: Marc Lynch says, state identity "refers not only to the conceptions held by leaders, but by the set of beliefs about the nature and purpose of the state expressed in public articulations of state actions and ideals".[47] Therefore, state identity is more than the personal convictions of leaders despite their centrality to the formulation of foreign policy. In other words, state identity incorporates institutions, norms and public discourse as well.[48]

---

[44] Alexander Wendt, "Collective Identity Formation and the International State", *American Political Science Review*, Vol.88, No.2, 1994, p.385.

[45] David Campbell, *Writing Security, United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992, p.76.

[46] Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett, *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, New York: Cornell University Press, 2002, p.8.

[47] Marc Lynch, "Abandoning Iraq: Jordan's Alliances and the Politics of State Identity", *Security Studies*, Vol.8, No.2-3, 1999, pp.349.

[48] *Ibid*.

According to Birgül Demirtaş-Coşkun, state identity is essentially about a state's rights, obligations, and responsibilities on the international level, but also of the meaning attributed to other actors.[49] She considers that state identity goes hand in hand with foreign policy. In particular, interaction with other states offers a way for a state in order to acquire a new identity or protect the old one. During this process of identity formulation or reformulation, foreign policy plays a key role since decision makers use foreign policy to realize their goals.[50]

In another definition, Glenn Chafetz, Michael Spirtas and Benjamin Frankel argue that state identity is about setting boundaries between oneself and others. In that regard, they ask who you are relative to others, and who they are in relation to yourself and other actors.[51] Thus, it is seen as a mechanism that provides a sense of 'self' and the means for comprehending the relationship of the self to the external environment.[52] On this point, Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett claim that state identity is social and profoundly influenced by a state's interaction with and relationship to other states. Through interacting and participating in an institutional context, states ascribe to an identity. As a result, state identity can be understood as "the corporate and officially demarcated identity linked to the state apparatus".[53]

---

[49] Birgül Demirtaş-Coşkun, "Identity: Turkish and German Responses", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.33.

[50] *Ibid*.

[51] Glenn Chafetz, Michael Spirtas and Benjamin Frankel, "Introduction: Tracing the Influence of Identity on Foreign Policy", *Security Studies*, Vol.8, No.2-3, Winter 1998-1999, Spring 1999, p.VIII.

[52] *Ibid*, p.IX.

[53] Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett, *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, New York: Cornell University Press, 2002, p.8.

To clarify further, Anthony Smith explains that the state entirely refers to "public institutions, differentiated from and autonomous of, other social institutions and exercising a monopoly of coercion and extraction within a given territory".[54]

To explain his definition of state identity, Masahiro Matsumura argues that state identity is related to "the state's perception of what role it should play and what status it should enjoy in international relations, such as a Western state or a non-Western state".[55] The identity of a state might shift over time. Each state's domestic political actors, primarily political leaders, construct an identity for the state through practice under constraints imposed by the domestic factors and within the context of the changing power structure of dynamic international relations.[56]

Within this context, this dissertation claims the aforementioned definitions take up the concept of state identity with either domestic or international realm as the principal factor defining a state's identity. They provide reductionist definitions which are not comprehensive enough to understand what state identity is. In this dissertation, the term 'state identity' composed of the domestic factors like political leaders and state apparatus/institutions, and the international system/dynamics which are in continuous interaction. Based on this definition, I will take two means, namely the domestic factors and the international system/dynamics, into consideration in my analysis. As for the change in state identity, if one of the two dimensions of state identity- namely the domestic factors and the international

[54] Anthony Smith, *National Identity*, Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press, 1991, pp.14-15.

[55] Masahiro Matsumura, The Japanese State Identity As a Grand Strategic Imperative, *The Brookings Institution Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies*, 2008, p.3.

[56] *Ibid*.

system/dynamics- shifts, the change remains limited. For an overall change in state identity, there is a need for a simultaneous change of both factors since they continuously produce and reproduce each other. To clarify, in addition to different political leaders, parties and ideologies, in the Turkish case, party closures and military coups might have impact on the formation of state identity. Also when the international system changes, for example the shift from bipolarity to unipolarity at the end of the Cold War, we can expect a change in state identity, but a limited one. In the case of a change in one of these two factors, there might emerge fluctuations and alternative explanations for state identities; however, both the domestic factors and the international system/dynamics need to change simultaneously for an overall change. In accordance with the said definition, I will attempt to analyze both domestic and systemic elements on Turkey's state identity and their impact on Turkey's relations with Israel.

1.4.   Turkey's State Identity

This research argues that the concept of state identity is relevant to the relations between Turkey and Israel especially during the JDP period from the constructivist perspective. It is noteworthy to remark that there have been only a limited number of academic studies taking up the Turkish-Israeli relations by focusing on the role of state identity. To do so, this research will try to fill the gap caused by other theoretical arguments which overlook the impact of factors such as norms and values forming and shaping state identity that define state interests and finally its foreign policy.

On this point, the literature review on Turkey's state identity provides us an opportunity to understand what the Turkish state identity has been, how it has changed in the course of time and affected the Turkish-Israeli relationship. In this framework, Şaban Çalış claims the defining factor of Turkish foreign policy and its identity is the state identity of the Republic of Turkey.[57] Similarly, Baskın Oran, who refers to the studies of Mustafa Aydın, William Hale and Oral Sander, argues that cultural, historical, strategic and internal structural dimensions, which form the identity of a state, have positive and negative impacts on Turkish foreign policy. By studying these dimensions, Oran focuses on the features of the Turkish statehood, in other words its state identity.[58] In the light of existing literature, I will endeavor to analyze how Turkey's state identity was formed in the foundation years, and has transformed in the course of time. I consider that such analysis will help us better understand the Turkish-Israeli relationship which will be discussed from a theoretical perspective in the following chapters.

Following the Turkish War of Liberation, the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT) convened and made a decision on the establishment of the Republic of Turkey on October 29, 1923. On the same day, the GNAT also elected Mustafa Kemal, who then gained the surname of "Atatürk", as President.[59] Atatürk

[57] Şaban Çalış, "Ulus, Devlet ve Kimlik Labirentinde Türk Dış Politikası", in Şaban Çalış, İhsan D. Dağı and Ramazan Gözen (eds), *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberte Yayınları, 2001, p.4.

[58] Baskın Oran, "Giriş: Türk Dış Politikası'nın Teoriği ve Pratiği", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: İletişim 2005, pp.17-93.

[59] Turgut Özakman, *Cumhuriyet (1922-1938): Türk Mucizesi Birinci Kitap*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2013, p.341.

stated that the Republic would help the Turkish nation much more easily show its characteristics and value to the civilized world[60], namely the Western world. In the framework of the definitions of state identity used by this dissertation, the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey confirms the role of domestic political actors, primarily political leaders, in the construction of an identity for a new-born state through practice. In this regard, the founding fathers of modern Turkey gave priority to restructuring and state-building process by a number of reforms that required a new state identity as well. To illustrate, Prime Minister İsmet İnönü said, instead of changing Turkey's map for more lands, they preferred to concentrate on internal affairs since they aimed to create a new homeland and to make steady progress on the basis of new principles.[61]

In this vein, the GNAT accepted the proposal for the abolishment of the Caliphate on March 3, 1924.[62] During the one-party period, secularism was acknowledged as one of the party principles in the congress of the Republican People's Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası/Partisi* - CHF/CHP) held on October 15-20, 1927.[63] Later on, the GNAT enacted the removal of Islam from the constitution and the abrogation of the shari'a on April 10, 1928, and formally adopted

---

[60] Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, *Nutuk*, Istanbul: ATAM Yayınları, 2013, p.389.

[61] Özlem Tür, "Türkiye ve Filistin (1908-1948): Milliyetçilik, Ulusal Çıkar ve Batılılaşma", *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol.62, No.1, 2007, p.238.

[62] Turgut Özakman, *Cumhuriyet (1922-1938): Türk Mucizesi İkinci Kitap*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2010, p.36.

[63] Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *İkinci Adam Birinci Cilt (1884-1938)*, Istanbul: Remzi Kitapevi, 2012, p.402.

secularism as a principle in the constitution on February 5, 1937.[64] Within this context, the new state was founded on secular principles, and the Westernized elites of the state provided superiority to Western values in the state structure.[65] Turkey's founders were clear about their goals of "being part of the Western system of states".[66] It presumed the building of a new identity for the state as well. Now, Turkey was a pro-Western, secular and nationalist state built on the negation of its multinational and theocratic Ottoman past.[67]

This situation was also influential on the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. The redefinition of state identity went hand in hand with domestic and foreign policies. The main target of Turkish foreign policy was to be a member of the Western family of nations.[68] Wars with the Western powers and their attempts to invade the Turkish lands would not prejudice the strong sentiment of being an integral part of the West.[69] Accordingly, the Republican leaders invested

---

[64] Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong?*, London: Phoenix, 2002, p.118.

[65] Baskın Oran, "Giriş: Türk Dış Politikası'nın Teoriği ve Pratiği", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: Iletişim 2005, pp.19-20.

[66] Meliha Benli Altunışık and Özlem Tür, *Turkey: Challenges of Continuity and Change*, Oxford: Routledge, 2005, p.89.

[67] Umut Uzer, *Identity and Turkish Foreign Policy: The Kemalist Influence in Cyprus and the Caucasus*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2011, pp.23-24.

[68] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.57.

[69] Ali Karaosmanoğlu, "The Evolution of the National Security Culture and the Military in Turkey", *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.54, No.1, 2000, p.208.

in the secularization of the state, and made religious, social and cultural reforms.[70] The reformation process made peaceful policies necessary. Atatürk's maxim "Peace at home, peace in the world" symbolized avoiding any irredentist claims. Consequently, Turkey joined the Briand-Kellogg Pact, an attempt to eliminate war as an instrument of national policy, in January 1929, and then became member of the League of Nations on July 18, 1932.[71] In addition, Turkey, together with Greece, Romania and Yugoslavia, signed the Balkan Pact on February 9, 1934 in Athens to guarantee the security of the borders in the Balkans,[72] and signed the Saadabad Pact with Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan on July 8, 1937 in Tehran to protect their common frontiers.[73]

Turkey followed a similar policy during the Second World War (1939-1945) although the Allied Powers had tried to persuade Turkey to enter the war.[74] After the war, Turkey felt obliged to forge closer links with the West as a result of the growing Soviet threat, and Ankara's diplomatic efforts devoted to attaining full participation in the complicated political, military and economic system of Atlantic

---

[70] Umut Uzer, *Identity and Turkish Foreign Policy: The Kemalist Influence in Cyprus and the Caucasus*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2011, p.24.

[71] Fahir Armaoğlu, *20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi*, Istanbul: Alkım, 2010, pp.414-415.

[72] Hasan Kösebalaban, *Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: BigBang, 2014, pp.124-125.

[73] *Ibid*, pp.126-128.

[74] Onur Öymen, *Silahsız Savaş: Bir Mücadele Sanatı Olarak Diplomasi*, Istanbul: Remzi, 2002, p.82.

and European integration.[75] To achieve this purpose, Turkey abandoned the one-party rule and replaced it by popular democracy in 1946, a sign for the voluntary process of democratization. In the same year, the Democrat Party (*Demokrat Parti* - the DP) under the leadership of Adnan Menderes was formed and came to power in 1950.[76] On the other side, Turkey became member of the OECD in 1948 and of the Council of Europe in 1949, was admitted to NATO in 1952, and signed the Ankara Agreement with the EEC in September 1963 through which Turkey gained associate-member status.

In fact, Turkey's position in the international system shaped by the Cold War dynamics fits the definition of state identity used in this dissertation. During this period, Turkey's state identity based on Western norms and values was influenced by the international system in which Turkey took part in the Western camp as a consequence of these two factors' interaction. To give an example, the Turkish military toppled the government in a military coup on September 12, 1980. It was a serious setback to Turkey's relations with the EC. To Bozdağlıoğlu, the fear that Turkey could be excluded from Europe remarked the fact that Turkey's desire to be part of the West went beyond other factors such as security. Hence, after winning the elections held in 1983, Turgut Özal, the leader of the Motherland Party (*Anavatan Partisi* - the ANAP) and the Prime Minister, made economic and

---

[75] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.58.

[76] *Ibid*, p.59.

political reforms, and applied for full membership in the EC in April 1987, which was regarded as a natural step in terms of the goal of Westernization.[77]

The demise of the socialist bloc in the late 1980s and the final dissolution of the Soviet Union in December 1991 radically changed the international system. The bipolar world system ended. Since the former Soviet allies surrounding Turkey could no longer receive military and economic assistance from a superpower, Turkey's threat perception changed. Turkey experienced Kurdish, Islamist, Neo-Ottomanist/Pan-Turkist and Western-oriented arguments which will be debated in the following chapters in terms of their impacts on Turkey's state identity.[78]

Moreover, the increasing influence of political Islam in Turkey's domestic politics, particularly with the Welfare Party's (*Refah Partisi* - the RP) coming to power in 1996, began to be felt. It caused concerns about Turkey's state identity for pro-Western forces. Political Islam was transformed into an ideology that could challenge both the Western identity at home and Turkey's Western-oriented foreign policy abroad.[79] In terms of foreign policy, according to the RP's understanding, it was Westernization policies that caused the abandonment of the Islamic world.[80] That the RP's strong anti-West and anti-Israel rhetoric advocated

---

[77] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, pp.74-77.

[78] Birgül Demirtaş-Coşkun, "Identity: Turkish and German Responses", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.33.

[79] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, pp.131-132.

[80] İhsan Dağı, "Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization", *Central European University Center for Policy Studies and Open Society Institute*, International Policy Fellowship Program 2001-2002, p.10.

closer relationships with the Middle East countries strengthened the concerns.[81] But the Turkish military increased its input into foreign policy because of the political instability in the country at large. The RP's fall from power as a consequence of "a postmodern or soft coup on 28 February 1997" undertaken by the military with the support of the secular segments of society increased the military's power further.[82]

On this point, it is useful to remind the construction of state identity by the domestic factors such as political leaders and components of state apparatus/public institutions. In the case of the RP, there is no doubt that Prime Minister Necmettin Erbakan was an influential actor who contributed to the process of shaping Turkey's state identity. However, as part of Turkey's status apparatus, both military and civil institutions were influential as well. In the final analysis, these actors had more weights in the construction process than the political leader, and the former succeeded to maintain Turkey's pro-Western state identity vis-à-vis the latter's challenge.

In this framework, it seems possible to claim that Turkey's state identity experienced change in the 1990s, but a limited one. In this period, the international system radically transformed with the demise of the bipolar world politics. As for the domestic factors, Turkey's traditional pro-Western identity faced a challenge with the rise of political Islam in particular. However, this process did not result in a complete change in its state identity. Since the definition of this dissertation requires a dual change of these two factors, we might come to the conclusion that Turkey's state identity was affected by both the systemic change and the alternative

---

[81] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.132.

[82] Umut Uzer, *Identity and Turkish Foreign Policy: The Kemalist Influence in Cyprus and the Caucasus*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2011, p.79.

narratives on its state identity; however, it did not necessarily mean an overall change in Turkey's state identity.

In the 2000s, especially from 2002 onwards, the domestic factors in Turkey have undergone profound changes. Although the process of Turkey's accession to the EU was at the top of the government's agenda in the first years of the JDP rule, its priority lessened over the course of time. During this process, the government attached importance to internal reforms that caused a decrease in the power of the military. In addition, the JDP and its ideology have increased its impact on public institutions, in other words state apparatus, and the government has begun to use more Islamic discourse for both domestic and foreign policies. The Turkish case may confirm that shifts in political elites with different role identities might at least in part change state identity.

Since states again redefine their preferences and interests, they may lead to different foreign policy behavior.[83] Accordingly, the JDP rule turns Islam into "a platform for advancing its bid for regional leadership".[84] On this point, Ahmet Davutoğlu's ideas and strategic thinking have been quite influential on the JDP's foreign policy. In fact, Davutoğlu mentions the process of self-redefinition for Turkey.[85] To him, the Ottoman history is in the center of Turkey's socio-cultural map. In terms of politics, Turkey must find a common ground with the Ottoman

---

[83] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.166.

[84] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.175.

[85] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Türkiye Söyleşileri 5: Cumhuriyet, Milliyetçilik ve İslamcılık*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2011, pp.22-23.

history. Even if not, political events dictate this reality.[86] Based on the Ottoman legacy, Davutoğlu argues that Turkey is a historically and geographically central country in its region; therefore, Turkey's turning its back to the Middle East is a very serious mistake and it is not possible to say, the Middle East does not interest Turkey.[87] Because this thesis focuses on Turkey's relations with Israel from a theoretical perspective, Davutoğlu's argument on Turkey's approach to the Middle East region provides us an important opportunity to understand the mind-sets of the JDP ruling elite. To clarify further, Davutoğlu underlines that "Since the year 2002, Turkey has begun to structure its policies on the basis of this new vision, keeping in mind well-defined targets, and looking to benefit from its geographical position and historical assets".[88]

However, the process of creating 'self' and other' is not independent of the international system/dynamics. On this point, the September 11 launched a new process in the world politics and the Middle East region has had a number of political developments. This process could be regarded as the continuation of transformation in the international system following the end of the Cold War. In line with this dissertation's state identity definition that requires a simultaneous change in both factors shaping state identity, we can reach the result that Turkey's

---

[86] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Küresel Bunalım*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2009, p.229.

[87] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Teoriden Pratiğe: Türk Dış Politikası Üzerine Konuşmalar*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013, pp.82-83.

[88] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.79.

state identity experienced a change from 2002 onwards, and the Turkish-Israeli relationship has been under the impact of this fact.

To support this argument, the research mainly concentrates on two periods of time for the analysis: the Cold War and afterwards. The dissertation divides the post-Cold War era into two main terms: The first begins with the early 1990s, and lasts until the general elections held in Turkey on November 3, 2002. The second starts with the JDP in power. The JDP also won the two following general elections held on July 22, 2007 and on June 12, 2011.[89] Although the JDP rule still continues in Turkey, the study examines the relations till the end of 2011. The reason for this is Turkey's relations with Israel came to a standstill following the Mavi Marmara incident in 2010 and after that. For both periods, the dissertation tries to contribute to the idea that the constructivist theory has strengthened its arguments on explaining international developments. Consequently, the Turkish-Israeli relations are studied from this perspective.

1.5.   Methodology

This dissertation studies Turkey's relations with Israel from the Turkish perspective. Broadly speaking, the research focuses on academic contributions, and political and diplomatic discourses. However, it does not mean to ignore the Israeli perspective. Therefore, this study includes the academic writings of the Israeli academicians and interviews with them so as to provide a more comprehensive

---

[89] The JDP won the general elections held on June 7, 2015 as well. But the JDP lost the majority in the GNAT for the first time. As a result of the failure in forming the new government, the Turkish voters once again went to the polls on November 1, 2015, and the JDP re-gained the majority in the GNAT.

view to the bilateral relations. In this context, the dissertation will mainly make an empirical research by document analysis and interviews. This research is based on first-hand information. From Chapter 3 to Chapter 7, the dissertation examines the foundation of the JDP foreign policy identity, its role in Turkish foreign policy within the framework of the constructivist theory, and the bilateral relations until the end of the Cold War, and during the post-Cold War era in which a particular importance is attached to the JDP term.

Within this scope, the empirical research consists of interviews, bilateral agreements, official statements and UN resolutions that are the primary sources available for research on Turkish foreign policy and the Turkish-Israeli relations. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with career diplomats, professors and researchers. The full list of the interviewees is shown in Appendix A.

In addition, secondary sources such as articles, books, academic journals, newspapers and international news agencies were utilized. A number of English and Turkish articles and books focusing primarily on the constructivist theory, Turkish foreign policy, the Middle East and the Turkish-Israeli relations were used. The academic journals of Insight Turkey, SETA Policy Brief, Perceptions, SAM Papers, Turkish Weekly, Turkish Studies, Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations, Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs, Israel Affairs, Israeli Studies, American Political Science Review, Annual Review of Political Sciences, European Journal of International Relations, Foreign Affairs, International Affairs, International Organization, International Security, Middle East Policy, Middle Eastern Studies, Mediterranean Politics, Mediterranean Quarterly and World Politics provided indispensable contributions to the dissertation.

Some newspapers used for the dissertation were Hürriyet, Milliyet, Yeni Şafak, Hurriyet Daily News, Today's Zaman, Haaretz, Jerusalem Post, Yedioth Ahronoth, the Guardian and the New York Times. Furthermore, international news agencies serving online such as Turkish Press, Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA), the Times of Israel, ITN Source, Al Jazeera, and NBC News were also consulted.

1.6.   The Contents of the Dissertation

Apart from this introductory Chapter 1, the dissertation consists of seven more chapters. Chapter 2 begins with a review of literatures on the constructivist theory in a comparative manner. This chapter also discusses about the added value of the theory for foreign policy analysis with a detailed review of main concepts such as culture, norm and identity. The works of Alexander Wendt, Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf, Paul Kowert, Valerie M. Hudson and Christopher Hill are prominent classics of constructivism. In the 1990s, Alexander Wendt argued for the theory with three important articles: *Anarchy is what states make of is: the social construction of power politic*s (1992), *Constructing International Politics* (1995) and *the agent-structure problem in international relations theory* (1997). Among these classics, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* by Valerie M. Hudson, *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World* by Vendulka Kubálková and *International Relations in a Constructed World* by Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert are regarded as great works of literature. Moreover, Turkish scholars such as Şaban H. Çalış, İhsan D. Dağı and Ramazan Gözen, with their publications (for example, *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*), have contributed to the current

discussions on Turkish foreign policy from the constructivist perspective. Based on these works, the dissertation tries to clarify the role of identity in the Turkish-Israeli relations. In parallel to the constructivist narrative emphasizing that international relations are socially constructed, this study supports that state interests are mainly constructed by systemic structures[90] and accordingly identities are the basis of interest.[91]

Chapter 3 searches about the impact of the legacy of history on the Turkish-Israeli relations. The Chapter starts with the Ottoman period. This start provides a perspective to the relations based on a more than 500-year background. Then, the Zionist ideology born in the nineteenth century is studied. The First World War (1914-1918), the interwar years (1919-1939), during which the Republic of Turkey was established and accordingly its state identity was formed, and then the Second World War (1939-1945) are focused upon respectively.

Chapter 4 takes up the Turkish-Israeli relations from the establishment of the State of Israel (1948) to the end of the Cold War (1991). Turkey's relations with the new-born Israeli State are assessed within the context of the Cold War dynamics. In parallel, this Chapter studies a number of significant developments such as the 1956 Suez War, the Six-Day War of 1967, the War of Attrition (1967-1970), the 1973 War, and the Jerusalem Law (1980). On this basis, the Chapter discusses how Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East avoided taking part in any conflict at the region during this term. That is to say that the Middle East

---

[90] Alexander Wendt, "Constructing International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.20, No.1, 1995, pp.71-72.

[91] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is what states make of is: the social construction of power politics", *International Organization,* Vol.46, No.2, 1992, p.398.

was not the foremost priority on the agenda but maintaining the status quo and national unity by acting together with the Western world in the Cold War was.

Chapter 5 looks at Turkey-Israel relations in the post-Cold War era. Firstly, the Chapter tries to explain the emerging dynamics of the new international order. Moreover, the immediate developments of the Gulf War (August 1990-February 1991), the Madrid Peace Conference (October-November 1991), and then the Oslo Accords of 1993 (signed in Washington D.C.) and of 1995 (signed in Taba) are studied in regard to their effect on the Turkish-Israeli relations. Secondly, Chapter 5 takes up the RP-DYP coalition headed by Necmettin Erbakan, who severely criticized Israel, since the RP experience is of importance in order to better understand the JDP's background. Chapter 6 proceeds to examine following coalitions (1997-2002).

Chapter 6 focuses on the foundation of the JDP's foreign policy identity. There are three topics questioning the legacy of the past, the impact of Ahmet Davutoğlu's ideas and foreign policy-making. To begin with the legacy of the past, this chapter studies the 28 February process, and then the EU accession process. The political leadership of the JDP from the *Milli Görüş* tradition won an election victory on November 3, 2002. However, different from this tradition, the JDP attached great importance to Turkey's accession to the EU. In this framework, Chapter 6 discusses about the transformation towards a pro-European position coming from an Islamic political background. To comprehend the transformation, not only Davutoğlu's conceptual approaches to civilizations, but also his strategic thinking is examined. His doctoral study "*Alternative Paradigms: The Impact of Islamic and Western Weltanschauungs on Political Theory*", book "*Strategic Depth*" and approach of "*Zero Problems with Neighbors*" contribute to explain the

JDP's intellectual development having results in its foreign policy understanding. In this vein, foreign policy-making is studied as well.

Chapter 7 studies the JDP in power (2002-2011). On this point, the role of the external factors/third parties on Turkey-Israel relations such as Palestine or the Palestinian issue, the United States, Iran and the Arab world in the wake of the Arab Spring are focused upon as well. Lastly, the dissertation argues whether or not there is a change in the Turkish state identity, and accordingly in the Turkish-Israeli relations, and if so how its state identity changed before and after 2002.

In the concluding Chapter, this dissertation attempts to reach final results in the light of the findings supporting the main arguments, and comes to a conclusion that the concept of state identity has provided a significant approach that helps explain Turkey's interests and foreign policy, and accordingly its relations with Israel during the ongoing JDP tenure.

CHAPTER 2

CONSTRUCTIVISM IN FOREIGN POLICY-MAKING

2.1.   Constructivist Theory

Since the end of the Cold War, the constructivist theory focusing on "how ideas define and can transform the organization of world politics, shape the identities and interest of states, and determine what counts as legitimate action"[92] has gained more popularity in the field of International Relations (IR). To some, there has been a constructivist turn in IR theory.[93] Accordingly, the new IR topics, namely identity, intersubjectivity, meaning, motivation, interest and culture, have become the biggest and most popular IR topics of the post-Cold War era.[94] IR scholars have furthermore progressed from identity to interest in their studies. Vendulka Kubálková explains this process in the following:

---

[92] Michael Barnett, "Social Constructivism", in John Baylis, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens (eds), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008, p.161.

[93] Jeffrey Checkel, "The Constructive Turn in International Relations Theory", *World Politics*, Vol.50, No.2, 1998, p.326.

[94] Vendulka Kubálková, "Soviet "New Thinking" and the End of the Cold War", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.102.

Many constructivists change the order of march, as it were, for their research. Instead of beginning with structure, which determines state's interest, as neorealists and neoliberals do, they proceed from identity to interest, and from interest all the way around again to structure, all of which, somewhat vaguely, constitutes culture. After fix-it constructivist repair, Structure ends up in an inclusive category called culture, which nevertheless seems to be remarkably bereft of content aside from the identity that states give to each other in their relations.[95]

Within this context, constructivists argue that international life is social and constructed, and oppose to the idea that international life is material only and pre-given.[96] Moreover, the theory is interested in understanding "how the material, subjective and intersubjective worlds interact in the social construction of reality ... how structures constitute agents' identities and interests ... [and] how individual agents socially construct these structures in the first place".[97] By suggesting the concept of intersubjectivity as a key concern, actors interact with each other; as a result, this reciprocity forms dynamic social relations implying a continuous change in international structure. In other words, international structure is a consequence of interactions among the actors, specifically states. On this basis, Alexander Wendt summarizes the main arguments of the theory as follows:

Constructivism is a structural theory of the international system that makes the following core claims: (1) states are the principal units of analysis for international political theory; (2) the key structures in the states system are intersubjective rather than material; and (3) state identities and interests are

---

[95] Vendulka Kubálková, "Foreign Policy, International Politics, and Constructivism", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.34.

[96] *Ibid*, p.21.

[97] Emanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.3, No.3, 1997, p.330.

in important part constructed by these social structures, rather than given exogenously to the system by human nature or domestic politics.[98]

In this framework, Harry Gould thinks that agents (states) and structures (in the state system) each constitute the other, and they simultaneously enable and constrain each other.[99] Therefore, the nature of states and international structure are not held independent of each other. In parallel, Kubálková refers to Wendt's statement of "anarchy is what states make of it", and comes to the conclusion that "anarchy is not a particular configuration of states objectively existing and determining states' moves, but instead an intersubjective agreement among them".[100] On this point, the concept of identity has been an important instrument to study state's behavior in world politics.

2.2. Defining Identity

According to the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, the meaning of identity is "the characteristics, feelings or beliefs that distinguish people from others".[101] In theoretical terms, Peter Katzenstein defines identity as constructions of nationhood and statehood by referring to varying national ideologies, collective

---

[98] Alexander Wendt, "Collective Identity Formation and the International State", *The American Political Science Review*, Vol.88, No.2, 1994, p.385.

[99] Harry D. Gould, "The Agent-Structure Debate", in Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert (Eds), *International Relations in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 1998, p.80.

[100] Vendulka Kubálková, "Foreign Policy, International Politics, and Constructivism", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.34.

[101] Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, Sixth Edition, p.593.

distinctiveness and purpose.[102] Michael Barnett considers that identities are neither personal nor psychological. Instead, Barnett argues, "They are fundamentally social and relational, defined by the actor's interaction with and relationship to others; therefore, all political identities are contingent, dependent on the actor's interactions with others and place within an institutional context".[103] In other words, identities are constituted by the interactions between internal ideas rooted in an actor's self-perceptions and external ideas implying that other external actors recognize identity the identity of an actor.

On this point, David Campbell exemplifies the constitution of the American identity to prove that identity and difference are linked to each other, and to reveal an opposed relationship of one to the other.[104] Similarly, Nizar Messari says that "Identity is established in relation to a series of difference, in fact, not only internationally but also domestically. It requires difference in order to exist the conversion of difference into otherness".[105] By citing William Connolly, Jutta Weldes and Mark Laffey et al. argue that an identity is "established in relation to a series of differences that have become socially recognized. These differences are

---

[102] Peter Katzenstein, "Alternative Perspectives on National Security", in Peter Katzenstein (ed), *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996, p.24.

[103] Michael Barnett, "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.5, No.1, 1999, p.9.

[104] David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1998, p.245.

[105] Nizar Messari, "Identity and Foreign Policy: The Case of Islam in U.S. Foreign Policy", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.230.

essential to its being. If they did not exist as differences, it would not exist in its distinctness and solidity".[106] In short, the identities of states are variable on the basis of different social contexts.

Barnett acknowledges that identities are situated within a broader *historical narrative*.[107] Yael Zerubavel states that *narrative* "constitutes one of the most important mechanisms by which a nation constructs a collective identity".[108] Martha Finnemore and Kahryn Sikkink underline the notion that constructivists, by following Jürgen Habermas, have explored the role of argument as a mechanism of social construction. Finnemore and Sikkink assert that *speech* is a social instrument used to persuade people to change their mind on which goals are valuable and on the roles they play (or should play) in social life. It is a crucial social construction work for creating new understandings and social facts that reconfigure politics.[109]

Within this context, Cihangir Moini Alemdari thinks that *history* and *memory*, together with *language*, form important components of a nation. Alemdari says that the history of victories, defeats, war stories, betrayals, power struggles, and conquests -all taken together more meaningful than each of them apart- provide a narrative basis. Nations gain continuity by *remembrance*, and the

---

[106] Jutta Weldes and Mark Laffey et al. (eds), *Cultures of Insecurity*, Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1999, p.11.

[107] Michael Barnett, "Israeli Identity and the Peace Process", in Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett (eds), *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, New York: Cornell University, 2002, p.65.

[108] Yael Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995, p.214.

[109] Martha Finnemore and Kahryn Sikkink, "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics", *Annual Review of Political Sciences*, Vol.4, No.1, 2001, p.402.

consciousness of identity is founded on the basis of *memories* and *narratives*.[110] In accordance with Alemdari's argument, Barnett underlines that narratives are constructed by *the participants* themselves, not by the outside observer. In other words, actors experience a storyline, and they are lived history.[111] Moreover, *events* play a crucial role in an historical narrative. A series of events are cognitively connected to each other.[112] Narratives connect these events, and thereby allowing traditions, history, language, religion, political-economic institutions and geopolitical factors to gain meaning in order to form identity.[113] So, the narrative of an identity, a social construct, not given, does provide an understanding of the past, present and future.[114]

Barnett defines *frames* as "specific metaphors, symbolic representations, and cognitive cues used to render or cast behavior and events in an evaluative mode and to suggest alternative modes of action" that have two basic characteristics.[115] First, how the event is understood has great importance in terms of its consequences for mobilizing action. In other words, social movements turn

---

[110] Cihangir Moini Alemdari, "İran'da Kimlik, Tarih ve Anlatı", in Hamid Ahmedi (ed), *İran: Ulusal Kimlik İnşası*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2009, pp.15-16.

[111] Michael Barnett, "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.5, No.1, 1999, p.12.

[112] *Ibid*, p.13.

[113] Cihangir Moini Alemdari, "İran'da Kimlik, Tarih ve Anlatı", Hamid Ahmedi, *İran: Ulusal Kimlik İnşası*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, pp.3-4.

[114] Michael Barnett, "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.5, No.1, 1999, p.14.

[115] *Ibid*, p.15.

new ideas into frames defining the issues at stake and the appropriate strategies for action.[116] Second, the importance of the frames is augmented at "historical moments defined by cultural contradictions and competing visions of the future".[117] Based on these characteristics, Rodger Payne regards frames as "basic building blocks" broadly constructing norms and serving to legitimize normative orders.[118]

Barnett also argues that the construction of national interest and policy orientations must be situated in *an institutional context*. According to Kubálková, *institutions* refer to agents, rules and consequences of acts. Kubálková alleges that people as agents act in institutions that make rules to influence others and to make other people do something.[119] Shiping Zheng considers that "If rules and the related practices of agents form a stable pattern, they become institutions that constitute an environment within which agents can act with rationality defined by this social context".[120] In this vein, people and states act as actors with their identities in an institutional context, and their interactions result in constitutive effects. With reference to the categorization of the institutions, Nicholas Onuf claims that

---

[116] Martha Finnemore and Kahryn Sikkink, "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics", *Annual Review of Political Sciences*, Vol.4, No.1, 2001, p.409.

[117] Michael Barnett, "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.5, No.1, 1999, p.15.

[118] Rodger Payne, "Persuasion, Frames and Norm Construction", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.7, No.1, 2001, p.39.

[119] Vendulka Kubálková, "A Constructivist Primer", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.61.

[120] Shiping Zheng, "Conflict between Mainland China and Taiwan", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.208.

institutions differ and are made up of rules varying in number and arrangement.[121] Onuf makes a connection between institutions and international relations. According to him, "international relations takes place in a context where agents and observers find a large number of formal commitment-rules (rules of international law)".[122] On this connection, Barnett states that "Identity will shape policy by drawing together and shaping societal interests into a national interest and the formal institutional context represents the political space".[123] Hence, identity defines the dynamics and the scope of inter-state interactions which also define state preferences and finally shape state actions in an institutional context.

2.3.   Identity and Its Impact on Foreign Policy

The concept of identity is related to drawing a border between "self" and "other". Wendt says that "the self" is cognitively identified with "the other".[124] They constitute and are constituted by their international environment.[125] Wendt states that world politics is 'socially constructed'; that is to say that "the

---

[121] Nicholas Onuf, "Constructivism: A User's Manual", in Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert (eds), *International Relations in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 1998, p.70.

[122] *Ibid*, p.73.

[123] Michael Barnett, "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.5, No.1, 1999, p.16.

[124] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.46, No.2, 1992, p.399.

[125] Nizar Messari, "Identity and Foreign Policy: The Case of Islam in U.S. Foreign Policy", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.237.

fundamental structures of international politics are social rather than strictly

material", and "these structures shape actors' identities and interests, rather than

just their behavior".[126] This explanation of identity provides an opportunity to

comprehend foreign policy defined by Nizar Messari as "an identity-making

political performance in which the relationship with other plays a central role".[127]

According to Valerie Hudson, identity and culture do shape the domestic

motivations and imperatives that "seem as or more important than international

balance-of-power considerations in foreign policymaking".[128] In truth, the role and

importance of identity and culture have increased in foreign policy. An actor's

values and culture, and its relevant policies and institutions[129] have been regarded

as the primary currencies of its soft power.[130]

On this point, it is noteworthy to remark that identity is not constant to

traditions but redefined by every generation, and recreated according to changing

---

[126] Alexander Wendt, "Constructing International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.20, No.1, 1995, pp.71-72.

[127] Nizar Messari, "Identity and Foreign Policy: The Case of Islam in U.S. Foreign Policy", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.237.

[128] Valerie M. Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*, Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2007, p.103.

[129] Joseph S. Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York: Public Affairs, 2004, p.31.

[130] "The concept of soft power refers to a co-optive, non-coercive and consent-based power, rather than a command-based, coercive and hard power. State power gains legitimacy in the eyes of others through its soft power whose resources include diplomacy, economy, culture, and identity. Through soft power, the state gets the other state to "want what it wants". Soft power involves consent." Fuat Keyman, "Globalization, Modernity and Democracy: Turkish Foreign Policy 2009 and Beyond", *Perceptions*, Vol.15, No.3-4, Autumn-Winter 2010, p.18.

social and political conditions.[131] Hudson emphasizes "changing social and political conditions" in that regard. Hudson claims that these aspects of identity are neither "carved in stone, nor do they spring from tables of stone"; instead, identity is reshaped every moment by society. Discourse and interaction in society are the engines of identity. In this framework, "we often term the transitory results of all of this social discourse 'culture'. Thus, we speak of 'culture wars', and 'culture change'."[132] In the post-Cold War period, an article "the Clash of Civilizations?" by Samuel Huntington became an important academic and political topic of discussion. Huntington considers the concept of civilization as a cultural identity distinguishing people from other species. Huntington explains it in the following:

> Villages, regions, ethnic groups, nationalities, religious groups, all have distinct cultures at different levels of cultural heterogeneity… They constitute civilizations. A civilization is thus the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species. It is defined both by common objective elements, such as language, history, religion, customs, institutions, and by the subjective self-identification of people.[133]

Within this context, it might be beneficial to make a distinction between state identity and national identity. Different from national identity reflecting divergent features of a nation, state identity examines "how states construct

---

[131] M. Hakan Yavuz, "Değişen Türk Kimliği ve Dış Politika: Neo-Osmanlıcılığın Yükselişi", İhsan D. Dağı, Şaban H. Çalış, Ramazan Gözen (eds) *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberté Yayınları, 2001, p.62.

[132] Valerie M. Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*, Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2007, pp.105-106.

[133] Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.72, No.3, 1993, pp.23-24.

identities and interests through interactions".[134] Similarly, Wendt offers that "State identity is endogenous to structured interaction among states".[135] On this basis, Toni Alaranta argues that "a national identity is transformed without any significant change in foreign policy or in the country's position in the international system" whereas a change in state identity occurs precisely "when a state's foreign policy and its overall positioning in the system is transformed".[136] Hence, it is widely accepted that state identity is more influential in the formation of foreign policy rather than national identity.

To reveal the relationship between identity and foreign policy, Ted Hopf took the Soviet identity and foreign policy in 1955, and the Russian identity and foreign policy in 1999 into the center of his study to show how a state's identity can affect how that state understands other states in world affairs. In this case, the socialist camp was regarded as "self" during the Cold War whereas the Western alliance was defined as "other". Based on the assumption that identities imply interests for states, Hopf claims that identities function to make some actions more probable than others. To exemplify, in the 1950s, Soviet willingness to provide China with unprecedented access to its military production, training and technology was made more probable as a result of Soviet understanding of that country as part

---

[134] Steve Smith, "Foreign Policy is What States Make of it: Social Construction and International Relations Theory", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.53.

[135] Paul Kowert, "The Construction of National Identity", in Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert (eds), *International Relations in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 1998, p.102.

[136] Toni Alaranta, *The Transformation of the Republic's Status in the International System: National and State Identity in Turkey*, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2015, p.32.

of "itself".[137] As for the 1990s, Hopf argues that the end of the Cold War meant a dramatic change in Russian understanding of "self" and "other", which implies a change in its identity indeed, and accordingly a change in the definition of interest and foreign policy as well. In view of that, Hopf discusses about how identity, interest and foreign policy preferences for Russia were explained during this period.[138] The link between a change in a state's identity and its foreign policy will be further discussed under the title of "Identity and Change in Foreign Policy" of this chapter.

To analyze foreign policy more, Trine Flockhart considers that it might be useful to distinguish between practice-based foreign policy and action-based foreign policy. First, practice-based foreign policy draws on practice seen as "unconscious or automatic activities embedded in taken-for-granted routines"[139] which contribute towards stability rather than as a factor which contributes towards change. Action-based foreign policy, on the other hand, is performed mainly through foreign policy decisions intended to solve a problem or to introduce new thinking. Thus, action-based foreign policy is sometimes regarded as an initial step towards changing practice.[140] Since this study argues that there is a change in

---

[137] Ted Hopf, *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*, New York: Cornell University Press, 2002, pp.148-149.

[138] *Ibid*, pp.208-210 and 214-219.

[139] Ann Swidler, "What Anchors Cultural Practices", in Theodore R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr Cetina and Eike von Savigny (eds), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, London: Routledge, 2001, p.84.

[140] Trine Flockhart, "Constructivism and Foreign Policy", in Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne (eds), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, p.89.

Turkey's state identity under the JDP rule which also implies a change in foreign policy, it seems possible to claim that the Turkish-Israeli relations can be included in the scope of action-based foreign policy.

2.3.1. Identity and Continuity in Foreign Policy

By drawing boundaries between "self" and "other" determining the continual behavioral patterns of states, the concept of identity provides an important opportunity for us to understand if there is continuity in foreign policy, or not. Ilya Prizel makes a connection between identity and foreign policy. Prizel claims that except for Poland, and to some degree Hungary, East and Central nationalists historically rejected the Western legalistic-national model in favor of nativism or Slavophilia that resulted in their resistance to heavy burdens of cultural and political ressentiment toward external pressures.[141]

> Poland has identified itself as the "Christ-nation"; Russia as the "Third Rome"; Romania as "heir to the Roman civilization engulfed by the sea of Slavic and Magyar adversity; Hungary as "an island of true civilization in a sea of Slavs"; Ukraine as a "bulwark against Muscovite Tartar despotism. Given this blend of culture and politics in East Europe... the foreign policies of these countries have continually reflected goals beyond the commonly defined national interests... For the foreign policy of almost every East European country to remain credible at home, a government must also zealously defend the nation's identity.[142]

---

[141] Ilya Prizel, *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia and Ukraine*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, p.26.

[142] *Ibid*, p.27.

Prizel sets a link between identity and foreign policy, and underlines continuity in foreign policy stemming from identity. In doing so, Prizel reveals that a strong sense of cultural and political ressentiment channeled to external pressures contributed to the formation of foreign policy. In this framework, it is possible to say that Turkey's Westernization process though not always harmonious has been a continual element of Turkish foreign policy starting from the nineteenth century that is since the last century of the Ottoman Empire. Thus, it might be concluded that there has been a close relationship between the continuity in Turkish foreign policy and the Turkish state identity.

2.3.2. Identity and Change in Foreign Policy

Since actors do not have a "portfolio of interests" independent from social context, they define their interests in the process of defining situations.[143] This process includes social interactions between "self" and "other". In other words, it is a dynamic phenomenon that implies change over time. The gradual change in state identity incites states to re-define their foreign policy patterns that results in change in international politics as well. Similarly, Robert Jackson and Georg Sorensen state that "If the thoughts and ideas that enter into the existence of international relations change, then the system itself will change as well, because the system

---

[143] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.46, No.2, 1992, pp.398.-399.

consists in thoughts and ideas".[144] Moreover, Prizel considers that identity is not constant and immutable but constantly redefined, in part by foreign policy.[145]

Prizel explains the reasons for the identity shifts of the states. First, Prizel says the most common factor altering an identity is "the metamorphosis or the total disappearance of "the other". He exemplifies the disintegration of the USSR having affected domestic and foreign policy priorities for the Central European states. Second, Prizel argues the pursuit of a specific foreign policy may induce a change over time. To illustrate, Austria followed a successful policy of neutrality after the Second World War, which led the Austrians to internalize the notion of neutrality to such a degree that many objected to the EU membership. Third, military defeats can result in rapid transformation. Prizel gives France as an example. He says, "France's shift from a national identity based on the concept of a civilizing empire to one of a component of a larger European entity can be directly traced to its defeats in Indochina (1954) and Algeria (1962)".[146] So, the French self-perception changed from "a civilizing empire" to "a component of a larger European entity". Fourth, "mere disappointment in a foreign policy" can radically change a polity's perception of its role in the international system. Prizel illustrates the American disappointment with the Treaty of Versailles and the Wilsonian diplomacy

---

[144] Robert Jackson and Georg Sorensen, *Introduction to International Theories and Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, p.162.

[145] Ilya Prizel, *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia and Ukraine*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, p.33.

[146] *Ibid*, pp.33-34.

implying the end of the belief in a universal mission.[147] Last, generational changes can change the identity of a polity as well. According to Prizel, the independence of India in 1947, the creation of ANZUS[148] in 1948, and the Suez Crisis in 1956 obviously illustrated that the British Empire was no longer tenable. Moreover, Prizel claims that the British politicians of Churchill's generation could not imagine the empire as a mere component of a larger European entity subordinating itself to Brussels, that is to say the EU.[149]

In this framework, Turkey defines its interests in the process of defining situations, and accordingly re-defines its foreign policy patterns. Based on the arguments set by Jackson, Sorensen and Prizel above, in the following chapters, this dissertation tries to explain the processes of defining situations in different terms in Turkey and their impacts on Turkey's relations with Israel.

2.4.   State, Identity and Interest

The Constructivist theory accepts the state as the main unit of analysis. According to the theory, the state operates in a social structure qualified by three elements, namely shared knowledge, material resources and practices,[150] as a result

---

[147] *Ibid*, p.35.

[148] The Australia, New Zealand and United States Security Treaty (ANZUS Treaty) was an agreement signed in 1951 in order to protect the security of the Pacific. (https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/anzus), October 12, 2014 accessed.

[149] Ilya Prizel, *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia and Ukraine*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, p.35.

[150] Alexander Wendt, "Constructing International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.20, No.1, 1995, p.73.

of the intersubjective nature of relations between states and international system. The diversity of identities of states is the main reason for this intersubjectivity.

The theory argues that the concept of identity is theorized within the context of history and sociology. On this point, the self and the other have a dominant position to explain this context. Shared norms and narratives contributing to the achievement and maintenance of "we-ness" through time are also influential on the identity of states that positions themselves in relation to others. It reflects intersubjectivity among them. Ted Hopf considers that "The intersubjective structure is the final arbiter of meaning".[151]

As regards to the concept of interest, Emanuel Adler says, "Constructivism is equipped to show how national interests are born, how they acquire their status of general political understandings, and how such understandings are politically selected in and through political processes".[152] To Wendt, identities form the basis of interests. Wendt claims that actors are not given a portfolio of interests. Instead, they define their interests in the process of defining situations, in other words, the actors are dependent on social context.[153]

Similar to Wendt, Thomas Banchoff asserts, "Collective identity shapes the content of state interests and the course of state action".[154] Jutta Weldes suggests

---

[151] Ted Hopf, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory", *International Security*, Vol.23, No.1, p.173.

[152] Emanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.3, No.3, 1997, p.337.

[153] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.46, No.2, 1992, pp.398.

[154] Thomas Banchoff, "German Identity and European Integration", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.5, No.3, 1999, p.262.

two dimensions, namely "articulation" and "interpellation", in order to examine "the representations out of which national interest emerge".[155] Weldes mentions that the term "articulation" refers to "the process through which meaning is produced out of extant cultural raw materials or linguistic resources"[156], and the term "interpellation" refers to "a dual process whereby identities or subject-positions are created and concrete individuals are 'hailed' into or interpellated by them".[157] Based on these terms, Weldes explains the construction of the national interest in the following:

> The dual processes of articulation and interpellation are of central importance in the construction of "the national interest". Through these processes, visions of the international system- including descriptions of one's own state, of other states and of threats- are created. These representations, in turn, *already entail* national interest.[158]

That is to say that the dual processes of articulation and interpellation result in particular national interests. In this framework, interests are not fixed, and they are not constant for different actors. Instead, interests vary based on different definitions of actors' identities within social context. In brief, this variation in state identity is decisive on national interests and accordingly on state policies.

---

[155] Jutta Weldes, "Constructing National Interests", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.2, No.3, 1996, p.284.

[156] *Ibid*.

[157] *Ibid*, p.287.

[158] *Ibid*, p.289.

2.5.   The International System

The Constructivist theory argues that states and the international system dialectically influence each other; in other words, agents and social structures are interrelated. To clarify this point, Wendt explains, "Regular practices produce mutually constituting sovereign identities (agents) and their associated institutional norms (structures)".[159] Wendt claims "what states do to each other affects the social structure in which they are embedded, by a logic of reciprocity".[160] In this context, Wendt advocates against the neorealist conceptualization of self-help and power politics. According to him, these concepts do not follow logically or casually from an anarchical structure, and if there is a self-help world today, it is a consequence of process, not structure. Wendt adds the followings:

> There is no "logic" of anarchy apart from the practices that create and instantiate one structure of identities and interest rather than another; structure has no existence or casual powers apart from process. Self-help and power politics are institutions, not essential features of anarchy. *Anarchy is what states make of it*.[161]

Albeit it does not mean that international relations are immune from rules. Onuf says that "By calling international relations anarchic, scholars are not saying that there is an absence of rule. This would be chaos, not anarchy. Instead, they

---

[159] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.46, No.2, 1992, p.413.

[160] Alexander Wendt, "Constructing International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.20, No.1, 1995, p.77.

[161] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.46, No.2, 1992, pp.394-395.

seem to be saying that structure- and especially a stable pattern of unintended consequences- rules the day”.[162] On this point, the rules and related practices form a stable pattern well suited to their agents’ intentions. Any stable pattern of rules, institutions and unintended results gives a structure.[163] Therefore, anarchy is a structural pattern.

Based on an intersubjective awareness in this structure, the international system is not considered something “out there” like the solar system. The international system does not exist on its own. Instead, it is constituted by *ideas*. Jackson and Sorensen define that “It is a human invention or creation not of a physical or material kind but of a purely intellectual and ideational kind. It is a set of ideas, a body of thought, a system of norms, which has been arranged by certain people at a particular time and place”.[164] On this point Finnemore and Sikkink add that “identities are constituted by the interaction of these internal and external ideas” but “the number of possible identities is not infinite… since identity formation is always limited by the array of possible identities in the international system at any historical moment”.[165] In such a kind of international system, Wendt

---

[162] Nicholas Onuf, “Constructivism: A User’s Manual”, in Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert (eds), *International Relations in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 1998, p.62.

[163] *Ibid*, p.61.

[164] Robert Jackson and Georg Sorensen, *Introduction to International Theories and Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, p.162.

[165] Martha Finnemore and Kahryn Sikkink, “Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics”, *Annual Review of Political Sciences*, Vol.4, No.1, 2001, p.399.

claims that an analysis on international politics requires an analysis of processes of interaction. Wendt supports his argument with the following:

> To analyze the social construction of international politics is to analyze how processes of interaction produce and reproduce the social structures -cooperative or conflictual- that shape actors' identities and interests and significance of their material contexts. It is opposed to two rivals: the materialist view, of which neorealism is one expression, that material forces *per se* determine international life, and the rational choice-theoretical view that interaction does not change identities and interests.[166]

Thereupon, states and the international system construct a mutually constitution in which interactions produce and reproduce structure, shaping the agents' identities and interests, and accordingly their policies.

2.6. Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the theoretical framework of the dissertation. Constructivism offers an analytical approach focusing on the identity of actors, and the interaction between them. The theory assumes "actors make their worlds, and this assumption lies behind most of the foreign policy analysis literature".[167] On

---

[166] Alexander Wendt, "Constructing International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.20, No.1, 1995, p.81.

[167] Steve Smith, "Foreign Policy is What States Make of it: Social Construction and International Relations Theory", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, p.38.

this point, self-perception and otherness play an important role in the formulation of foreign policy. By paraphrasing Wendt, Steve Smith says that "foreign policy is what states make of it".[168] Accordingly, the identity of an actor, that is to say a state as a unit of analysis, decides its behaviors and abilities in the international system.

Constructivist thinking attaches importance to a state's interaction with and relationship to other states. For example, Barnett and Hudson advocate this idea. Generally speaking, states define and implement foreign policies alongside their identities. Within this context, state identity matters in driving states' relations with each other. The next chapter will start to adopt this theoretical background on the Turkish-Israeli relations.

---

[168] *Ibid*.

CHAPTER 3

THE LEGACY OF HISTORY

IN THE TURKISH-ISRAELI RELATIONS

From a socio-historical perspective, the Turks and the Jews had interacted with each other and developed close relations long before their state-level relations.[169] Since the constructivist theory argues that the legacy of history, memory and narrative play a crucial role in the formation of a state's identity, Chapter 3 will analyze the impact of these factors on Turkey's state identity. In this chapter, the Ottoman period, particularly the rise of Zionism in the last years of the Empire, the First World War, the foundation of the Republic of Turkey and the Second World War will be examined. By doing so, I will try to explain Turkey's state identity shaped by Turkey's modernization process by its founding fathers that would be decisive on Turkey's stance on the declaration of the State of Israel in 1948.

---

[169] According to the studies on this field, the semi-nomadic Turkish people Hazarlar in Turkish or Kuzarim in Hebrew (the Khazars), who had claimed domination of the North Caucasus, the Crimean Peninsula and Kiev from 650 to 850, had a multi-confessional population in which the Jewish community lived as well. In such a society, the Khazar royals and nobles had preferred to convert to Judaism in the beginning of the eight century. Peter B. Golden, "Khazar Studies: Achievements and Perspectives", in Peter B. Golden, Haggai Ben-Shammai and András Róna-Tas (eds), "The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives"*, Handbook of Oriental Studies*, Vol.17, 2007, p.9.

3.1.   The Ottoman Period

The first meeting of the Ottoman Turks and the Jewish community began with the conquest of Bursa by Ottoman Sultan Orhan Gazi on April, 6, 1326. When the city was declared the capital, the Jewish tradesmen were invited to Bursa, and the beleaguered Jewish community, following the new climate of freedom, came even from the Arabian Peninsula. The Ottoman support for the oppressed Jewish communities continued: Sultan Murad I settled the Jews who fled Hungary; in 1394, Sultan Yıldırım Bayezid invited the French Jews, who were assaulted by King Charles VI, to the Ottoman Empire; and in 1421, Sultan Murad II accepted the German Jews who were fleeing persecutions.[170]

On May 29, 1453, Sultan Mehmet II conquered Istanbul where the Jews lived as well. Moses Kapsali, the last Chief Rabbi of Constantinople, became the first Chief Rabbi of Istanbul.[171] The Sultan invited the Jewish communities residing in the different parts of Anatolia to Istanbul, and many Jewish families accepted the invitation.[172] During the reign of Sultan Bayezid II (1481-1512), Ferdinand II of Aragon and Isabella I of Castile signed an edict of expulsion for the Jews in 1492.[173] Turkish Admiral Kemal Reis and his fleet were sent to Cadiz to take the

---

[170] (http://www.sephardicstudies.org/sultans1.html), May 1, 2014 accessed.

[171] (http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/11114-moses-kapsali), May 1, 2014 accessed.

[172] (http://www.turkyahudileri.com/content/view/246/272/lang,tr/), May 1, 2014 accessed.

[173] (https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Judaism/expulsion.html), May 1, 2014 accessed.

Jews from there. Under his protection, a convoy of Jewish immigrants was organized. About 150,000 of the approximately 600,000 Spanish Jews moved to the Ottoman Empire.[174] Stanford Shaw writes that "as many as 250,000 may have gone to the Ottoman Empire in the late fifteenth century".[175]

After the Ottoman army under the command of Sultan Selim I had defeated the Mamluks in 1516, four centuries of Ottoman rule over Palestine was inaugurated. In the margin of his visit to Jerusalem, the Sultan put an end to the law of no return imposed by the Roman Senate, and invited the Jews to settle their historical lands.[176] During the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-1566), Joseph Nassi, a Marrano (Jewish convert to Christianity), settled in Istanbul, and served as an advisor to Suleiman the Magnificent and later to his son Sultan Selim II as well.[177] Moreover, Süleyman the Magnificent ordered the construction of the city walls of Jerusalem.[178]

In this framework, Kemal Karpat defines the Ottoman state as a Muslim state in which the Jews, like the Muslims, were *Ehl-i Kitap* (the People of the Book) who enjoyed the divine blessing and guidance of the Torah. It means "They

---

[174] (http://www.sephardicstudies.org/sultans1.html), May 1, 2014 accessed.

[175] Bernard J. Shaw, *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic*, New York: New York University Press, 1991, p.31.

[176] (http://www.salom.com.tr/newsdetails.asp?id=87631), May 1, 2014 accessed.

[177] Christopher Marlowe, *The Jew of Malta with Related Texts*, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2009, p.XV.

[178] (http://www.sephardicstudies.org/sultans1.html), May 1, 2014 accessed.

were free to practice their faith, to organize and live according to the principles of their religions".[179] In the state administration, the *Millet* (Nation) system formed a fundamental basis. Under the system, subjects or units, rather than individuals, were defined according to their religious affiliations. It allowed non-Muslim communities to administer their communal affairs under the authority of their ecclesiastical leaders having significant administrative, judicial and financial responsibilities. In other words, each religious group was organized as a corporate communal legal entity under its own religious leadership.[180] Similarly, the Jews were part of the system under which they could administer their communal affairs.

In short, the orderly Ottoman government brought improvements to the regions where the Jews lived, and this situation encouraged the immigration of other Jewish communities into those regions. The immigration wave reached its peak with the death of Suleiman the Magnificent in 1566; however, the gradual decline of the Empire caused widespread neglect.[181] According to Shaw, all the prosperity, power and influence gained by the Ottoman Jewry during the 15th and 16th centuries largely disappeared during the next 200 years. This change was mainly the result of the decline and the following disintegration of the Empire as a

---

[179] Kemal H. Karpat, *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*, Leiden: Brill, 2002, p.718.

[180] Hakan Yavuz, *Islamic Political Identity in Turkey*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, p.40. For further information: İlber Ortaylı, *Üç Kıtada Osmanlılar*, Istanbul: Timaş, 2007, pp.59-68.

[181] Bernard Reich, *A Brief History of Israel*, New York: InfoBase Publishing, 2008, p.12.

whole.[182] Then, Palestine became a focal point for the Zionist ideology in the 19th century aiming the establishment of an independent Jewish national home.

3.1.1. Zionism: Towards a Jewish National Home

According to the Ottoman administrative system, Palestine was ruled from Istanbul but the region was divided into districts, and administratively attached to the province of Damascus. Under the Ottoman rule (1516-1918), those distincts, called *sanjaks*, were part of administrative units called *vilayets*. Most of Palestine was part of the *vilayet* of Syria and was governed from Damascus by a pasha. Thus, it was commonly referred to as southern Syria indeed.[183] However, in line with the decline of the Empire, the state began to lose its lands. In particular, non-Muslim communities declared their independence with the support of European powers such as Britain, France and Russia. Similarly, non-Ottoman Jews made some efforts for the independence. To illustrate, in 1838, Sir Moses Montefiore, a British Jew, negotiated with Mohammed Ali Pasha- the viceroy of Egypt (who at that time also ruled modern-day Syria and Palestine) who then challenged the Sultan- over a charter for land in *Eretz Israel*[184] where Jews might live without interference.[185]

---

[182] Bernard J. Shaw, *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic*, New York: New York University Press, 1991, p.109.

[183] Alan Dershowitz, *The Case for Israel*, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 2003, p.24.

[184] *Eretz Yisrael* or *Eretz Israel* means "Land of Israel" which is "Jewish homeland to be established in the general area of Palestine". (http://www.zionism-israel.com/dic/Eretz_Yisrael.htm), January 2, 2014 accessed.

The Zionist ideology unified such efforts for the establishment of a Jewish state. Theodor Herzl, a secular Viennese journalist, is widely accepted as the founder of Zionism,[186] a political movement offering "a specifically Jewish national territory ruled by Jews, and located in the ancient Jewish homeland, Palestine".[187] Zionism provided a national-cultural vision for the state-building process for Jewish people.[188] In this respect, to Gideon Shimoni, Zionism was basically a particular response to the impact on the actual conditions of existence of Jews, and its propagation involved "intentive cultural excavation and construction" as well.[189] Hence, Michael Barnett accepts Zionism as "an obvious component of the national identity".[190] So, Zionism is considered as a solution to "the problem of Jewish collective existence and identity in the modern era".[191]

---

[185] Gregory S. Mahler, *Politics and Government in Israel: The Maturation of a Modern State*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2011, p.17.

[186] Referring to the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, the literary meaning of Zionism is explained as "a political movement that was originally concerned with establishing an independent state for Jewish people, and is now concerned with developing the state of Israel". Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, Sixth Edition, p.1390. The term derives from the word "Zion", a mountain near the city of Jerusalem, and "Zion" is biblically used as a synonym for Jerusalem, too. (http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/657453/Zion), March 11, 2014 accessed.

[187] Martin Gilbert, *The Story of Israel*, London: Andre Deutsch, 2011, p.6.

[188] Amir Bar-Or, "The Making of Israel's Political-Security Culture", in Gabriel Sheffer and Oren Barak (eds), *Militarism and Israeli Society*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010, p.274.

[189] Gideon Shimoni, "Postcolonial Theory and the History of Zionism", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.13, No.4, 2007, p.862.

[190] Michael Barnett, "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.5, No.1, 1999, p.11.

[191] Erik Cohen, "Citizenship, Nationality and Religion in Israel and Thailand, in Baruch Kimmerling (ed), *The Israeli State and Society: Boundaries and Frontiers*, New York: State University of New York Press, 1989, p.68.

Within this context, on August 29, 1897, the First Zionist Congress with the participation of Jewish delegates from different parts of the world was convened in the Swiss city of Basel. The Congress published a document called the Basel Program whose opening sentence started with "Zionism aims at establishing for the Jewish people a publicly and legally assured home in Eretz Yisrael..."[192] Eretz Yisrael referred to Palestine, part of the Ottoman Empire, ruled by the Sultan. In his diary, Herzl wrote that "At Basel I founded the Jewish state. If I said this loud today, I would be greeted by universal laughter. In five years, perhaps, and certainly in fifty years, everyone will perceive it".[193]

The Second Zionist Congress convened again in Basel on August 28-31, 1898. At the Congress, Herzl called on the participants to "conquer the communities", a call for focusing on political activities in Palestine and for working in the Jewish communities.[194] In accordance with a resolution for obtaining a legal charter for Jewish settlement in Palestine, Gregory Mahler draws attention to that Herzl attempted to work through Kaiser Wilhelm II because Germany had influence with the Ottoman Empire at that time. However, the Sultan opposed the idea. As a result, "the Kaiser would not support Zionism over the objections of his ally".[195]

---

[192] (https://www.knesset.gov.il/lexicon/eng/bazel_eng.htm), March 11, 2014 accessed.

[193] Theodor Herzl, *The Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Marvin Lowenthal (trans.), New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1962, p.224.

[194] (http://www.herzl.org/english/Article.aspx?Item=539), December 25, 2013 accessed.

[195] Gregory S. Mahler, *Politics and Government in Israel: The Maturation of a Modern State*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2011, p.20.

In other words, Zionism prompted Jewish immigration to Palestinian lands in order to transform an autonomous Jewish community into an independent political unit.[196] The immigration changed regional demography dramatically. The first waves of the immigration to Palestine began under the Ottoman rule.[197] The immigration caused immediate conflict with the Ottoman authorities who were quick to ban it.[198] The Ottomans opposed the Jewish immigration because of the system of capitulations, in which European powers enjoyed extraterritorial rights and privileges throughout the Empire. Similarly, Anita Shapira notes that an additional non-Muslim element into the Middle East would provide further grounds for European intervention in the Empire.[199] But the Ottoman administrative organs were not competent enough to control and manage immigration flows, and apply relevant state policies.[200] Almost 80.000 Jews immigrated to the region from 1880

---

[196] Calvin Goldscheider, *Israel's Changing Society: Population, Ethnicity and Development*, Colorado: Westview Press, 2002, p.20.

[197] Joshua Walker, "Turkey and Israel's Relationship in the Middle East", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.17, No.4, 2006, p.62.

[198] David Vital, "Israel at Sixty: Some Reflections", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.14, No.3, 2008, p.557.

[199] Anita Shapira, *Israel: A History*, Massachusetts: Brandeis University Press, 2012, p.22.

[200] Calvin Goldscheider, *Israel's Changing Society: Population, Ethnicity and Development*, Colorado: Westview Press, 2002, p.46.

to 1914.[201] So, the Jewish immigration deteriorated the socio-economic conditions for the Muslim community of Palestine further.[202]

On the other side, Theodor Herzl made personal initiatives in accordance with the decisions taken at the Zionist Congresses. Herzl visited the Ottoman capital three times in 1898, 1901 and 1902. In his last visit, Herzl obtained an audience with Sultan Abdulhamid II. Herzl sought his permission for a Jewish "home" in Palestine under his protection. In his book "*The Jewish State*", Herzl gives details about his claim: "If His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return undertake to regulate the whole finances of Turkey".[203] But the negotiation with the Sultan failed.[204]

---

[201] Asher Arian, *Politics in Israel: The Second Republic*, Washington: CQ Press, 2005, p.26.

[202] In fact, before the Jewish immigration, Sultan Mahmud II (1808-1839) and Sultan Abdülmecid I (1839-1861) launched a reformation process in order to secure the Ottoman territorial integrity and modernize the Empire. In this context, the *Gülhane Hatt-ı Hümayunu* (also known as *Tanzimat Fermanı*) of 1839 granting equality by law to non-Muslims was issued. In addition, the *Islahat Fermanı* (the Rescript of Reform) of 1856 confirmed the rights and liberties provided by the *Tanzimat Fermanı*. Furthermore, the *Kanun-u Esasi* (the Basic Law of the Ottoman Empire) was declared under the reign of Sultan Abdulhamid II on December 23, 1876. The constitution stated that "All Ottomans are equal in the eyes of the law. They have the same rights, and owe the same duties towards their country, without prejudice to religion" (Article 17). However, the dissolution of the Empire continued. (http://www.worldstatesmen.org/OttomanConstitution1876.htm), May 24, 2014 accessed.

[203] Theodor Herzl, *The Jewish State*, London: Penguin Books, 2010, p.30.

[204] Theodor Herzl recorded the reply of the Sultan as follows: "I am not going to give one inch of Palestine to the Jews, as Palestine is not mine; but it belongs to the Ummah. This Ummah has shed blood to defend this land, fed it with their blood, and we will not give away our blood, cheaply, for its sake." Dr. Yusuf Al Qaradawi, *Jerusalem: The Concern of Every Muslim*, 2012 (from www.scribedigital.com). His reply to Herzl is glorified today by pro-Islamist political groups and parties in Turkey. To illustrate, Necmettin Erbakan, the leader of the *Milli Görüş* (National View) movement and the Prime Minister of Turkey (1996-1997), says the Jews have no right on the lands of Palestine at all. The target of Zionism is to establish "*Büyük İsrail*" (Great Israel). Hence, the Sultan's reply to Herzl is often praised. İhsan D. Dağı, *Kimlik, Söylem ve Siyaset: Doğu-Batı Ayrımında Refah Partisi Geleneği*, Ankara: İmge Kitapevi, 1998, p.70. Moreover, in a TV series, called *Filinta*, broadcasted on public television TRT, Abdulhamid II is portrayed as a Sultan who tried to protect the Islamic world as the Caliph of all Muslims on earth and rejected the sale of the Palestinian lands to the Jews. Abdulhamid II's decision not to sell the lands is accepted "right" by claiming there is turmoil in the Middle East after the establishment of the State of Israel. Türkan

As to the reasons for why Sultan Abdulhamid II rejected the offer, Ofra Bengio underlines Islamic sensitivities and sentiments, and opposition from the Arab inhabitants of Palestine to Jewish settlement.[205] On the other side, it was not possible for the Sultan to recognize such an autonomous structure in the middle of the Ottoman lands since Istanbul had serious concerns about the possibility that the great powers could increase their influence on the Empire by using Zionism.[206] Moreover, the Sultan's decision proved that there was a unique policy towards the Zionist movement in Palestine in which the Jewish settlement was completely prohibited.[207]

3.1.2. The First World War

The First World War became a turning point in the way for the establishment of a Jewish state. The Ottoman Empire had decided to enter the war on the German side. The decision caused Britain, France and Russia, the Allied Powers, to plan for the partition of the Ottoman Empire. In this vein, the Sykes-

---

Polatcı and A. Nafiz Ünalmış, "Son Dönem Osmanlı Dini Jeopolitiği", in Engin Akçay, Erkan Ertosun and Mahmut Akpınar (eds), *Dini Jeopolitik Yaklaşımıyla Orta Doğu*, Ankara: Akçağ, 2013, p.240. Therefore, it might be concluded that there is a kind of revisit of the Ottoman past today, a clue to understand the current formation process of Turkey's state identity which is in a shift.

[205] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.72.

[206] Mim Kemal Öke, *Ortadoğu ve Filistin Sorunu*, p.14 (It is possible to reach from internet).

[207] Büşra Barın, *The Ottoman Policy towards Jewish Immigration and Settlement in Ottoman Empire: 1882-1920*, unpublished master thesis submitted to Middle East Technical University, 2014, p.208.

Picot Agreement was signed between Britain and France in May 1916. The agreement constituted the division of most of the Arab lands under the Ottoman rule into British and French spheres of influence.[208] The Balfour Declaration issued unilaterally by Britain was another partition scheme.[209] In the battlefield, the idea of "the establishment of a Jewish Legion to fight alongside the Allies and against the Turks" to liberate Palestine gained popularity in some Zionist circles[210] although not all Zionists favored such an idea. To exemplify the first group, Martin Gilbert illustrates the Jewish support for the Gallipoli campaign of the Allied powers. Gilbert says that on March 22, 1915, a majority of the Palestine Refugees' Committee in Egypt passed a resolution in order to form a Jewish Legion and propose to Britain its utilization in Palestine. Within a few days, 500 men enlisted. Then, Ze'ev Jabotinsky[211] and Joseph Trumpeldor[212] prevailed upon the British

---

[208] (http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/britain-and-france-conclude-sykes-picot-agreement), May 4, 2014 accessed.

[209] William L. Cleveland and Martin Bunton, *A History of the Modern Middle East*, Boulder: Westview Press, 2009, p.243.

[210] Martin Gilbert, *Israel: A History*, New York: Harper Perennial, 2008, p.31.

[211] Ze'ev Vladimir Jabotinsky is a Russian-born Jew and a lifelong Zionist. He was a member of the Zionist Executive and one of the founders of "Keren Hayesod" (United Israel Appeal or the Foundation Fund). In the First World War, Jabotinsky also served in the British army as a lieutenant. Following the War, he founded the Union of Zionists-Revisionists (Hatzohar) and the New Zionist Organization (N.Z.O.). Besides the N.Z.O., the Betar youth movement and the Irgun Tzvai Leumi became the three operative extensions of his movement which supported for free immigration and the immediate establishment of a Jewish State. (http://www.jabotinsky.org/site/content/t2.asp?Pid=123&Sid=10), March 16, 2014 accessed.

[212] Joseph Trumpeldor, a Russian-born Jew and a Jewish national hero. After he had served as a veteran of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905, he decided to settle in Palestine. Following the outbreak of the First World War, he joined the Allied forces. He also founded the Zion Mule Corps in 1915. He involved in the defense of Tel Hai, a former Jewish settlement in Galilee, against the Arabs but lost his life there. (http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/biography/trumpeldor.html), March 16, 2014 accessed.

government to allow the creation of "a Zion Mule Corps" to serve on the Gallipoli peninsula.[213]

On the other hand, the Jewish community led by Chief Rabbi Haim Nahum advocated the Ottoman Empire.[214] However, the British army captured Jerusalem in December 1917 and detached Palestine from the Ottoman Empire. The British military occupation took place from 1917 to 1920. During this period, on January 3, 1919, Chaim Weizmann, the President of the Zionist Organization and the first President of the State of Israel, and Emir Faisal, son of the King of Hejaz and leader of the 1916 Arab revolt against the Ottoman Empire, signed a formal pact in London which guaranteed the Jews the right to immigrate freely to Palestine and to settle legally settlement on the land.[215] According to Davutoğlu, the immigration provided the ground for the establishment of the State of Israel under the British control.[216]

---

[213] Martin Gilbert, *Israel: A History*, New York: Harper Perennial, 2008, p.31.

[214] Rıfat N. Bali, *Devlet'in Yahudileri ve "Öteki" Yahudi*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2010, p.22.

[215] Gregory S. Mahler, *Politics and Government in Israel: The Maturation of a Modern State*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2011, p.26.

[216] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2012, p.380.

3.2. Foundation of the Republic of Turkey: Rebuilding the State through an Inward-Oriented Strategy and Maintenance of Status quo

After the Turkish War of Liberation, the Republic of Turkey was declared on October 29, 1923. The founding military-bureaucratic elites attached utmost importance to the process of state-building and restructuring. On this point, the Westernization process, which had deeply affected the elites' identities since the late Ottoman Empire, became a priority for the newly established state and was used as a means to transform society and contribute to the survival of the state in the international arena, although Mustafa Kemal Atatürk had liberated the country from the Western domination.[217] Indeed, there was an old struggle between the adoption of a set of European values and prescriptions and the retention of old and indigenous ideas closely linked to the religion of Islam and its cultural signs.[218] This situation is indeed consistent with the dissertation's definition on the process of creating "self" and "other". Turkey's founding elites regarded ideas closely linked to Islam and its cultural signs as "other" in this process. Accordingly, Atatürk tried to achieve the renunciation of three strains, namely pan-Ottomanism, pan-Islamism and pan-Turkism, with his political principles namely republicanism, secularism and nationalism respectively.[219] The new state was determined to make

---

[217] Bernard Lewis, *The Crisis of Islam*, London: Phoenix, 2003, p.XVI.

[218] Philip Robins, "Turkish Foreign Policy since 2002: Between a 'Post-Islamist' Government and a Kemalist State", *International Affairs*, Vol.83, No.1, 2007, p. 290.

[219] Mustafa Aydın, "Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy: Historical Framework and Traditional Inputs", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.35, No.4, 1999, p.171.

progress for modernity and become a secular republic committed to the Turkish rather than to the Muslim identity.[220] Bernard Lewis accepts this new state as the only Muslim state that "formally adopted secularism as a principle, and enacted the removal of Islam from the constitution and the abrogation of the shari'a".[221]

With regard to foreign policy, the primary purpose was to accomplish and maintain peace and national security.[222] This purpose meant the abandonment of the idea of "the foreign zones of influence".[223] In fact, Atatürk's maxim "Peace at home, peace in the world" symbolized avoiding any irredentist claims for Turkey. In this vein, Turkey, together with Greece, Romania and Yugoslavia, signed the Balkan Pact on February 9, 1934 in Athens in order to guarantee the security of the borders in the Balkans.[224] Then, Turkey signed the Treaty of Non-Aggression, widely known as the Saadabad Pact, with Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan on July 8, 1937 in Tehran to "respect the inviolability of their common frontiers".[225]

---

[220] William Hale, *Türk Dış Politikası: 1774-2000*, Istanbul: Mozaik, 2003, p.36.

[221] Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong?*, London: Phoenix, 2002, p.118.

[222] William Hale, *Türk Dış Politikası: 1774-2000*, Istanbul: Mozaik, 2003, pp.36-37.

[223] Philip Robins, *The Middle East: A Beginner's Guide*, Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2009, p.19.

[224] Hasan Kösebalaban, *Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: BigBang, 2014, pp.124-125.

[225] *Ibid*, pp.126-128.

Within this context, Turkey's state identity was composed of Western, secular and modern features. To be part of the West/civilization was in the center of Turkey's interests. Turkey formed its relations with the Middle Eastern states on the basis of perception that the region was the opposite side of Westernization and secularism, and perceived as "other" representing a value-system from which Turkey should keep itself distant. To make it clear, for example, Turkey rejected to participate in the Islamic Conference held in Jerusalem in 1931 under the auspices of Haj Amin al-Husseini, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. In the rejection, Turkey's concerns about the possibility of discussion on the re-establishment of the Caliphate in Turkey and the re-appointment of last Caliph Abdulmecid II as the Caliph again were influential.[226] Thus, Turkey dealt with the events in the Middle East as long as the developments in the region affected Turkey's interests.[227] And, as argued above, Turkey's interests were closely linked to its state identity.

3.2.1. The Jewish Community in Turkey during the Foundation Years

The Jewish community's position to the Turkish War of Liberation and afterwards helps us understand its place in the new-born Republic better. During the war, it can be said that the majority of the Jews showed loyalty and support unlike the Christian minorities. The main reason behind the Jewish support might be explained due to the discriminatory policies of the Allied Powers which favored

---

[226] Özlem Tür, "Türkiye ve Filistin (1908-1948): Milliyetçilik, Ulusal Çıkar ve Batılılaşma", *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol.62, No.1, 2007, pp.238-239.

[227] *Ibid*, p.242.

the Christian communities vis-à-vis the Jews and that they had no other home country at that time. After the war had resulted in the Turkish victory, a peace conference was summoned with the participation of the Turkish, British, French, Italian and Greek delegations in Lausanne. In the conference, Rabbi Chaim Nahum served as an advisor to the Turkish delegation.[228] The negotiations concluded with the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne on July 24, 1923 that acknowledged the independence of the new Turkish state. Section III of the Treaty (Articles 37-45) regulated the "Protection of Minorities" that required from Turkey the following:

> Non-Moslem minorities will enjoy full freedom of movement and of emigration, subject to the measures applied, on the whole or on part of the territory, to all Turkish nationals… (Article 38) Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities will enjoy the same civil and political rights as Moslems. (Article 39) Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as other Turkish nationals. (Article 40) The Turkish Government undertakes to grant full protection to … synagogues… (Article 42)[229]

The Jews, one of the non-Moslem minorities, enjoyed these guarantees. Following an amendment in the Turkish Constitution in 1928 that deleted the article "the state's religion is Islam", and then formally introducing the principle of secularism into the Turkish Constitution in 1937,[230] religious education would be given only at religious institutions. For the Jews, that meant synagogues.

---

[228] Ali Karaosmanoğlu, "A Turkish View of Bilateral Relations with Israel" in Ali İhsan Bağış (ed), *Actual Situation and Prospects of Turkey's Bilateral Relations with Israel*, Ankara: Friedrich Neumann Foundation, 1992, p.2.

[229] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/lausanne-peace-treaty-part-i_-political-clauses.en.mfa), May 17, 2014 accessed.

[230] İlber Ortaylı, *Türkiye'nin Yakın Tarihi*, Istanbul: Timaş, 2014, pp.28-29.

On the other side, Italy's fascist leader Benito Mussolini's calling the Mediterranean Sea as *Mare Nostrum* (Our Sea) and his decision for arming the Aegean islands increased the security concerns of Turkey. First, "Trakya Umumi Müfettişliği" (Thrace Inspectorate General) with the city of Edirne as its center was established by a decree issued on February 19, 1934. The Inspectorate General included the cities of Edirne, Kırklareli, Tekirdağ and Çanakkale.[231] Moreover, the *İskan Kanunu* (the Law on Settlement, Law No. 2510) was enacted on June 14, 1934 in order to move away persons charged with spying for a foreign power from borderlines.[232] The developments caused social unrest in Eastern Thrace in which many Jews lived, and played a dominant role in the socio-economic life of the region. At first, incidents took place in Çanakkale. The events called "the 1934 Thrace Events" escalated. Rıfat Bali explains the events in the following:

> Directly or indirectly, the Jews were made increasingly aware that their presence in Thrace was not wanted and that they should leave the region. Panic seized the community, and the Jews began to sell their possessions and real estate and flee to Istanbul. Finally, when it seemed that events might result in a massacre or worse, the government intervened to restore calm.[233]

On this point, conspiracy theories accusing the Jews of plotting to bring about the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire as well as the overwhelming

---

[231] *Taraf,* Temmuz 4, 2010.

[232] The Article 4 of the Law described *Casuslar* (Spies) under the category of *Türk Kültürüne Bağlı Olmayanlar* (the ones who are not subject to the Turkish culture). (http://mirekoc.ku.edu.tr/sites/mirekoc.ku.edu.tr/files/tr_leg11.pdf), December 27, 2014 accessed.

[233] Rıfat Bali, *Model Citizens of the State: The Jews of Turkey during the Multi-Party Period*, Plymouth: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2012, p.24.

participation of local ethnic minorities, particularly the Jews, in trade and manufacturing in Turkey were seen as the background of those events against the Jews.[234] Furthermore, the *Cemiyetler Kanunu* (the Law on Associations, Law No. 3512) enacted in June 1938 banned associations founded on an ethnic, religious or class basis.[235] The Law restricted associations with connections outside Turkey as well. In other words, associations operating as local branches of international groups were banned. Hence, Jewish associations having international connections such as B'nai B'rith were closed down.[236]

Nevertheless, Bengio remarks that the Jews regarded Atatürk as their protector and called him *El Gadol* (the Great). To show his tolerance to the Jewish community, Bengio reminds us that Abravaya Marmaralı was elected to the Turkish parliament in 1935. Also, Turkey permitted a large group of Jewish sportsmen to participate in the Maccabi games in Israel in 1935, and participated in the Zionist-sponsored Levant Fair in Tel Aviv in 1936.[237]

---

[234] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.73.

[235] Corry Guttstadt, *Turkey, the Jews and the Holocaust*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013, p.14.

[236] Şule Toktaş, "Citizenship and Minorities: A Historical Overview of Turkey's Jewish Minority", *Journal of Historical Sociology*, Vol.18, No.4, 2005, p.403.

[237] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.73.

3.2.2. The Second World War, Turkey and the Jewish Community

Turkey adopted a neutral stance during the Second World War, and survived the war as a non-belligerent state by following a flexible policy that responded to the realities of the moment. At the end of the war, Turkey declared war against Nazi Germany, and then became one of the founding members of the UN. Due to the negative economic effects of the war, on November 11, 1942, the Turkish government issued *Varlık Vergisi* (the Law on Capital Tax), which was abandoned on March 15, 1944. The tax rate, which was calculated on the ground of annual revenue, was 179 per cent for the Jews, who were categorized as non-Muslims, one of the four taxation groups. Rıfat Bali draws attention to fact that non-Muslims paid much more than other tradesmen and industrialists who had the same level of income and wealth. In addition, non-Muslims who could not afford to pay their taxes had to work physically.[238] As a result, the Law weakened the economic situation of the Jews and triggered some of them to leave the country.

On the other side, Turkey accepted hundreds of Jews escaping the Nazi atrocities as refugees.[239] They had an opportunity to work in Turkey as well. To illustrate, Stanford Shaw says that well-known Jewish professors were appointed to

---

[238] Rıfat N. Bali, *Devlet'in Yahudileri ve "Öteki" Yahudi*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2010, p.129.

[239] Turkey's efforts did not always result in success. To illustrate, the catastrophe of "Struma", a Romanian passenger streamer sailing and then reaching Istanbul on December 15, 1941 with 769 Jewish refugees on board, sat in Bosphorus for 70 days and their passengers were forbidden to go ashore except for a few people who received special permission. The Turkish authorities claimed that the refugees did not have Palestine Certificates. Finally, the ship without a working engine was towed onto the open seas, was struck by a Soviet torpedo and went down. With the exception of David Stoliar, all refugees died off the coast of Istanbul. Corry Guttstadt, *Turkey, the Jews and the Holocaust*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp.114-115; Rıfat N. Bali, *Devlet'in Yahudileri ve "Öteki" Yahudi*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2010, pp.263-264.

Ankara University and Istanbul University, which were under a reformation process at that time.[240] Moreover, after the change in the British policy that enabled several Jews to enter Palestine from Nazi-dominated Europe, any Jewish refugee who could by "rail or sea, out of the Balkans to Istanbul (an escape route just opened up)" was allowed to proceed to the region.[241] On this route, the Turkish geographical location was quite important. On January 17, 1943, the British Embassy in Ankara delivered a Note Verbal indicating that 5.000 Jews would be accepted to Palestine as refugees, and asked the Turkish authorities to give permission of the passage. On January 26, 1943, Turkish and British diplomats discussed about the Jewish immigration at the Turkish Foreign Ministry.[242] In spite of the difficult conditions of the war, Turkey provided its facilities for the immigration which saved lives. However, Corry Guttstadt says, Ankara's policies primarily sought to prevent the Jewish immigration or re-immigration to Turkey indeed. To clarify, Guttstadt argues that the Turkish government issued a secret decree (No.2/9498) in August 1938, which barred the Jews from entering the country. In addition, Guttstadt claims that the government also withdrew the citizenship of many Turkish Jews living abroad at that time, and the laws to that effect imposed a lifetime ban on their returning to Turkey.[243]

---

[240] Stanford J. Shaw, *Yahudi Soykırımı ve Türkiye: Türkiyeli ve Avrupalı Yahudilerin Nazi Zulmünden Kurtarılmasında Türkiye'nin Rolü, 1933-1945*, Istanbul: Timaş, 2014, pp.24-25.

[241] Martin Gilbert, *Israel: A History*, New York: Harper Perennial, 2008, p.115.

[242] Bilal N. Şimşir, *Türk Yahudiler II*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2010, pp.387-389.

[243] Corry Guttstadt, *Turkey, the Jews and the Holocaust*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp.309-310.

3.3.   Chapter Conclusion

The simultaneous fall of the Ottoman Empire and the rise of Zionism caused several conspiracy theories on the dissolution of the Ottomans to arise by referring to the meeting between Sultan Abdulhamid II and Theodor Herzl, the Sultan's rejection of Herzl's offer, the dissolution of the Empire, the loss of Palestine and the Jewish immigration to Palestine under the British mandate. Such conspiracy theories have found many supporters among Turkish conservatives, and become influential on their history perception. In other words, there is a revisiting of the Ottoman past in Turkey today implying a shift in Turkey's state identity which will be argued in the following chapters.

In the post-Ottoman era, three main factors shaped the mood of the Turkish-Jewish relations: the Turkish restructuring after the War of Independence, the Jewish immigration to Palestine, and the international developments. First, the new-born state invested in Turkish nation-building based on a secular system granting the Jews the same civil and political rights as Muslims. Meanwhile, Turkey's modernization process that formed a state identity having Western, secular and modern features[244] would be decisive for Turkey's stance on Israel's independence and following developments in the Middle East. Second, the Jewish immigration to Palestine strengthened the idea of establishing an independent Jewish state. In this process, Turkey tried to keep itself distant from the tensions such as the Arab revolt of 1936-1939, and did not regard Palestine as part of its

---

[244] Özlem Tür, "Türkiye ve Filistin (1908-1948): Milliyetçilik, Ulusal Çıkar ve Batılılaşma", *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol.62, No.1, 2007, p.239.

foreign policy.[245] Third, the Second World War caused security concerns for Turkey. The Thrace Events and the issue of the Law on Capital Tax triggered the Jewish immigration from Turkey to other countries whereas Turkey did some efforts to save Jews who escaped from the Nazi regime.

Although Turkey and Israel built their diplomatic relations in January 1950, their social ties were rooted in more than 1.000 years. During this process, their relationship has experienced several ups and downs which are influential on their perception of each other. Therefore, their bilateral relations are not independent of their historical background. By focusing on the legacy of history, memory and narrative which play role in the formation of state identity, this dissertation will analyze Turkey's relations with Israel from a constructivist perspective.

---

[245] *Ibid*, p.242.

CHAPTER 4

THE TURKISH-ISRAELI RELATIONS
FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL
TO THE END OF THE COLD WAR (1948-1990)

Chapter 4 focuses on the new international system that emerged after the Second World War. Under the Cold War dynamics, Turkey consistently invested in its Westernization process during which Turkey interacted with other state actors, and continuously reshaped its state identity in the light of its relations with the Western world in particular including ups and downs in this term. As for the domestic factors, political leaders like İsmet İnönü and Adnan Menderes attached utmost priority to Turkey's integration into the Western institutions. Similarly, the military-civil ruling elites in the state apparatus/institutions also accepted a pro-Western stance to Turkey's international positioning. In this vein, Chapter 4 takes up the Turkish-Israeli relations from the foundation of the State of Israel to the end of the Cold War, and analyses the impact of Turkey's state identity on the relations in this period shaped by a number of issues such as the Periphery Pact of 1958.

4.1.   The New International System after the Second World War:

Turkey's State Identity under the Impact of the West

After Nazi Germany was defeated in the Second World War, the US and the USSR became superpowers since the leading European states such as Britain and France had dramatically lost their power. The international system turned into a bipolar structure. The US replaced Britain in the Middle East. However, the US was not alone and had to face the socialist bloc in the region. Saudi Arabia, Jordan, the Gulf States and Iran (until the 1979 revolution) participated at the US-led Western camp whereas Egypt, Iraq, Algeria and Syria preferred the Soviet camp. As a consequence of the polarization between the blocs, the Middle East region became a kind of chessboard of the Cold War.

On the chessboard, Turkey acted together with the Western camp. American President Harry Truman sent a letter to the US Congress on March 12, 1947, and petitioned the Congress to authorize a provision of $400 million worth of military aid to Turkey and Greece. In the letter, President Truman stressed that the maintenance of Turkey's territorial integrity was an obligation, and that Turkey and Greece were complementary to each other in terms of security and stability. On May 22, 1947, the Congress decided to provide $100 million to Turkey and $300 million to Greece.[246] On June 5, 1947, American Secretary of State George Catlett Marshall announced the decision of providing American aid for the economic recovery in Europe so as to avoid any "political disturbances" and "desperation"

---

[246] Fahir Armaoğlu, *20.Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1914-1995)*, Istanbul: Alkım, 2010, p.538.

which might have strengthened the USSR in the region.[247] These developments provided Turkey with economic and financial aids.

In Turkey's preference for the Western camp was greatly influenced by Soviet policy towards the country after the Second World War as well. Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov held a meeting with Turkish Ambassador to Moscow Selim Sarper on June 7, 1947. In the meeting, Molotov said that if Turkey desired an agreement with the Soviet Union, it would have to accept the following Soviet demands: 1- To make some changes in the Treaty of Moscow between the Grand National Assembly of Turkey and the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic that had been signed on March 16, 1921 in Moscow in favor of the Soviet Union, 2- To defend the Turkish Straits using both the Turkish and the Soviet armies, as well as providing military bases for the Soviet army in the Straits, 3- To come to an agreement between Turkey and the Soviet Union on the Montreux Convention Regarding the Regime of the Straits of 1936. But Turkey rejected the demands. In return, the Soviet Union made a claim on Turkey's eastern cities, Kars and Ardahan.[248]

As a result of the growing Soviet threat, Turkey felt obliged to take part in the Western security structure. The Korean War provided Turkey with an important opportunity in this regard. After the UN Security Council's calling for sending troops to the Korean Peninsula, the Menderes government decided to send 4.500 soldiers to the Korean War. It was the second largest army deployment after the

---

[247] Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994, p.453.

[248] Mehmet Gönlübol, *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1995)*, Ankara: Siyasal Kitapevi, 1996, p.193; Oral Sander, *Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Ankara: İmge Kitapevi, 2006, p.229.

US. Hüseyin Bağcı regarded the decision as an "exceptional case" because Turkey had avoided participating in any military operation or intervention beyond its borders until that time.[249] Turkish Foreign Minister Fuat Köprülü said, Turkey was now a member in the military planning of NATO and its security could be best protected under the UN umbrella.[250] The positive impact of this decision was felt when Turkey was accepted as a full member of NATO in 1952. By entering NATO, Turkey assumed a new role as a partner of the West indeed.[251] Turkey also found a significant chance to access to both American and European political and diplomatic circles. The value of such contacts enabled Turkey to establish itself as a European power.[252] According to Kemal Karpat, to be "the defender of the Western civilization" meant for the Turks that they were finally accepted and became part of the Western world.[253] Karpat argues that Turkey's political regime became closer to the West, and Turkey experienced an important Westernization/ modernization process.[254]

---

[249] Hüseyin Bağcı, *Türk Dış Politikasında 1950'li Yıllar*, Ankara: METU Press, 2001, pp.19-20.

[250] *Ibid*, pp.24-25.

[251] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.60.

[252] Ferenc A. Vali, *Bridge across the Bosphorus*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971, pp.124-125; Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.60.

[253] Kemal H. Karpat, "Introduction", in Kemal H. Karpat (ed), *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition: 1950-1974*, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1975, p.6.

[254] Kemal H. Karpat, *Türk Dış Politikası Tarihi*, Istanbul: Timaş, 2015, p.162.

4.2. UN Partition Plan, Foundation of the State of Israel and Turkey

Many Palestinian Jews were on the side of the Allied Powers in the Second World War. During the war, they provided military aid and actively participated in the fights. It helped them gain an advantageous position vis-à-vis the Palestinian Arabs. Thereupon, the UN General Assembly set up a Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) on May 15, 1947 in order to prepare for advising the British Government on the future government of Palestine[255] in a response to the British request for the recommendation. The UNSCOP began its task on 15 June, and submitted its report to the UN General Assembly on 3 September. According to the report, the Jewish population was a considerable minority, whose main concentration was on the coastal plain, the Jerusalem area and the northern uplands. The Committee recommended the partition of Palestine into two independent States, one Arab and one Jewish.[256] In addition, the City of Jerusalem shall be established as a *corpus separatum*[257] under a special international regime and shall be administered by the UN.[258] The report was endorsed by the Jewish side whereas the Arab leaders rejected it.

---

[255] (http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/06F1E89B3B48291B802564B40049CC67), January 7, 2014 accessed.

[256](http://domino.un.org/unispal.nsf/9a798adbf322aff38525617b006d88d7/07175de9fa2de5638525 68d3006e10f3?OpenDocument), January 7, 2014 accessed.

[257] It means a "separate entity".

[258] (http://unispal.un.org/unispal.nsf/0/7F0AF2BD897689B785256C330061D253), January 7, 2014 accessed.

Following the report, the UN General Assembly voted on Resolution 181 (of 29 November 1947) and adopted the resolution by a vote of 33 to 13, with 10 abstentions and 1 absent. Turkey voted against the resolution. It was welcomed by the Arab leaders. To show the Arab appreciation for the Turkish vote, immediately after the plenary meeting of the UN General Assembly, Syrian President Shukri al-Quwatli sent a thank-you note to Turkish President İsmet İnönü.[259]

In this context, just before the official termination of the British mandate, on May 14, 1948, the independence of the State of Israel was officially declared. One day after the Israeli independence, a group of Arab states, namely Egypt, Transjordan (Jordan), Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq attacked the new-born state in order to assist the Arab Liberation Army and the Palestinian Arabs.[260] The first attack came from Egyptian aircraft, which bombed Tel Aviv.[261]

The UN General Assembly decided to call on the conflicting parties to negotiate peace and establish the Conciliation Commission composed of Turkey, the US and France.[262] Turkey, together with Western countries, voted for the establishment of the Commission. However, all of the Arab delegations voted

---

[259] Melek Fırat and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1945-1960: Batı Bloku Ekseninde Türkiye-1, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: I) Arap Devletleriyle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (Ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: Iletişim 2005, p.617.

[260] Cameron G. Thies, "International Socialization Processes vs. Israeli National Role Conceptions: Can Role Theory Integrate IR Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis?", *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Vol.8, No.1, 2012, p.36.

[261] Alan Dershowitz, *The Case for Israel*, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 2003, p.75.

[262] (http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/C758572B78D1CD0085256BCF0077E51A), August 6, 2013 accessed.

against it.[263] Nonetheless, except Iraq, four other states started negotiations with Israel under the supervision of the Commission. The negotiations failed when the parties did not agree on the future of the refugee problem, the status of Jerusalem and the determination of the boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors. In spite of the UN efforts, the war continued but the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) defeated the Arab armies, and Israel signed Armistice Agreements with Egypt on February 24, 1949, with Lebanon on March 23, 1949, with Jordan on April 3, 1949, and with Syria on July 20, 1949.[264]

4.3.   Turkey's Relations with Israel (1948-1960)

The period from the end of the Second World War to the Korean War, in other words the first years of the Cold War, was quite influential on the future of Turkey-Israel relations. As indicated above, Turkey voted against the UN Partition Plan of 1947, then implemented an impartiality policy during the first war between Israel and the Arab states and became a member of the Conciliation Commission. After Israel had signed armistice agreements with Egypt and Lebanon, Turkey recognized Israel on March 28, 1949.[265] That is to say that "Turkey was the first- and, until the Camp David summit in 1978, the only- Muslim country to recognize

---

[263] Danny Danon, *Israel: The Will to Prevail*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, p.112.

[264] Fahir Armaoğlu, *20.Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1914-1995)*, Istanbul: Alkım, 2010, p.591.

[265] Indeed, before the recognition, Turkey and Israel made a Postal Agreement on June 30, 1948. To respond to the criticism of the Agreement by the Arab world, Turkey announced that the Agreement was made for humanitarian reasons by stressing, "Over 10,000 citizens live in Israel". Mehmet Mücahit Ekinci, *Turkish-Israeli Relations: Past and Present*, Ankara: Ankamat Matbaacılık, 2011, p.62.

the state of Israel".[266] Turkey officially opened its first diplomatic mission in Israel with the presentation of the Letter of Credence of Seyfullah Esin, the First Head of Mission, to the President of Israel Chaim Weizmann on January 7, 1950.[267]

Turkey's change in its foreign policy from the rejection of the establishment of a Jewish state, as foreseen in the Partition Plan, to the recognition was closely related to Turkey's pro-Western state identity. Turkey was careful about avoiding any contact with the Eastern bloc countries. On this basis, Bölükbaşı argues that there was a mistaken belief in Ankara that the Zionist leaders belonged to the pro-Soviet camp. However, Ankara was later convinced that Israel was solidly in the Western bloc and a potential ally against the Soviet Union.[268] Halil Erdemir adds two more reasons for Turkey's recognition. First, the Turkish authorities needed for peaceful relations with the West. Second, Turkey denied bilateral or multilateral religious relations with the 'Islamic' states of the region. It meant that Turkey was a 'secular' and a 'pragmatic state' in the Middle East which could cooperate with the interest of the Western world.[269] Similar to Erdemir, Baskın Oran says both countries were secular countries in the region. Turkey and Israel were trying to improve parliamentary democracy and strengthen market economy. Moreover, during the Korean War, different from the Arab states, Israel had supported

---

[266] (http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/political-troubles-between-turkey-and-israel-implications-of-booming-bilate), July 29, 2013 accessed.

[267] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/relations-between-turkey-and-israel%20.en.mfa),   April   21,   2014 accessed.

[268] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.29, No.1, 1999, p.22.

[269] Halil Erdemir, "How Worthy Israeli Relations for Turkey?", *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, Vol.9, No.2, 2010, pp.28-29.

sending troops to Korea. Thus; Israel won the trust of Ankara further. Last, Israel attached importance to improving diplomatic relations with Turkey. To illustrate, Israel appointed senior diplomat Eliyahu Sasson as the Israeli Ambassador to Ankara, and after Washington D.C., Paris and London, opened its fourth military attaché in Ankara.[270]

In doing so, Israel saved itself from diplomatic loneliness in the Middle East and opened a door in the Arab-Muslim world. In the first thirty months of the Israeli statehood, the immigration of 34,547 Jews from Turkey, a neutral country in the Second World War, to Israel became a societal factor for this eagerness.[271] The Korean War (1950-1953) provided a common ground for improving the relations as well. In particular, Israel's declaration of support for the UN's involvement in the War had a positive effect on the bilateral relations.[272] Moreover, economic and trade relations dramatically improved. In July 1950, a trade agreement was signed, which was renewed every year.[273] Turkey supplied agricultural products and raw materials to Israel while the Arab countries had placed Israel under a boycott. What was further was the opening of a direct air corridor between Istanbul and Tel Aviv in 1950, and Turkey's invitation to Israel to take part in the International Industrial

---

[270] Melek Fırat and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1945-1960: Batı Bloku Ekseninde Türkiye-1, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: I) Arap Devletleriyle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (Ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: Iletişim 2005, p.642.

[271] Martin Gilbert, *Israel: A History*, New York: Harper Perennial, 2008, p.259.

[272] Michael B. Bishku, "How Has Turkey Viewed Israel?", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, p.181.

[273](http://archives.gov.il/archivegov_eng/publications/electronicpirsum/israel-turkey/israel-turkeyintroduction.htm), May 27, 2015 accessed.

Fair of Izmir in 1951.[274] So, the bilateral relations reached the ambassadorial level in 1952.

On the other side, the Washington administration developed step by step master plan on how to contain the Communist domination; therefore, the US became the chief sponsor of regional groupings in the Middle East such as the 1955 Baghdad Pact (later, the Central Treaty Organization)[275] formed by Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Iraq and Britain, "all of which signed an interlocking series of agreements during 1954 and 1955."[276] According to Hüseyin Bağcı, the maintenance of security and stability in the Middle East, and the creation of an efficient security system to prevent communism from entering this "sensitive region" were the leading principles of Turkish foreign policy in the 1950s.[277] Hence, the Turkish participation to the Pact was consistent with its priorities in the Middle East. As for Israel, the Pact might ultimately serve Israel's interests in the region although Israel was not a member.[278]

In this vein, it seems possible to assume that Turkey-Israel relations were deeply affected by the bipolar international structure. Turkish Foreign Minister

---

[274] (http://www.todayszaman.com/todays-think-tanks_turkey-israel-towards-a-decoupling-between-economics-and-politics_255991.html), May 27, 2015 accessed.

[275] Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, New York: Vintage, 1989, p.389.

[276] William L. Cleveland and Martin Bunton, *A History of the Modern Middle East*, Boulder: Westview Press, 2009, p.309.

[277] Hüseyin Bağcı, *Türk Dış Politikasında 1950'li Yıllar*, Ankara: METU Press, 2001, p.40.

[278] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.36.

Fuat Köprülü (1950-1956) obviously stated that Turkey's place in an ideologically divided world was with the democratic nations, namely the West.[279] Based on Adler's argument that structures constitute agents' identities and interests,[280] Turkey's preference to take part in the Western camp consolidated the formation of the Turkish state identity whose components were strongly inspired from the Westernization process. In other words, the existing international structure became influential on Turkey and its foreign policy towards Israel.

Turkey's state identity defined its interests and foreign policy accordingly. For Turkey, Israel was a partner in the Western camp in which they described their state identities as democratic and secular. Both countries regarded their bilateral relations as "self" whereas the remaining regional actors were seen as "other". To clarify, Foreign Minister Köprülü said to the Turkish journalists that Turkey would stay committed to the Western alliance, and in this framework, would work for reaching a compromise between Israel and the Arab states.[281] Therefore, it might not be wrong to claim that Turkey took the international system/dynamics, one of the two factors forming a state's identity, into account in its relations with Israel.

---

[279] Meltem Yetener, "Adnan Menderes", in Ali Faik Demir (ed), *Türk Dış Politikasında Liderler*, Istanbul: Bağlam, 2007, p.63.

[280] Emanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.3, No.3, 1997, p.330.

[281] Meltem Yetener, "Adnan Menderes", in Ali Faik Demir (ed), *Türk Dış Politikasında Liderler*, Istanbul: Bağlam, 2007, p.52.

4.3.1. The Law of Return of 1950

After the declaration of the State of Israel, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion expressed his political philosophy with the doctrine of *mamlachtiyut, "*the centrality of the state and its superiority to any other value" in other words "statism". In accordance with the doctrine, Ben-Gurion tried to apply a twofold strategy: *aliyah* (the immigration to the Hold Hand/the immigration of Jews into Israel) and *kibbutz galuyot* (the ingathering of the Exile).[282] Within this context, The Law of Return 5710-1950, enacted to regulate the Jewish immigration to Israel on July 5, 1950, provided every Jew in the world with the right to immigrate to Israel.[283] Under the Law, which also permitted dual citizenship, all Jews, wherever they were, were granted the right to come to Israel as *oleh* (immigrant) / *olim* (immigrants) and become Israeli citizens.[284]

During this process, Turkey did not prohibit the Jewish immigration but granted passage of Bulgarian, Syrian and Iraqi Jewish immigrants to Israel.[285] However, Turkey did not permit the dual citizenship until 1981. Thus, Jewish immigrants "either gave up their previous citizenship in favor of Israeli citizenship

[282] Cameron G. Thies, "International Socialization Processes vs. Israeli National Role Conceptions: Can Role Theory Integrate IR Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis?", *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Vol.8, No.1, 2012, pp.37 and 39.

[283] William L. Cleveland and Martin Bunton, *A History of the Modern Middle East*, Boulder: Westview Press, 2009, p.351.

[284] Şule Toktaş, "Citizenship and Migration from Turkey to Israel: A Comparative Study on Turkish Jews in Israel, *East European Quarterly*, Vol.41, No.2, 2007, p.119 and p.147.

[285] Michael B. Bishku, "How Has Turkey Viewed Israel?", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, p.182.

or maintained their previous citizenship while assuming permanent residency status".[286] The truth is that the Jewish immigration from Turkey to Israel had already begun before the Law. According to the figures of the Jewish Agency for Israel, 34.500 Jews emigrated from Turkey to Israel in the period of 1948-1951.[287] The Law accelerated this process.

4.3.2. The Events of 6-7 September 1955

In spite of the Jewish immigration from Turkey to Israel, not all of the Jews left Turkey, and the existence of the Jewish community in Turkey became another factor in the Turkish-Israeli relations. Its importance was revealed in the 1950s when a disagreement on the future of Cyprus between Turkey and Greece reached a crisis level. It is estimated that more than 20,000 Jews lived in Turkey at that time. On the night of 6-7 September 1955, angry mobs who learned that a bomb exploded close to the Turkish Consulate-General in Thessaloniki and damaged also the museum- the house where Atatürk was born- attacked the Greek community in Istanbul.[288]

During the attack, the Jewish community was also targeted to a certain extent. Because of the attack, some Jews fled Turkey and "the Turkish government

---

[286] Şule Toktaş, "Citizenship and Migration from Turkey to Israel: A Comparative Study on Turkish Jews in Israel, *East European Quarterly*, Vol.41, No.2, 2007, p.119.

[287] (http://www.jewishagency.org/society-and-politics/content/36566), May 28, 2015 accessed.

[288] Mehmet Gönlübol, *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1995)*, Ankara: Siyasal Kitapevi, 1996, p.347.

apologized and reassured Israel that it had no intention or inclination to prejudice in any way the security or the rights of the Jews of Turkey".[289]

4.3.3. The 1956 Suez War

Egyptian President Nasser, who had overtaken the leadership of the country with the 1952 military coup, decided to nationalize the Suez Canal Company in July 1956. The Canal was strategically vital to both British and French interests. The nationalization had a serious impact on Britain and France. The London and Paris administrations were now ready to make a secret alliance with Israel to change the situation. Barry Rubin claims that Britain, France and Israel agreed "Israel would invade the Sinai Peninsula before the Egyptian army could make use of the Soviet arms. Then France and Britain would intervene to end the war and, in doing so, would remove Nasser from power."[290] In accordance with the plan, Israel attacked on Egypt on October 29, 1956, and one day later, the British and French forces joined the attack.

The Menderes government accused Nasser of being responsible for inflaming the crisis whereas Turkey regarded the Anglo-French attack on Egypt as a breach of international law. In addition, the Turkish administration emphasized that the Soviet Union benefitted from the crisis, and proclaimed that the Baghdad

---

[289] Michael B. Bishku, "How Has Turkey Viewed Israel?", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, p.182.

[290] Barry Rubin, *Israel: An Introduction*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012, p.27.

Pact could provide the security of the Middle Eastern countries. [291] By taking the Turkish public opinion and reactions of the Arab states into account, the Menderes government decided to recall its ambassador to Tel Aviv Şevket İstinyeli on November 26, 1956. In return, Israel recalled its Ambassador to Ankara on December 19, 1956. In fact, the bilateral diplomatic relations did not end but were lowered to the level of chargé d'affaires.[292]

Ankara recalled Ambassador İstinyeli but attempted not to antagonize Israel, and informed Tel Aviv that the withdrawal was done in order to "save the Baghdad Pact"[293] of which Britain was a full member as well. In line with its diplomatic position to the 1956 Suez War, Turkey supported draft proposals at the UN which were in favor of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egypt. However, Howard Patten draws attention to the Turkish abstention to the Resolution ES-1000 which envisaged the establishment of a UN Emergency Command Force so as to secure the Suez Canal, and claims that the Turkish abstention revealed its desire, not to take an overtly proactive stance on the war, for fear of endangering its relations with either Israel or the Arab world.[294]

---

[291] Melek Fırat and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1945-1960: Batı Bloku Ekseninde Türkiye-1, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: I) Arap Devletleriyle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (Ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: Iletişim 2005, pp.628-629.

[292] Howard A. Patten, *Israel and the Cold War: Diplomacy, Strategy and the Policy of the Periphery at the United Nations*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013, p.82; Melek Fırat and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1945-1960: Batı Bloku Ekseninde Türkiye-1, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: I) Arap Devletleriyle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (Ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: Iletişim 2005, p.629.

[293] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.9, No.1, 1999, p.23.

[294] Howard A. Patten, *Israel and the Cold War: Diplomacy, Strategy and the Policy of the Periphery at the United Nations*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013, p.81.

4.3.4. The Periphery Pact of 1958

With the impact of the immediate attack from the neighboring Arab states soon after the declaration of independence, the achievement and maintenance of security became a top priority for Israel.[295] The 1956 Suez War once again confirmed its high priority. The Iraqi coup d'état (14 July 1958), and the Lebanon crisis (15 July-25 October 1958) increased security concerns even further. In this framework, Israeli Prime Minister David Ben Gurion attempted to end the isolation of Israel by its hostile Arab neighbors with the non-Arab periphery countries of the Middle East, form a balance of power and strengthen relations with the West, particularly the United States.[296] Israel tried to enlist even the political support of the African countries in that regard.[297] Ofra Bengio stresses that Ben Gurion's letter to American President Dwight D. Eisenhower revealed his initiative and the Turkish-Israeli relations through secret channels:

> Israel had lately been strengthening its relations in the Middle East with four countries of the outer ring, Sudan, Ethiopia, Iran, and Turkey, with a view to stemming the "strong-Nasserist-Soviet torrent". He also revealed that relations with Turkey were developing in secret channels in addition to the open negotiations.[298]

---

[295] Asher Arian, *Politics in Israel: The Second Republic*, Washington: CQ Press, 2005, p.10.

[296] Joshua Walker, "Turkey and Israel's Relationship in the Middle East", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.17, No.4, 2006, p.69; Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.40.

[297] Arye Oded, "Africa in Israeli Foreign Policy-Expectations and Disenchantment: Historical and Diplomatic Aspects", *Israel Studies*, Vol.15, No.3, 2010, p.122.

[298] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.41.

Ben Gurion visited Turkey on August 29, 1958. The visit resulted in the formation of the Turkish-Israeli alliance and the signing of the Peripheral Pact. According to the Pact, Israel would provide technical and military assistance to Turkey but it was not clear if Turkey would or would not provide its military assistance to Israel when an Arab-Israel war broke out.[299] In addition, the Pact foresaw intelligence sharing between the two countries in line with the common threat perception: "the Soviet Union, certain Arab countries, especially Syria, and terrorism".[300] Michael B. Bishku gives information on the exchange of intelligence on their common enemies: Reportedly, in return for information from Israel's intelligence agency, Mossad, on Soviet activities in Turkey, the Turkish National Security Service provided Israel with data on Arab agents. This top-secret program was code-named "Trident".[301] On this point, Howard Patten claims Admiral Sezai Orkunt, the Head of Military Intelligence at Turkish General Staff between 1964 and 1966, admitted this arrangement between the two countries and added that no more than ten military and civilian officials knew about it.[302]

---

[299] William Hale, *Türk Dış Politikası: 1774-2000*, Istanbul: Mozaik, 2003, p.131.

[300] Joshua Walker, "Turkey and Israel's Relationship in the Middle East", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.17, No.4, 2006, pp.71-72.

[301] Michael B. Bishku, "How Has Turkey Viewed Israel?", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, p.181.

[302] Howard A. Patten, *Israel and the Cold War: Diplomacy, Strategy and the Policy of the Periphery at the United Nations*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013, p.84.

Regarding the Pact, Ahmet Davutoğlu considers that the cooperation at that time became a parameter, which Israel constantly took into consideration.[303] As for the Turkish side, Joshua Walker explains why Turkey changed its position towards Israel after the 1956 Suez War and then joined the Pact with three main reasons: Iraq's vote against Turkey over Cyprus at the UN in December 1957, the establishment of the United Arab Republic between Egypt and Syria in February 1958, and finally the fall of the monarchy in Iraq in July 1958.[304]

In fact, the timing of Ben Gurion's visit to Ankara was meaningful. It took place less than two months after the upheaval in Iraq. After the regime change, the Iraqi withdrawal from the Baghdad Pact was 'threatening' to both countries. Moreover, widespread Arab nationalism in the Middle East under the auspices of the Soviet Union brought Turkey and Israel closer together.[305] In this vein, Turkish and Israeli high-ranking security officers paid mutual visits to each other. To illustrate, General Cemal Tural, who would later become Turkish Chief of Staff (1966-1969), visited Israel in 1964 while Head of Israeli Military Intelligence Meir Amit visited a secret US military base at Erzurum. Furthermore, Commander of the Israeli Air Force Ezer Weizman, later the Minister of Defense and then the

---

[303] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2012, pp.420-421.

[304] Joshua Walker, "Turkey and Israel's Relationship in the Middle East", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.17, No.4, 2006, p.71.

[305] Kamer Kasım, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri: İki Bölgesel Gücün Stratejik Ortaklığı", in Idris Bal (ed.), *21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: Ankara Global Araştırmalar Merkezi (AGAM), 2006, pp.841-842.

President of Israel, had been scheduled to pay a visit to Turkey at the end of 1964 but the escalation of the Cyprus crisis caused its cancellation.[306]

During this period, the Turkish-Israeli relations were not confined only to military and intelligence sharing. The rapprochement resulted in stronger economic and trade relations as well. The 1950 bilateral trade agreement let Turkey buy phosphates, plastic, fibers for synthetic ropes, detergents, electric motors and compressors from Israel[307] needed for the Turkish industry. With this agreement, Turkey indirectly imported steel products from the Eastern European countries via Israel. In addition, the two countries signed a new trade agreement in Ankara in March 1960. The new agreement covered an annual volume of $16 million of goods compared to the previous agreement covering an annual volume of $9 million. It was the largest trade agreement ever signed by Turkey and Israel.[308] An agreement in the field of tourism cooperation was also signed in March 1961. Pertaining to diplomatic relations, Turkey and Israel agreed to raise their representations to ambassadorial level within the context of the Pact. In addition, the Pact included joint public relations campaigns aiming at creating common public opinions as well.[309]

---

[306] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, Palgrave: Macmillan, 2004, p.54.

[307](http://archives.gov.il/archivegov_eng/publications/electronicpirsum/israel-turkey/israel-turkeyintroduction.htm), February 23, 2014 accessed.

[308] Yitzhak Oron (ed), *Middle East Record Volume 1, 1960*, London: George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Limited, 1965, p.308.

[309] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, Palgrave: Macmillan, 2004, p.44.

As regards to the importance of the Peripheral Pact in terms of Turkey's state identity, the Pact pointed the level of political relations between Turkey and Israel. The Pact once again proved that Turkey's relations with Israel were very much influenced by Turkey's commitment to the Western alliance. That is to say that the nature of relations could not be altered without a dramatic change in Turkey's place in the alliance, or a dramatic shift in the structure of the alliance itself.[310] In short, Turkey's formation of state identity was deeply shaped by the West in the Cold War context, and Turkey's relations with Israel were not independent from this fact. Consequently, the Pact showed that the two states interacted to each other in a structure in which they constitute their interests and foreign policies.

4.4.   Turkey towards Autonomy? Relations with Israel (1960-1990)

The change in Turkey's relations with the Western alliance happened in the year of 1964 when the West clearly did not support Turkey's Cyprus policy.[311] The crisis had significant implications for Turkey's worldview, priorities, and relations with the outside world, including Israel due to fact that Turkey was left isolated

---

[310] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.145; Kemal H. Karpat, "Turkish and Arab-Israeli Relations", in Kemal H. Karpat (ed), *Turkish Foreign Policy in Transition*, 1950-1974, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1975, p.123; Philip J. Robins, *Turkey and the Middle East*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1991, p.77.

[311] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.145.

with almost no support at the UN, and felt betrayed by its Western allies.[312] Turkey needed to re-evaluate its foreign policy and tried to develop its relations particularly with the Arab states in order to determine the vote on the Cyprus issue at the UN in favor of Turkey.

In this direction, the first Demirel government (1965-1969) foresaw a multilateral foreign policy in which the Muslim and Arab "brotherly" countries had a priority. In accordance with this political framework, a meeting was organized with the participation of Turkish Ambassadors serving in the Middle East in Ankara between 22 and 24 May 1967, during which Turkey defined the three main principles of its policy toward the Arab world:

1- Developing bilateral relations with all the Arab countries in every field,

2- Avoiding taking part in the conflicts between the Arab countries, and being neutral,

3- Not participating in the pacts and regional agreements which would divide the Arabs.[313]

Under the circumstances, there was no doubt that the change in Turkish foreign policy had negative consequences for the Israeli side. With the impact of the Cyprus crisis and Turkey's consequent opening up the Arab world, together with the Palestinian issue, the Turkish-Israeli relations began to enter a freeze from the mid-1960s on. But it did not necessarily imply a dramatic shift in the Turkish

---

[312] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, pp.54-55.

[313] Melek Fırat and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1960-1980: Göreli Özerklik-3, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: I) Arap Devletleriyle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (Ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: İletişim, 2005, pp.788-789.

state identity. According to Bengio, in terms of the domestic factors, both the Turkish army and the intelligentsia were still either pro-Israel or against the pro-Arab line that was gaining ground in Turkey.[314] Turkey never cut its relations with Israel; instead, the cooperation continued in various areas including intelligence and military as well: "Contacts between the secret services went on uninterruptedly in all times. Turkey also allowed Israeli Air Force flights to cross its airspace on their way to and from Iran."[315]

4.4.1. The 1967 Arab-Israel War

Israel attacked Egypt, Syria and Jordan at 07.45 in the morning of 5 June 1967. When the Egyptian army realized the attack, it was 10.35. That is to say that Egypt could neither react to the Israeli attacks, nor had the air force to attack Israeli targets. On the first day of the War, Israel destroyed almost 300 out of 360 Egyptian, 50 Syrian and 20 Jordanian aircrafts while they were on the ground. Israel almost quadrupled its lands compared to the lands defined by the 1947 UN Partition Plan. Furthermore, the Egyptian army, the biggest threat to the security of Israel, lost 80% of its military capacity.[316] On the other side, it was estimated that 100,000-260,000 Palestinians were expelled from the West Bank and 80,000

---

[314] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.61.

[315] *Ibid*, p.67.

[316] Tayyar Arı, *Geçmişten Günümüze Orta Doğu: Siyaset, Savaş ve Diplomasi Cilt I*, Bursa: MKM Yayınları, 2012, p.296.

Syrians were driven from the Golan Heights in 1967.[317] The war worsened the refugee problem even further, another subject of dispute in the region. In geopolitical terms, the primary purpose of the Arab leaders was to eliminate the State of Israel; however, after the war, their main target was to regain the territories lost to Israel during the war.[318] According to American Secretary of State Henry Kissinger (1973-1977), "Israel's 1967 borders with Egypt, Syria and Jordan reflected in essence the internationally recognized borders of the British mandate of Palestine".[319]

Consistent with the principles defined by the Demirel government, Turkey kept silent when Egypt closed the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping just before the war. Similarly, Turkey maintained its neutrality during the war, as it was the case in the previous Arab-Israeli confrontations. The government explicitly called for the US not to use the American bases in Turkey to resupply Israel during the war.[320] Foreign Minister İhsan Sabri Çağlayangil made the following statement to assure the Arabs: "The military bases in Turkey were not going to be used against

---

[317] John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy", *Middle East Policy*, Vol.13, No.3, 2006, p.38.

[318] Tayyar Arı, *Geçmişten Günümüze Orta Doğu: Siyaset, Savaş ve Diplomasi Cilt I*, Bursa: MKM Yayınları, 2012, p.299.

[319] Henry Kissinger, *Does America Need a Foreign Policy?*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001, p.170.

[320] Michael B. Bishku, "How Has Turkey Viewed Israel?", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, p.184; William Hale, *Türk Dış Politikası: 1774-2000*, Istanbul: Mozaik, 2003, p.177; Süha Bölükbaşı, "Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.29, No.1, 1999, p.26.

the Arabs by way of a fait accompli".[321] Moreover, Turkey supported UN Security Council Resolution 242 of 22 November 1967 which included the application of "withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict"[322] although Turkey refused to condemn Israel for "belligerency".

On the other hand, before the acceptance of Resolution 242, Turkey had voted in favor of draft resolution A/L 522/Rev.3 titled "Immediate Withdrawal of the Armed Forces of Israel from Territories Belonging to Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic", which noted "the armed forces of Israel occupy areas including territories belonging to Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic"[323] but it was rejected by the General Assembly on July 4, 1967 by a roll-call vote of 53 to 46, with 20 abstentions.[324] Turkey abstained in the vote over all four paragraphs of draft resolution A/L 519 by the USSR, which noted "Israel, in gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the universally accepted principles of international law, has committed a premeditated and previously prepared aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan…"[325] but it was also rejected by the General Assembly on July 4, 1967.

---

[321] Bülent Aras, *Palestinian Israeli Peace Process and Turkey*, New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc., 1998, p.119.

[322] (http://unispal.un.org/unispal.nsf/0/7D35E1F729DF491C85256EE700686136), August 14, 2013 accessed.

[323] (http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/76BF6A75B8482D15052566C6006560D4), April 11, 2014 accessed.

[324] *Ibid*.

[325] (http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/2795FFF6B58B212C052566CD006E0900), April 11, 2014 accessed.

Within this context, Howard Pattern considers that the Turkish position at the UN proved that "Turkey did not believe that Israel should compensate the UAR and was unafraid of challenging the position taken by the Arab Member States, which voted in favor of the draft resolution".[326] However, Kamer Kasım draws attention to the Turkish impartiality on the Israeli-Arab conflict. Turkey voted for Resolution 242, which required the withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied, but Turkey did not condescend to the decision of breaking off all kinds of relations with Israel, which was taken at the Organization of the Islamic Conference Summit of 1969.[327] Turkey aimed at maintaining its neutrality so as to balance the opposing camps.

4.4.2. The War of Attrition (1967-1970) and the 1973 War

After the 1967 War, a continuous exchange of artillery fire alongside the Bar Lev line on the Suez Canal escalated into a war between Israel and Egypt called the War of Attrition from 1967 to 1970.[328] The fire of the Egyptian artillery was replied by the Israeli counter-attacks and air strikes.[329] On July 30, 1970, the Israeli F-4 Phantoms and Mirage IIIs hit five Soviet-flown MiG-21s. American

[326] Howard A. Patten, *Israel and the Cold War: Diplomacy, Strategy and the Policy of the Periphery at the United Nations*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013, p.92.

[327] Kamer Kasım, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri: İki Bölgesel Gücün Stratejik Ortaklığı", in Idris Bal (ed), *21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: Ankara Global Araştırmalar Merkezi (AGAM), 2006, pp.841-842.

[328] (http://mfa.gov.il/MFA/AboutIsrael/History/Pages/The%20War%20of%20Attrition%20-1968-70.aspx), August 30, 2013 accessed.

[329] Martin Gilbert, *The Story of Israel*, London: Andre Deutsch, 2011, p.42.

Secretary of State Kissinger was afraid the attack would produce another "Sarajevo Affect"; in other words, a dispute between the two states could turn into a super power dispute. Because of the American pressure, the Israeli government refrained from launching further attacks.[330] Then, in June 1970, American Secretary of State William P. Rogers (1969-1973) tried to broker a cease-fire between Israel and Egypt under the good offices of Dr. Gunnar Jarring, a Swedish diplomat.[331] The negotiations resulted in a cease-fire agreement, which was signed in August 1970.

However, the cease-fire lasted three years. In accordance with a joint plan prepared by Egypt and Syria, the Egyptian army advanced into the Sinai Peninsula on October 6, 1973 while the Syrian forces crossed ceasefire lines to enter the Israeli-held Golan Heights which had been captured in the 1967 War. The Egyptian army overran "almost all the Israeli military outposts along its eastern bank. The Syrian army, meanwhile, drove westward across the Golan Heights."[332] In addition, some other Arab countries, namely Algeria and Morocco, declared their support of the war against Israel as well.[333]

---

[330] Zeev Maoz, *Defending the Holy Land: A Critical Analysis of Israel's Security & Foreign Policy*, the United States: The University of Michigan Press, 2006, p.145.

[331] Martin Gilbert, *Israel: A History*, New York: Harper Perennial, 2008, p.414.

[332] Martin Gilbert, *The Story of Israel*, London: Andre Deutsch, 2011, p.44.

[333] Martin Gilbert, *Israel: A History*, New York: Harper Perennial, 2008, pp.437-438.

On the other hand, the Egyptian army depended on its ground units' ability to prevent Israeli counter-attacks.[334] Arı considers that Egypt wished to regain its lost territories, and expected the international community to take initiative and put an end to the war but instead this policy only prepared the ground for the Israeli counter-attacks.[335] In this vein, the IDF passed through the north of the Sinai to the west of the Nile River and surrounded the Third Army around Cairo. In the Syrian front, the IDF managed to recapture the Golan Heights from the Syrian army and come closer to 20 km of Damascus.

During this process, the Organization of the Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC) meeting was held in Kuwait on 16-17 October, and the Gulf countries stated that they "raised the posted price of crude by 70% placed an embargo on exports to the U.S. and other nations allied with Israel".[336] The decision caused higher energy costs for many petrol dependent Western economies. Due to economic shrinkage and fostered inflation, they faced 'stagflation'.

Under the circumstances, on October 22, 1973, the UN Security Council accepted Resolution 338 which "calls upon all parties to present fighting to cease all firing and terminate all military activity immediately, no later than 12 hours after the moment of the adoption of this decision, the positions after the moment of

---

[334] Zeev Maoz, *Defending the Holy Land: A Critical Analysis of Israel's Security & Foreign Policy*, the United States: The University of Michigan Press, 2006, p.146.

[335] Tayyar Arı, *Geçmişten Günümüze Orta Doğu: Siyaset, Savaş ve Diplomasi Cilt I*, Bursa: MKM Yayınları, 2012, p.317.

[336] (http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/ROHO/projects/debt/oilcrisis.html), October 19, 2013 accessed.

the adoption of this decision, in the positions they now occupy".[337] Resolution 338 confirmed and consolidated Resolution 242.[338] However, Resolution 338 did not stop Israel. On this point, the USSR declared that it would have unilaterally acted if the US had not intervened in the situation which might have turned into a conflict between the two superpowers.[339] With the influence of American Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's "shuttle diplomacy", Israel stopped its military activities, all troops were withdrawn to pre-war borders, and finally, a ceasefire agreement was reached on October 25, 1973.[340]

During the war, Turkey had forbidden the use of the Incirlik Air Base by the US Air Force except for routine works of NATO.[341] Ankara's decision hampered the resupply of the IDF. The Turkish Foreign Ministry Spokesman stated, "Turkey does not approve of Arab lands being forcefully occupied by the Israelis and that it feels a lasting peace settlement is contingent upon the satisfaction of the legitimate demands of the Arab nations on this matter."[342] Turkey supported UN Security

---

[337] (http://unispal.un.org/unispal.nsf/0/7FB7C26FCBE80A31852560C50065F878), April 6, 2013 accessed.

[338] Tayyar Arı, *Geçmişten Günümüze Orta Doğu: Siyaset, Savaş ve Diplomasi Cilt I*, Bursa: MKM Yayınları, 2012, p.303.

[339] *Ibid*, p.321.

[340] Barry Rubin, *Israel: An Introduction*, The United States: Yale University Press, 2012, p.36.

[341] William Hale, *Türk Dış Politikası: 1774-2000*, Istanbul: Mozaik, 2003, p.177.

[342] Bülent Aras, *Palestinian Israeli Peace Process and Turkey,* New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc., 1998, p.119.

Council Resolution 338.[343] Süha Bölükbaşı argues that the Turkish gesture to the Arab world was performed in order to save Turkey from the 1973 oil embargo.[344] The cost of importing oil was $300 million for the Turkish economy. The cost dramatically increased to $2 billion in 1974. Therefore, the unexpected rise in oil prices urged Turkey to find the needed financial resources, integrate itself into the Middle Eastern market, and increase its export to the region.[345] Besides the oil costs, Turkey's deteriorating relations with the Western world due to the Cyprus issue, the American arms embargo on Turkey and Ankara's isolation in the international arena[346] made Turkish governments adopt a multilateral foreign policy in which the Arab/Muslim countries gained more importance.[347] In short, the relations between Turkey and Israel during the 1973 War were in a deadlock.[348]

In this context, on 10 November 1975, Turkey voted in favor of the UN General Assembly's Resolution 3379 (XXX) on "Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination" which determined that "Zionism is a form of racism and racial

---

[343] (http://www.un.org/Depts/dpi/palestine/ch3.pdf), April 2, 2014 accessed.

[344] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.29, No.1, 1999, p.26.

[345] Oral Sander, *Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Ankara: İmge Kitapevi, 2006, p.236.

[346] Emel Parlar Dal, "The Transformation of Turkey's Relations with the Middle East: Illusion or Awakening?", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.13, No.2, 2012, p.248.

[347] Melek Fırat and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1960-1980: Göreli Özerklik-3, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: I) Arap Devletleriyle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: İletişim, 2005, pp.794-795.

[348] Howard A. Patten, *Israel and the Cold War: Diplomacy, Strategy and the Policy of the Periphery at the United Nations*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013, p.98.

discrimination."[349] In 1975, Turkey also established official relations with the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO). In return, the PLO opened an office in Ankara in October 1979.[350]

On the other side, Turkey did not cut off its relations with Israel, but instead tried to improve the bilateral relations after the summit held in 1978 between Egyptian President Anwar al-Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin which resulted in what are known as the Camp David Accords.[351] Howard Patten says, while Turkey was adopting an anti-Israel stance in the public arena of the UN, it began purchasing arms from Israel.[352] To illustrate, Turkey purchased Shafrir short-range air-to-air missiles, M111 Hetz anti-tank shells as well as Uzi submachine guns and ammunition from Israel.

4.4.3. The Jerusalem Law of 1980 and the Last Years of the Cold War

On July 30, 1980, the Knesset passed "Basic Law: Jerusalem, Capital of Israel". According to the Basic Law, "Jerusalem, complete and united, is the capital of Israel", and "Jerusalem is the seat of the President of the State, the Knesset, the

---

[349] (http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/761C1063530766A7052566A2005B74D1), February 3, 2014 accessed.

[350] Kamer Kasım, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri: İki Bölgesel Gücün Stratejik Ortaklığı", in Idris Bal (ed), *21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: Ankara Global Araştırmalar Merkezi (AGAM), 2006, p.842.

[351] (https://www.whitehouse.gov/1600/camp-david), June 4, 2015 accessed.

[352] Howard A. Patten, *Israel and the Cold War: Diplomacy, Strategy and the Policy of the Periphery at the United Nations*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013, p.101.

Government and the Supreme Court".[353] About the Holy Places, in which Turkey is closely interested, the Law mentions that no authority might be transferred to any foreign body. After the Israeli legislative steps were taken with the aim of changing both the character and status of Jerusalem, Turkey supported the UN Security Council's Resolution 476 of 30 June 1980 reconfirming "all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, the occupying Power, which purport to alter the character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem have no legal validity",[354] and Resolution 478 of 20 August 1980 censuring "the enactment by Israel of the "basic law" on Jerusalem" and affirming "the enactment of the "basic law" by Israel constitutes a violation of international law".[355]

Moreover, the closure of the Turkish Consulate General in Jerusalem was announced on August 28, 1980 as "a sign of protestation".[356] Alon Liel in his interview of Turkish Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel in Ankara states that Demirel indicated, "The August 1980 reaction had constituted Turkey's entire reaction to the Jerusalem Law".[357] In the margin of the Organization of Islamic Conference held in Taif in December 1980, the Turkish Foreign Ministry

---

[353] (http://www.knesset.gov.il/laws/special/eng/basic10_eng.htm), September 12, 2013 accessed.

[354] (http://palestineun.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/SC-478-1980.pdf), April 1, 2014 accessed.

[355] (http://www.cfr.org/israel/un-security-council-resolution-478-israel/p11226), April 1, 2014 accessed.

[356] (http://jerusalem.cg.mfa.gov.tr/Mission.aspx), October 6, 2013 accessed.

[357] Alon Liel, *Turkey in the Middle East: Oil, Islam, and Politics*, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2001, p.116.

announced Turkey would limit its relations with Israel and withdraw all diplomatic personnel in three months, except for a secretary, who would continue with the title of chargé d'affaires.[358] In doing so, Turkey was looking for the support of the OIC members on the Cyprus issue.[359] Turkey also supported the UN Security Council's Resolution 497 of 17 December 1981 deciding "the Israeli decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights is null and void and without international legal effect".[360]

On the other hand, factors such as the lack of Arab support for the Cyprus issue,[361] their lack of attention to the mistreatment of the Bulgarian Turks, tensions over water rights, and differences over the ASALA[362] and the PKK activities put an end to high levels of economic and political relations between Turkey and some Arab countries.[363] In fact, Turkey's relations with the Arab world did not produce

---

[358] Howard A. Patten, *Israel and the Cold War: Diplomacy, Strategy and the Policy of the Periphery at the United Nations*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013, p.104.

[359] Sedat Laçiner, "Turgut Özal Period in Turkish Foreign Policy: Özalism", *USAK Yearbook*, Vol.2, 2009, p.157.

[360] (http://www.cfr.org/israel/un-security-council-resolution-497-israel-syria/p11198), April 1, 2014 accessed.

[361] In this development, Turkey's disappointment with its pro-Arab policy was influential. To make it clear, Turkey's long-lasting effort to gain Arab support on the Cyprus issue failed. To illustrate, the Arab world preferred to condemn the declaration of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in November 1983.

[362] It was a terrorist organisation dedicated to the murder of Turkish diplomats abroad and to the creation of an independent Armenian state in eastern Turkey. Howard A. Patten, *Israel and the Cold War: Diplomacy, Strategy and the Policy of the Periphery at the United Nations*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013, p.110.

[363] Bülent Aras, The Academic Perceptions of Turkish-Israeli Relations, *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, Vol.1, No.1, 2002, p.5.

the expected economic benefits. Turkey had economic relations mainly a limited number of the oil producing states of the region. The region lost its attractiveness for Turkey because of declining oil revenues starting in the mid-1980s.[364] On the contrary, the Turkish-Israeli relations started to develop. Global developments like the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the Iranian Revolution brought Turkey and Israel closer. These issues increased American concerns in the region as well. In 1980, the US replaced the Carter Doctrine[365] with the Reagan Doctrine.[366] It implied a new strategic and accordingly political restructuring. The US needed the Turkish support for launching the Rapid Deployment Force in the Middle East. Similarly, Israel was also important to American strategic thinking. Hence, the two members of the Western camp, namely Turkey and Israel, once again acted in together in accordance with the dynamics of the international order.

Moreover, the Israeli attack on Lebanon in 1982 was one of the most important developments in the Middle East during the 1980s. Israeli rulers thought the establishment of a pro-Western and pro-Israeli regime in Lebanon governed by the Christian Maronite community would detach Lebanon from the Muslim Arab

---

[364] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, pp.150-151.

[365] It was a policy proclaimed by American President Jimmy Carter on 23 January 1980. According to the Doctrine, the US would use military force to defend its national interest in the Gulf region if needed. It was a response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.
(https://www.princeton.edu/~achaney/tmve/wiki100k/docs/Carter_Doctrine.html), April 29, 2014 accessed.

[366] It was a strategy proclaimed by American President Ronald Reagan in the early 1980s. The Doctrine aimed at diminishing the Soviet influence in Africa, Asia and Latin America. In accordance with the Doctrine, the US provided aid to anti-communist guerrillas and resistance movements against the Soviet backed communist governments in those regions.
(http://www.princeton.edu/~achaney/tmve/wiki100k/docs/Reagan_Doctrine.html), April 29, 2014 accessed.

world and induced it to make an alliance with Israel.[367] But Lebanon allowed international terrorist organizations to train openly on its lands posing a threat to the Israeli security. Following the Palestinian attempt to assassinate Israel's Ambassador to the UK Shlomo Argov, the Israeli forces attacked Lebanon on June 6, 1982. At that time, Turkey was dealing with the terror of the ASALA in Lebanon. Although Turkey opposed the occupation of Lebanon by Israel as a result of its developing relations with the Arab world, Turkey welcomed the Israeli offer of cooperation in exterminating the ASALA headquarters in Lebanon.[368] A number of ASALA terrorists were captured. Israel gave the terrorists to Turkey and continued providing information to the Turkish authorities on the terrorist groups.[369] As a result, the ASALA lost most of its power and then support in this country.

Within this scope, Prime Minister Turgut Özal (1983-1989) regarded relations with Israel "as a window on future events" and claimed that "for Turkey to play a role in solving the problems of the Middle East, that window must remain open".[370] Israel was Turkey's door to the West, while Turkey served Israel's door

---

[367] Eyal Zisser, "The Israeli-Syrian-Lebanese Triangle: The Renewed Struggle over Lebanon", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.15, No.4, 2009, p.400.

[368] Atay Akdevelioğlu and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1980-1990: Batı Bloku Ekseninde Türkiye-2: Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt II: 1980-2001*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, pp.150-151.

[369] William Hale, *Türk Dış Politikası: 1774-2000*, Istanbul: Mozaik, 2003, p.179.

[370] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.146.

to the Middle East.[371] This reciprocity was directly linked to their mutual identities, which in turn, define their interests. Turkey and Israel emphasized their respective identities in terms of their ethnic, cultural, and political distance from the rest of the Middle East and their links with the West. Both shared the same goal of integrating into the West culturally, economically and politically. So, they were 'outsiders', and therefore, viewed themselves empathically.[372] Consequently, Turkey appointed a senior diplomat with ambassadorial rank, Ekrem Güvendiren, to its mission in Tel Aviv. Moreover, Turkey voted against an Arab resolution, which called for the rejection of Israeli diplomatic credentials at the UN in 1988.

4.5. Chapter Conclusion

After the Second World War, Turkey felt obliged to take part in the Western security structure because of the growing Soviet threat. In parallel to Turkey's Westernization process, there were efforts for its integration into the Western institutions. By doing so, Turkey tried to strengthen its position in the Western bloc and assume a new role as a partner of the West. Within this context, Turkey granted a de facto recognition to the State of Israel on March 12, 1949, abstained in the vote over Israel's admission to the UN on May 11, 1949, officially recognized Israel on May 28, 1949, and became the first Muslim country to

---

[371] Anat Lewin, "Turkey and Israel: Reciprocal and Mutual Imagery in the Media, 1994-1999", *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.54, No.1, 2000, p.247.

[372] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.156.

recognize Israel.[373] On March 9, 1950, Turkey established diplomatic relations by the posting of a plenipotentiary to Tel Aviv.[374] In 1952, they further upgraded their relations by exchanging ambassadors.

By referring to Alexander Wendt's argument that the fundamental structures of international politics are social and shape actors' identities and interests,[375] it seems possible to reach a conclusion that the international system based on the US-USSR bipolarity was influential on Turkey's state identity and its relations with Israel. Under such an international system, both countries preferred the US-led Western camp. Their preferences confirmed the assumption that the concept of identity is more important than international balance-of-power considerations in foreign policy.[376]

By referring to this dissertation's state identity definition, it is possible to remark that the scope of Turkey's "self" perception included Israel, a partner in the Western camp against the "others" in the Middle East. In view of that, both countries' ruling elites, in other words the domestic factors, defined their state identities and their components as democratic and secular. They upheld the rule of

---

[373] Howard A. Patten, *Israel and the Cold War: Diplomacy, Strategy and the Policy of the Periphery at the United Nations*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013, p.20; Melek Fırat and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1945-1960: Batı Bloku Ekseninde Türkiye-1, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: I) Arap Devletleriyle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (Ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: İletişim, 2005, p.617.

[374] Dietrich Jung and Wolfango Piccoli, *Turkey at the Crossroads: Ottoman Legacies and a Greater Middle East*, New York: Zed Book Ltd., 2001, p.173.

[375] Alexander Wendt, "Constructing International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.20, No.1, 1995, pp.71-72.

[376] Valerie M. Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*, Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2007, p.103.

law and the application of basic human rights rather than authoritarianism. Turkey and Israel chose a free market economy in preference to a socialist economy. They also developed their security cultures with the West. Turkey and Israel, the only two democratic countries in the region, formed their interests in this framework, and developed close relations during the Cold War.

However, it should be noted that the Turkish-Israeli relations experienced several ups and downs as well. In fact, this situation is consistent with the constructivist argument that identity is not set but constantly shifts, and is redefined all the time. Likewise, Turkey interacted with other state actors including Israel but maintained its pro-Western state identity under the international dynamics. In short, the definition of Turkey's state identity remained an indispensable factor for the definition of its interests and foreign policy, and accordingly its relations with Israel.

CHAPTER 5

THE TURKISH-ISRAELI RELATIONS

IN THE POST-COLD WAR PERIOD (1990-2002)

Chapter 5 will concentrate on the post-Cold War dynamics that point to dramatic changes in the international system which are influential on the formation of Turkey's state identity. Domestically, Turkey experienced discussions on alternative explanations to its state identity. In the light of both international and domestic factors, Chapter 5 claims that Turkey's Western-oriented state identity was still an influential factor to determine its relations with Israel in the new era. However, during the 1990s, the rise of political Islam became an undeniable fact particularly with the pro-Islamic RP's coming to power in 1996. Bozdağlıoğlu defines the RP-led coalition as a term of "the duality of Turkey's state identity". On the contrary, I will argue that the pro-Western military-civil elites were more decisive on the formation of Turkey's state identity than the RP and its ideology. The fall of the RP government and the following governments proved continuity in Turkey's state identity and accordingly its relations with Israel.

5.1. Turkey's Shared State Identity with Israel in the Post-Cold War Era: Towards a 'Strategic Relationship' in the Middle East

There are a variety of factors that contributed to the Turkish-Israeli relations in the 1990s. First of all, the dissolution of the Socialist bloc in 1989 drastically changed the international order. The bipolar international system based on the US-USSR rivalry turned into a unipolar structure led by the US. Turkey and Israel, the only two pro-Western democracies in the Middle East, were on the winning side. In particular, the former Soviet allies in the region could no longer receive military and economic assistance from a superpower since the final collapse of the USSR in December 1991. The threat perception for Turkey and Israel changed accordingly. In this framework, Turkey found an opportunity to steer its foreign policy in new directions including the Middle East.[377]

On this point, it is noteworthy to indicate that Kurdish, Islamic, neo-Ottomanist/pan-Turkist and Western-oriented arguments on Turkey's state identity came to the agenda in the beginning of the 1990s. First, increasing Kurdish ethnic consciousness with the impact of the PKK constituted a serious challenge to the unity of state that also put some limitations to Turkey's maneuvering space in foreign policy. Second, Islamic narrative defended a resurgence of Islamic values and rejected dependence on the West. Third, the dissolution of the USSR and Yugoslavia resulted in the independence of Turkic and/or Muslim states, and

---

[377] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, pp.19-20.

provided Turkey a chance to play a leadership role.[378] However, Turkey's internal structures were still identified with the world view of Turkey's founding fathers based on Western-oriented features shaping its state identity accordingly.[379] To this view, Turkey's Western identity did not change as a consequence of international conjuncture.[380] In addition, there were some facilitating factors for the Turkish-Israeli relations such as Turkey's concerns about its security under the conditions of its relations with Syria, Iraq and Iran in particular. By sharing similar security concerns, Turkey and Israel found a suitable ground for further strengthening their relations. As indicated, the internal factors in Turkey fostered this process.

On the other side, the Middle East peace process between Israel and the Arab world paved the way for stronger relations between Turkey and Israel. At this point, the Gulf War[381] became a significant development accelerating the process of the Turkish-Israeli rapprochement, in which both Turkey and Israel gave their support to the US-led coalition against Saddam Hussein's Iraq. In fact, Turkey and Israel created a mutual image used to portray a "self" and an "other" as being distinct in the Middle East dominated by mainly Arab states when Turkey and

---

[378] Birgül Demirtaş-Coşkun, "Identity: Turkish and German Responses", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, pp.33-37.

[379] Şaban Çalış, "The Turkish State's Identity and Foreign Policy Decision-Making Process", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.6, No.2, 1995, p.136.

[380] Birgül Demirtaş-Coşkun, "Identity: Turkish and German Responses", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.39.

[381] In the immediate after of the end of the Cold War, the fall of the iron curtain threatened Turkey's role in the West. However, the Gulf War swiftly restored Turkey's strategic role in the management of the crisis. To illustrate, NATO's concept of "out of area intervention" was for the first time operationalized, and Turkey took an important role in this process. Ankara permitted to the Allies to use the İncirlik Air Base near Adana for launching sorties over Iraq.

Israel further fostered their relations. Once the Turkish-Israeli rapprochement became public, the Turkish ruling elites underlined that Turkey and Israel are the only countries in the region that share a common identity based on Western features.[382]

5.1.1. The Gulf War

Within the context of the ongoing profound changes and among other international developments bringing important consequences for the Turkish-Israeli relations in the last years of the Cold War, the Gulf War (August 1990 - February 1991) played a major part in formatting regional relations. The war was waged in a time when Turkey's position in the new international environment was being questioned, particularly in Europe.[383] However, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 changed the West's perception of Turkey. NATO's concept of *"out of area intervention"* was put into operation for the first time, and Turkey's status in NATO was significantly enhanced.[384]

Since Turkey and Israel were supportive of the US-led coalition against Hussein's Iraq, Turkey viewed Israel as "an ally and a strategic partner", and thus attached great importance to this alliance and partnership in its security

---

[382] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.151.

[383] Binnur Özkeçeci-Taner, "From Allies to Frenemies and Inconvenient Partners: Image Theory and Turkish-Israeli Relations", *Perceptions*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, p.117.

[384] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.23.

establishment.[385] The only two democracies in the Middle East that is filled with authoritarian and dictatorial political systems had special relationships with the US. The perception of "common enemies" played an important role in strengthening the bilateral relations that reached the level of strategic partnership. Both states considered they had the same hostile "rogue" states- namely Iran, Iraq and Syria- in the region, and this perception contributed to regarding each other as "valuable strategic partners in a perceived hostile political environment".[386]

5.1.2. The Madrid Peace Conference

Apart from the Gulf War, the Madrid Conference was a crucial development in the international politics in the early 1990s. The Conference commenced on October 30, 1991. The joint sponsors were the US and the USSR, and accordingly American President George Bush and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev delivered the first two speeches in the Conference. With the impact of the American pressure, the Israeli government agreed to join the Conference. Yoram Peri highlights that the IDF realized the new geo-strategic environment arising, at the same time insinuating some possible consequences for the Israeli security in the long-term.[387] At the Conference, Israel was represented by Prime Minister Yitzhak Samir, and the Arab States were represented by their Foreign

---

[385] Binnur Özkeçeci-Taner, "From Allies to Frenemies and Inconvenient Partners: Image Theory and Turkish-Israeli Relations", *Perceptions*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, p.117.

[386] Ufuk Ulutaş, "Turkey-Israel: A Fluctuating Alliance", *SETA Policy Brief*, No.42, 2012, p.4.

[387] Yoram Peri, "The Political-Military Complex: The IDF's Influence over Policy towards the Palestinians Since 1987", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.11, No.2, 2005, p.326.

Ministers. Dr. Haider Abdel Shafi was the head of the Palestinian delegation. Martin Gilbert states that "The belligerent had met around the same table at Madrid, and their representatives were talking directly to each other for the first time since the War of Independence forty-three years earlier".[388]

The Conference established the ground rules for the peace process between the Israelis and the Palestinians: Direct, bilateral negotiations on the basis of UN Resolutions 242 and 338 and the principles of land for peace.[389] The peace process continued at meetings held in Washington D.C., Ottawa, Moscow, Tokyo, Brussels and Vienna. During the meetings, various topics such as economic cooperation, Palestinian refugees, water resources and environmental issues were discussed.[390]

5.1.3. The Oslo Peace Process and Afterwards

After the Madrid Conference, Israeli and Palestinian representatives began to meet secretly in the Norwegian capital in July 1992. The negotiations resulted in the signing of the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements, also known as the Oslo Accords, in Washington D.C. on September 13, 1993. Gilbert describes "the revolution" and "the new reality" in the Middle

---

[388] Martin Gilbert, *Israel: A History*, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008, p.598.

[389] Dov Waxman, *The Pursuit of Peace and the Crisis of Israeli Identity: Defending/Defining the Nation*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, p.86.

[390] Martin Gilbert, *The Story of Israel*, London: Andre Deutsch, 2011, p.52.

East peace process as follows: "Israel had recognized the PLO, was talking to it, and was signing agreements with it; and the PLO had recognized Israel."[391]

Besides the mutual recognition, the Accords established a Palestinian Authority (PA) to rule the Gaza Strip, except for Israeli settlements, and the town of Jericho. The Accords foresaw the division of the West Bank into three areas: "Area A, all of the towns except for Hebron would be under full PA control. Area B, the villages, was to be governed by the PA politically, but Israel would have the right to enter them for security purposes. Area C, Jewish settlements and unpopulated areas, continued to be under Israeli control. All Jewish settlements, the PLO agreed, would remain where they were until a full peace treaty was signed."[392] In accordance with the Accords, Israel had completed its withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and the Jericho area of the West Bank by May 1994, and then the IDF withdrew from the West Bank's populated areas with the exception of Hebron by the end of 1995.[393]

In addition to the Accords, the Protocol on Economic Relations between the Government of the State of Israel and the PLO (also called the Paris Protocol) was signed in Paris on April 29, 1994. The Protocol aimed at bringing prosperity to the Palestinian economy, and regulating economic relations between Israel and the PLO. What is more is the Israeli-Palestinian Interim Agreement on the West Bank

[391] Martin Gilbert, *Israel: A History*, New York: Harper Perennial, 2008, p.565.

[392] Barry Rubin, *Israel: An Introduction*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012, p.48.

[393] Raphael Cohen-Almagor, "The Failed Palestinian-Israeli Peace Process 1993-2011: An Israeli Perspective", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.18, No.4, 2012, p.563.

and the Gaza Strip was signed in Washington D.C. on September 28, 1995. The Agreement confirmed the division of the West Bank into three zones. The agreement also stipulated that a Palestinian Council would be inaugurated in 18 months. Appropriately, elections to the Palestinian Council were held on January 20, 1996. Shortly after the election, both the Israeli civil administration and the military government were dissolved.[394]

5.1.4. The Middle East Peace Process and Turkey's Relations with Israel

Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu considers that Israel had been regarded as "a tumor" in the geopolitics of the Middle East but gained the status of a nation-state equal to other countries in the region with the peace process.[395] This process contributed to the intensification of relations between Turkey and Israel as well. In other words, the peace process removed "complications due to Turkish policy of uneasy balancing between the Arab countries and Israel especially since the 1960s".[396] Their shared security concerns such as the Syria-Iran relations[397] increased the motivation for bilateral cooperation, too. In this framework, Turkey once again upgraded its diplomatic relations with Israel to ambassadorial level in

---

[394] *Ibid*.

[395] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2012, p.384.

[396] Meliha Benli Altunışık, "The Turkish-Israeli rapprochement in the post-Cold War era", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.36, No.2, 2000, pp.173-174.

[397] Jubin M. Goodarzi, *Syria and Iran: Diplomatic Alliance and Power Politics in the Middle East*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2009, p.291.

1991. Turkish Ambassador Ekrem Güvendiren presented his credentials to Israeli President Chaim Herzog. The Turkish-Israeli relations showed multi-faceted developments in every field in that period.

In June 1992, Turkish Tourism Minister Abdulkadir Ateş paid a visit to Israel and became the first Turkish minister to visit the country. In the visit, an agreement which envisaged an annual traffic of more than 300,000 Israelis to Turkey was signed between the two countries.[398] In July 1992, Israeli President Herzog conducted an unofficial visit to Turkey to participate in ceremonies commemorating the 500-year anniversary since the arrival of expulsed Jews from Spain to the Ottoman Empire in 1492. Turkish President Turgut Özal and Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel also joined the ceremonies. Herzog said that President Özal declared "a new era had begun" and "constraints had disappeared, barriers had been lifted, and Turkey was prepared to cooperate closely with Israel in every field".[399] Ofra Bengio noted that Özal's declaration was not mentioned by a Turkish source but Bengio does not suspect on its authenticity.[400]

Shortly after the signing of the Oslo Accords, Turkish Foreign Minister Hikmet Çetin paid a visit to Israel in November 1993. Çetin became the first Turkish Foreign Minister who visited the country.[401] During the aforementioned

---

[398] Michael B. Bishku, "How Has Turkey Viewed Israel?", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, p.188.

[399] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.105.

[400] *Ibid*, p.208.

[401] Kamer Kasım, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri: İki Bölgesel Gücün Stratejik Ortaklığı", in İdris Bal (ed), *21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: Ankara Global Araştırmalar Merkezi (AGAM), 2006, p.839.

visit, it was decided to establish the legal framework for economic and trade relations between Turkey and Israel. In other words, unlike other Middle Eastern states, the two countries enjoyed free market economies.[402] Foreign Minister Çetin expressed that "Turco-Israel relations will develop further in all fields. We have agreed that Turkey and Israel should cooperate in restructuring the Middle East".[403] After the visit, economic cooperation and cultural exchange agreements were signed.[404] Israeli President Ezer Weizman, Prime Minister and Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin, and finally Foreign Minister Shimon Peres visited Turkey during the same year. President Weizman's visit was the first state visit of an Israeli president to Turkey. The modernization of F-4 and F-5 aircrafts was on the agenda during Rabin's visit.[405]

Just nine days after the signing of a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan on October 26, 1994, this time, Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Çiller visited Tel Aviv on November 5, 1994.[406] Prime Minister Çiller defined the Turkish-Israeli

[402] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.120.

[403] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.147.

[404] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.29, No.1, 1999, p.31.

[405] Kamer Kasım, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri: İki Bölgesel Gücün Stratejik Ortaklığı", in İdris Bal (ed), *21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: Ankara Global Araştırmalar Merkezi (AGAM), 2006, p.839.

[406] Joshua Walker, "Turkey and Israel's Relationship in the Middle East", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.17, No.4, 2006, p.79.

cooperation as a "strategic relationship".[407] On the occasion of the visit, an anti-terrorism agreement providing an opportunity for the exchange of intelligence was signed.[408] Following the visit, Turkey and Israel reached an agreement in 1995 on the modernization of Turkish F-4s. According to the agreement, the Israeli IAI would overtake the modernization of 54 F-4 aircrafts.[409] Turkey and Israel also signed a memorandum of understanding on the training of pilots in each country's airspace on September 18, 1995. Bengio says that the memorandum provided Israel with an opportunity to overcome the "claustrophobia" that had diminished the fortitude of the Israeli Air Force since the Israeli withdrawal from Sinai in 1982.[410]

In fact, Israel was regarded as an important supplier of weapons needed by the Turkish army. A modernization program with $150 billion worth of the Turkish Armed Forces, the purchase of 200 Popeye 1 missiles from Israel, the joint production of Popeye 2 missiles and $900 million worth of modernization of Turkish F-4 and F-5 aircrafts were on the agenda.[411] The negotiations on the F-4 and F-5 aircraft modernization resulted in two more agreements signed in

---

[407] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Türkiye ve İsrail: Mesafeli Yakınlıktan Stratejik Ortaklığa", in Şaban H. Çalış, İhsan D. Dağı and Ramazan Gözen (eds), *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberté Yayınları, 2001, p.263.

[408] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.29, No.1, 1999, p.31.

[409] Kamer Kasım, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri: İki Bölgesel Gücün Stratejik Ortaklığı", in İdris Bal (ed), *21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: Ankara Global Araştırmalar Merkezi (AGAM), 2006, p.839.

[410] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.112.

[411] Kamer Kasım, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri: İki Bölgesel Gücün Stratejik Ortaklığı", in İdris Bal (ed), *21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: Ankara Global Araştırmalar Merkezi (AGAM), 2006, p.839.

December 1996 and 1998. The cost of the modernization amounted to almost $700 million making it the biggest foreign contract for the Israeli aircraft industry.[412]

Moreover, Turkish Armed Forces Deputy Chief of Staff Çevik Bir visited Israel in February 1996. In the visit, a comprehensive military training agreement between Turkey and Israel was signed on February 23, 1996 by Çevik Bir and David Ivry, the Director General of the Israeli Ministry of Defense. The Military Training Cooperation Agreement stressed "the desire for promoting relations and cooperation, believe bilateral cooperation to be of mutual benefit and recognize that such cooperation can promote further relations".[413] The agreement called for joint training of aircraft pilots, intelligence sharing, and permitted the Israeli air force jets to fly in Turkish air space for training.[414] The agreement included the exchange of military information, experience and personnel as well.[415] Bengio reveals the objectives of the agreement as follows:

> 1. Achieving cooperation on various levels on the basis of the exchange of personnel and their expertise. 2. Exchanging visits between military academies, units, and camps. 3. Application of training of exercises. 4. Sending observers to follow up military exercises in the two countries. 5. Exchanging officials to collect and share information, especially in social

---

[412] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.114.

[413] Turkey-Israel Military Training Cooperation Agreement, 23 February 1996, preamble.

[414] Binnur Özkeçeci-Taner, "From Allies to Frenemies and Inconvenient Partners: Image Theory and Turkish-Israeli Relations", *Perceptions*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, pp.116-117.

[415] Kamer Kasım, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri: İki Bölgesel Gücün Stratejik Ortaklığı", in İdris Bal (ed), *21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: Ankara Global Araştırmalar Merkezi (AGAM), 2006, p.839.

and cultural fields that included military history, military museums, and military archives. 6. Exchange of visits by military naval vessels.[416]

Turkish President Demirel's visit to Israel in March 1996 was a major turning point in the bilateral relations.[417] It was the first visit of a Turkish President to Israel. According to President Demirel, both democratic countries shared similar views to regional and international issues.[418] During the visit, four agreements[419] on economic cooperation, free trade, promotion of bilateral investments and prevention of double taxation were signed. In particular, the agreement on free trade provided for an opportunity to reduce customs duties gradually over the next few years, and the complete removal of tariffs in 1999.[420]

In April 1996, the right-wing government under Benjamin Netanyahu's premiership came to power in Israel. The new Israeli Prime Minister was in favor

---

[416] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.108.

[417] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Türkiye ve İsrail: Mesafeli Yakınlıktan Stratejik Ortaklığa", in Şaban H. Çalış, İhsan D. Dağı and Ramazan Gözen (eds), *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberté Yayınları, 2001, p.264.

[418] Nil Tuncer, "Süleyman Demirel", in Ali Faik Demir, *Türk Dış Politikasında Liderler*, Istanbul: Bağlam, 2007, p.225.

[419] The exact names of the agreements are "Agreement on Trade, Economic Industrial, Technical and Scientific Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of Turkey and the Government of the State of Israel", "Agreement Establishing a Free Trade Area between the Republic of Turkey and the State of Israel", "Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Turkey and the Government of the State of Israel for the Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investments", and "Convention between the Republic of Turkey and the State of Israel for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income".

[420] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Türkiye ve İsrail: Mesafeli Yakınlıktan Stratejik Ortaklığa", in Şaban H. Çalış, İhsan D. Dağı and Ramazan Gözen (eds), *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberté Yayınları, 2001, p.264; Süha Bölükbaşı, "Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.29, No.1, 1999, p.32.

of signing a comprehensive military agreement with Turkey which would then form the basis for the security structure of Israel in the region. However, Turkey avoided concluding such an agreement until a peace agreement is reached between the Israelis and the Arabs.[421] Nevertheless, eight Israeli F-16s spent a week at Akıncı Air Base near Ankara in accordance with the air force training exchange agreement calling for Israeli aircraft to train in Turkey four times a year.[422]

By pertaining to connection between Turkey's state identity, interest and foreign policy, it is possible to draw a conclusion from the developments indicated above that Turkey for the first time allied itself with a Middle Eastern country, Israel, not adjacent to Turkey, unlike the Saadabad and Baghdad Pacts.[423] The case of Turkey's relations with Israel seems consistent with the constructivist argument that state identity is formed in relationship to other states, and is profoundly influenced by the state's interaction with others. Accordingly, state identity directly affects the kind of foreign policy that a state will pursue.[424]

---

[421] William Hale, *Türk Dış Politikası: 1774-2000*, Istanbul: Mozaik, 2003, p.320.

[422]   (http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/turkish-israeli-military-cooperation-an-assessment), December 24, 2014 accessed.

[423] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.104.

[424] David Campbell, *Writing Security, United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992, p. 76.

5.2.   The Welfare Party-True Path Party Coalition in Turkey (1996-1997):

The Duality of Turkey's State Identity? Farewell to Israel?

The RP - the True Path Party (*Doğru Yol Partisi* - the DYP) coalition was formed in June 1996. The leader of the RP, Necmettin Erbakan, who was very critical of Israel[425] and promised to terminate the agreements with this country during his party's election campaign in 1995,[426] became the Prime Minister. Due to the RP's Islamist orientation and its anti-Israel rhetoric, some claimed that Turkey might have turned towards the East, in other words to the Islamic world.[427] For the first time, Turkey had a prime minister whose political philosophy was based on the religion of Islam.[428] The structure of the coalition government highlighted "the duality of Turkey's state identity" indeed.[429] The implications of this duality in foreign policy were seen in the following months. To illustrate, Prime Minister Erbakan received the leader of the Muslim Brotherhood as his first visitor while

---

[425] According to the RP's Islamic ideology, Turkey's interest lies in developing close relations with the Muslim world. In addition, the most important threat to Turkey comes from the West and Israel. Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.138; Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, "Modernity, Identity and Turkey's Foreign Policy", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.67.

[426] Kılıç Buğra Kanat, "Continuity of Change in Turkish Foreign Policy under the JDP Government: The Cases of Bilateral Relations with Syria and Israel", *Arab Studies Quarterly*, Vol.34, No.4, 2012, p.241.

[427] Emel Parlar Dal, "The Transformation of Turkey's Relations with the Middle East: Illusion or Awakening?", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.13, No.2, 2012, p.248.

[428] Hakan Yavuz, "Political Islam and the Welfare (Refah) Party in Turkey", *Comparative Politics*, Vol.30, No.1, 1997, p.63.

[429] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, "Modernity, Identity and Turkey's Foreign Policy", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.66.

Western-oriented Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Çiller stressed Turkey's Europeanness. In addition, Erbakan, with the ambition to initiate the D-8 (Developing Eight) - an association of Muslim countries- was visiting such Islamic countries such as Iran and Libya when Çiller was touring Western capitals.[430]

On this point, opponents of political Islam supported the opinion that developing relations with Israel, the only country in the region having a similar political and economic structure to Turkey would prevent a new adventure in foreign policy. There were two basic reflections of this understanding in the Turkish public opinion: First, it was believed that as a result of the efforts made for rapprochement with other Islamic countries, which are politically and economically less developed, Turkey would move away from the targets of Westernization and Modernization defined in the beginning of the Republic. Second, as seen before in Turkey's official recognition of Israel in 1949, instead of intensifying relations with Islamic countries which would leave Turkey alone in various international platforms, it was necessary to form high-level relations with Israel which was supportive of Turkey.[431] Although Turkey's relations with Israel were a foreign policy issue, the interaction with domestic concerns was dynamic and far-reaching. According to Hakan Yavuz, the growing ties between Turkey and Israel became a

---

[430] *Ibid.*

[431] Çağrı Erhan and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1990-2001: Küreselleşme Ekseninde Türkiye: Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt II: 1980-2001)*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2002, p.569.

zone of contestation over Turkey's national orientation and another source of polarization between competing segments of the Turkish society.[432]

Under the circumstances, Prime Minister Erbakan tried to dominate foreign policy agenda consistent with the RP's ideological outlook despite the objections of his secular partner. On the other hand, what Prime Minister Erbakan ignored was the power of military, the 'guardian' of Atatürk's secular vision,[433] which was quite influential on both Turkey's domestic and foreign policy agenda. With the impact of the Turkish army, for example, Erbakan could not suspend the negotiations, which had already begun between Turkey and Israel. Instead, Erbakan signed an agreement on cooperation in the defense industry on August 28, 1996. Together with the Military Training Cooperation Agreement of 23 February 1996, this agreement provided for joint air and naval exercises, access to port facilities and training for the air forces. The agreement aimed at strengthening the collaboration of the two countries in the fight against terrorism. The agreement also provided for a joint system of surveillance with the help of the US military technology.[434] Besides the agreement, Erbakan also approved the F-4 modernization program and accordingly, Israeli aircraft did continue its training in Turkey.[435]

---

[432] Hakan Yavuz, "Turkish-Israeli Relations Through the Lens of the Turkish Identity Debate", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.27, No.1, 1997, pp.22-23.

[433] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.135.

[434] Eugene Kogan, "Cooperation in the Israeli-Turkish Defense Industry", *Conflict Studies Research Center Middle East Series*, Vol.5, No.43, 2005, p.9.

[435] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.29, No.1, 1999, p.33.

Some believed that the signing of the military cooperation agreement was related to the domestic politics in which the Turkish Armed Forces were actively taking part. Tarık Oğuzlu considers that the Turkish army had a desire to prevent the RP-led coalition from steering the country from the West towards the East.[436] According to Philip Robins, the military relations between Turkey and Israel was the barometer of who would most influence foreign policy, the Kemalist-dominated state or the Islamist-dominated government, and the signing of the agreement showed that the military was able to reassert its dominance over the strategic contours of Turkish foreign policy.[437] Moreover, Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu claims that the Turkish military's efforts to tie Turkey to Israel were meant to stop "the Islamization of Turkish foreign policy". Bozdağlıoğlu continues with the followings:

> In the case of Turkish-Israeli relations, the struggle between the secularists and the Islamists (i.e. the military and the Welfare Party) shows that both the military's and the WP's foreign policy preferences and understanding of national interest depend in most part on their identity conceptions... Israel, which is regarded by the Turkish military as the only modern and Western country in the region, becomes a natural alliance partner for Turkey. For the Welfare Party, the opposite is true... Israel constitutes the most dangerous threat to... that of Turkey in particular [438]

---

[436] Tarık Oğuzlu, "The Changing Dynamics of Turkey-Israel Relations: A Structural Realist Account", *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol.15, No.2, 2010, p.276.

[437] Philip Robins, *Suits and Uniforms: Turkish Foreign Policy since the Cold War*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003, pp.262-263.

[438] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.157.

On the other side, the rapprochement between Turkey and Israel was not confined to the military field only. The agreements were made at a time when the Turkish-Israeli trade was on the increase with Israel. By the year of 1997, Israel became the second largest Middle Eastern market for Turkey, just behind Saudi Arabia.[439]

Trade Figures between Turkey and Israel

During the RP-DYP Coalition Term

The RP-DYP Coalition Term	Export (From Turkey to Israel)	Import (From Israel to Turkey)	Total Amount (Million/ US Dollar)
1996	254.853	192.627	447.480
1997	391.514	233.681	625.195

(From www.tuik.gov.tr)

Correspondingly, high-level visits mutually continued under the RP-DYP coalition as well. To illustrate, Turkish Chief of Staff General İsmail Hakkı Karadayı visited Israel on February 24-28, 1997, and Israeli Foreign Minister David Levy paid a visit to Ankara in April 1997.[440] During his visit to Israel, Karadayı stated, "We (Turks and Jews) have been together for the last 400 years.

---

[439] Michael B. Bishku, "How Has Turkey Viewed Israel?", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, p.190.

[440] Özlem Tür, "Turkey and Israel in the 2000s: From Cooperation to Conflict", *Israel Studies*, Vol.17, No.3, p.49.

We have a strong bond. Both Turkey and Israel share organic, spiritual, and emotional relations".[441]

The bilateral meetings between the Turkish and Israeli military officials at which the challenges to the regional peace were discussed were causing widespread criticism in the Arab/Islamic world. The reports of the meetings implied that Turkey and Israel shared the same view on Iran, Iraq and Syria being the main sources of various challenges including terrorism.[442] Indeed, the Turkish authorities were accusing the Damascus administration of supporting the terrorist groups such as the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK). To illustrate, Turkish Defense Minister Turhan Tayan who visited Israel on 30 April-2 May 1997 stated that Syria was a base of terrorism[443] and his statement was shared by his Israeli counterpart Yitzhak Mordechai.[444] Defense Minister Tayan also visited the Golan Heights.[445] By taking the Turkish-Israeli military cooperation agreements into consideration, this visit increased the Syrian security concerns.

---

[441] Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003, p.155.

[442] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Türkiye ve İsrail: Mesafeli Yakınlıktan Stratejik Ortaklığa", in Şaban H. Çalış, İhsan D. Dağı and Ramazan Gözen (eds), *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberté Yayınları, 2001, p.266.

[443] Similar to Turkish Defense Minister Turhan Tayan, in September 1998, Turkish Chief of Staff General Hüseyin Kıvrıkoğlu charged Syria of using terrorism to wage "undeclared war" against Turkey.

[444] Umut Uzer, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkilerinde Bunalım", *Ortadoğu Etütleri*, Vol.2, No.2, 2011, pp.148-149.

[445] Bente Scheller, *The Wisdom of Syria's Waiting Game: Foreign Policy under the Assads*, London: Hurst Publishers, 2013, p.111.

Both the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) and the Arab League (AL) were critical of the military and security cooperation between Turkey and Israel. In 1997, the OIC denounced the cooperation, and in 1998, the AL declared that "Turkish alignment with Israel was intended to redraw the map of the Middle East" but Turkey rejected the declaration and underlined that the bilateral agreements with Israel were not against third countries.[446]

Within this context, the RP's coming to power can be regarded as a serious challenge to Turkey's state identity. Although domestic political actors, primarily political leaders, construct an identity for the state, they make this practice under constraints imposed by other domestic factors. In the Turkish case, the domestic factors, the military in particular, were influential on the maintenance of Turkey's pro-Western state identity. In other words, Erbakan and his party's ideology presented an Islamist alternative formation of Turkey's state identity; however, the internal interaction resulted in continuity.

5.3.   Coalition Governments in Turkey (1997-2002):

Continuity in Turkey's State Identity and its Relations with Israel

After the resignation of Prime Minister Erbakan in June 1997, President Süleyman Demirel gave the responsibility of forming the new government to Mesut Yılmaz, the leader of the ANAP. Yılmaz formed his government together with Bülent Ecevit's Democratic Left Party (*Demokratik Sol Parti* - the DSP) and

---

[446] Kılıç Buğra Kanat, "Continuity of Change in Turkish Foreign Policy under the JDP Government: The Cases of Bilateral Relations with Syria and Israel", *Arab Studies Quarterly*, Vol.34, No.4, 2012, p.238.

Hüsamettin Cindoruk's Democrat Turkey Party (*Demokrat Türkiye Partisi* - the DTP). His government received the vote of confidence at the Turkish Parliament with the support of the CHP in July 1997. As argued in introduction, the shift in Turkey's government, in fact, proved that pro-Western secular forces were strong enough to protect the state's identity as constructed by its founders.

In December 1997, new Prime Minister Yılmaz paid an official visit to the US. During the visit, a prominent Jewish lobbying institution in the US, Anti-Defamation League (ADL), gave *Distinguished Statesman Award* to him.[447] In the award ceremony, ADL National Director Abraham H. Foxman praised Turkey's role in the Middle East peace process and said during his speech that "the unique Turkish tradition of religious tolerance, pluralism and democracy would continue in the nation that had been so hospitable to Jews for centuries" in his speech.[448] As such, the award ceremony was indeed a reflection of the Jewish support to Turkey in the US. Former Israeli Defense Minister Yitzhak Mordechai confirmed this support by saying that Israel was assisting Turkey on the American political scene, and encouraging Jewish organizations to follow this path.[449]

Turkish Foreign Minister İsmail Cem, whose tenure was from 1997 to 2002 under the Yılmaz and then the Ecevit governments, signaled the realignment of the Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East, which had maintained its strategic

---

[447] *Anatolian Agency*, December 11, 1997.

[448] (http://archive.adl.org/presrele/mise_00/3082-00.html), December 24, 2014 accessed.

[449] Dietrich Jung with Wolfango Piccoli, *Turkey at the Crossroads: Ottoman Legacies and a Greater Middle East*, New York: Zed Books, 2001, p.169.

importance after the Cold War. Foreign Minister Cem believed that Turkey was a supra-regional power with its history, culture, relations, civilization, strategic position, industrial infrastructure and experience.[450] According to Cem, Turkey has a traditional influence in the region.[451] To activate this influence, Cem envisaged Turkey's improvement of close ties with its Arab neighbors as well as Iran. With this vision, a Turkey with good relations in its region could be a much more powerful country and then develop a more independent foreign policy.[452]

In the wake of this approach, the Turkish government tried to diversify its foreign policy options by re-engaging its relations with regional actors.[453] However, it did not mean that Turkey wished to degrade the level of its relations with Israel. Instead, both countries continued to improve their relations in every field including military cooperation in stronger terms. In January 1998, the military cooperation was further reinforced with the first joint naval exercise called "Reliant Mermaid" comprising naval ships and aircraft from Turkey, Israel and the US while the joint air maneuvers named "the Anatolian Eagle" were conducted in

---

[450] İsmail Cem, *Avrupa'nın Birliği ve Türkiye*, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005, p.77.

[451] İsmail Cem, *Türkiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi*, Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2007, p.431.

[452] Meliha Benli Altunışık, "The Turkish-Israeli rapprochement in the post-Cold War era", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.36, No.2, 2000, p.184.

[453] Emel Parlar Dal, "The Transformation of Turkey's Relations with the Middle East: Illusion or Awakening?", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.13, No.2, 2012, p.249.

Konya.[454] Although "the Reliant Mermaid" was a humanitarian search and rescue exercise, its impact was felt in the Arab world.[455]

On this point, it should be remembered that Turkey and Syria, the two countries which almost went to war, signed the Adana Accords in October 1998 in which they pledged not to provide safe haven to militant groups targeting the other side. After the signing the Accords, the Turkish-Syrian relations improved in a very short time. For example, the Syrian administration closed down the training camps of the PKK.[456] The rapprochement process accelerated with the capture of PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan in February 1999. Explicitly speaking, Turkey's need for Israel in the fields of security and intelligence lessened. However, it did not necessarily mean an essential change in Turkey's relations with Israel. The role of the military, a leading domestic actor shaping Turkey's state identity, was crucial in that regard. The bilateral military agreements with Israel were still intact and well-functioning. In addition, the Turkish military personnel continued their regular visits to Israel.[457]

Within this context, on July 14, 1999, Turkish President Demirel visited Israel and met Israeli President Ezer Weizman and Prime Minister Ehud Barak. On

---

[454] Kılıç Buğra Kanat, "Continuity of Change in Turkish Foreign Policy under the JDP Government: The Cases of Bilateral Relations with Syria and Israel", *Arab Studies Quarterly*, Vol.34, No.4, 2012, p.237 and 240.

[455] Süha Bölükbaşı, "Türkiye ve İsrail: Mesafeli Yakınlıktan Stratejik Ortaklığa", in Şaban H. Çalış, İhsan D. Dağı and Ramazan Gözen (eds), *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberté Yayınları, 2001, pp.265-266.

[456] Özlem Tür, "Turkish-Syrian Relations - Where are we going?", *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, No.23, 2010 p.166.

[457] Ali Balcı and Tuncay Kardaş, "The Changing Dynamics of Turkey's Relations with Israel: An Analysis of Securitization", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, p.109.

July 15, Demirel travelled to Palestine to join PLO leader Arafat. Demirel had discussions with his Israeli and Palestinian counterparts on the Middle East peace process. Demirel's visits to Israel and then to Palestine showed Turkey's sensibility to the peace process and its relations with the Arab/Muslim world while improving its relations with Israel as well. After the visits, for this time, President Weizman attended the celebration of the 75th anniversary of the Republic of Turkey in Ankara on October 29, 1999.[458]

However, the Camp David Summit which was held between American President Bill Clinton, Israeli Prime Minister Barak and PLO leader Arafat in July 2000 ended with failure. In addition, the visit of Israeli opposition leader Ariel Sharon to the Temple Mount in September 2000, of which the al-Aqsa Mosque- the third holiest site in the religion of Islam- is part, triggered the second Palestinian uprising (*Intifada*) against Israel. These developments negatively affected Turkey's relations with Israel. To illustrate, Turkey supported the UN Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on December 1, 2000 that recalled also the withdrawal of the Israeli army from the Palestinian lands.[459]

Under these conditions, Israeli Defense Minister Binyamin Ben Eliezer visited Ankara in July 2001. It was claimed that Eliezer addressed the cooperation between Turkey and Israel in order to create a common missile defense shield by

---

[458] *Hurriyet Daily News*, June 19, 1999.

[459] Ali Balcı, *Türkiye Dış Politikası: İlkeler, Aktörler, Uygulamalar*, Istanbul: Etkileşim, 2013, p.248.

using the Arrow missile interceptor in the visit. He lobbied in Washington D.C. so as to let Turkey take part in the Arrow production program.[460]

On the other hand, Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's visit to Ankara in November 2001 revealed the growing disagreement between Turkey and Israel in terms of their differentiating approaches to the Palestinian issue. In particular, Ecevit's rejection of Sharon's claim that "Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat supported terrorism"[461] in a joint press conference made the disagreement quite visible. The Israeli attack on the Jenin refugee camp in April 2002 further deteriorated the bilateral relations. The bombings causing casualties of many Palestinian civilians provoked a public outcry in Turkey, and Prime Minister Ecevit described the attack as "genocide".[462] These developments once again revealed that the Turkish society was highly "reactive" in times of Israel's aggression towards Palestine. The agreements signed with Israel in the 1990s were strongly criticized by the civilian actors, and opposition parties, media and civil society organizations demanded either the suspension or the cancellation of the agreements. The government could not remain unconcerned. However, the military was strong

---

[460] Kamer Kasım, Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri: İki Bölgesel Gücün Stratejik Ortaklığı, İdris Bal (Ed), 21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası, Ankara: Ankara Global Araştırmalar Merkezi (AGAM), 2006, S.839.

[461] Kılıç Buğra Kanat, "Continuity of Change in Turkish Foreign Policy under the JDP Government: The Cases of Bilateral Relations with Syria and Israel", *Arab Studies Quarterly*, Vol.34, No.4, 2012, pp.240-241.

[462] Binnur Özkeçeci-Taner, "From Allies to Frenemies and Inconvenient Partners: Image Theory and Turkish-Israeli Relations", *Perceptions*, Vol.17, No.3, p.117.

enough to prevent such decisions.[463] As a result, Turkey never chose to cut off its relations with Israel entirely.

In this vein, in spite of Ecevit's severe criticism of Israel, in April 2002, Turkey decided to give the $687.5 million worth of modernization project of 170 M-60A1 tanks to Israel Military Industries (IMI), a multi-year program "considered to be one of the world's largest tank upgrade programs".[464] In July 2002, Turkey also gave 300 helicopters belonging to Turkish Air Force to the same firm to be modernized.[465] In addition, Foreign Minister Cem, together with Greek Foreign Minister George Papandreou, visited Israel and Palestine on April 24-25, 2002. Cem and Papandreou were received by Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, and met Israeli Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Simon Peres. Referring to the Turkish-Greek rapprochement, Cem and Papandreou discussed both Israeli and Palestinian sides on the deadlock over the Church of Nativity in Bethlehem.[466]

Besides military cooperation and foreign policy developments, the two countries continued to strengthen their economic relations without any interruption. To illustrate, the bilateral trade capacity rose from almost $100 million in the

---

[463] Ali Balcı, *Türkiye Dış Politikası: İlkeler, Aktörler, Uygulamalar*, Istanbul: Etkileşim, 2013, p.249.

[464] (http://defense-update.com/features/2010/april/turkish_tank_15042010.html), November 16, 2013 accessed.

[465] Muzaffer Ercan Yılmaz, "Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Dönemde Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri", *Akademik Orta Doğu*, Vol.4, No.2, 2010, p.59.

[466](http://archive.papandreou.gr/papandreou/content/Document.aspx?d=6&rd=7739474&f=1360&rf =1307380017&m=3156&rm=22081958&l=1), August 30, 2014 accessed.

beginning of the 1990s to $1.4 billion in 2002. The balance of export and import vis-à-vis Israel was in favor of Turkey, and Turkish companies found a valuable market here for selling their products. With the impact of the agreement on tourism, Turkey became an important destination for the Israeli tourists. Over 229.000 Israelis visited Turkey in 2002.[467]

5.4.   Chapter Conclusion

The Turkish-Israeli relations can be divided into two main periods in the post-Cold War era. The first period begins with the Gulf War in the last years of the Cold War, and continues with other significant developments such as the Middle East peace process. The second period starts with the JDP term in Turkey, which will be examined in the following chapters. Chapter 5, which analyses the first period, highlights Alexander Wendt's assumption that "identities form the basis of interests".[468]

Within the context of the new international dynamics, Turkey and Israel, the only two democracies in the Middle East, defined their interests in the process of defining their existing situations. First, the Gulf War became an important process of defining situation for both Turkey and Israel. Although a shift in the international system/dynamics implied a limited change in Turkey's state identity, in the Turkish case, various facilitating factors for Turkey's relations with Israel

---

[467] Dallen J. Timothy and Daniel H. Olsen, *Tourism, Religion and Spiritual Journey*, New York: Routledge, 2006, p.167.

[468] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.46, No.2, 1992, pp.398.

such as the continuous importance of security affairs in the new international environment provided Turkey maintain its state identity based on a pro-Western character. In this framework, Turkey's main objective became to protect its own stability against the grave repercussions of the violent conflicts in the neighboring regions under the new conditions.[469] However, Turkey's security concerns were not constructed only in terms of territorial integrity, but also for the preservation of the Turkish state, embodied in its one of the most valued republican principles, namely secularism. For the military-bureaucratic elites, Israel represented an ideological mirror-image of the secular Turkish state.[470] Through a strategic relationship with Israel, they could confirm Turkey's Western orientation, demonstrate its "secular" credentials and counter regional support for local Islamist groups.[471] Therefore, Turkey, which initially preferred to foster economic, technical and cultural ties, later attached more importance to political and security cooperation with Israel.[472]

However, Turkey's relations with Israel were not independent from criticism in Turkish politics. Critical discourse peaked in Turkey when Necmettin Erbakan, who severely criticized Israel and Turkey's close relations with this country, became Prime Minister. Based on a *narrative*, which constitutes one of the

---

[469] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.77.

[470] Ali Balcı and Tuncay Kardaş, "The Changing Dynamics of Turkey's Relations with Israel: An Analysis of Securitization", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, p.103.

[471] Hakan Yavuz, "Turkish-Israeli Relations Through the Lens of the Turkish Identity Debate", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.27, No.1, 1997, p.27.

[472] Meliha Benli Altunışık, "The Turkish-Israeli rapprochement in the post-Cold War era", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.36, No.2, 2000, p.172.

most important mechanisms for a collective identity,[473] Erbakan and his *Milli Görüş* parties that used the discourse of "Lider Türkiye" (Leader Turkey) and "Şahsiyetli Dış Politika" (foreign policy possessing an independent character) offered a foreign policy *frame* shaped in opposition to the West, and simultaneously to Israel.[474] With regards to *institutions*, by referring to Umut Uzer's mentioning of three institutions, namely "the prime minister, the foreign ministry and the military"[475], responsible for the formulation of foreign policy, Erbakan was the Prime Minister, whereas State Ministers Abdullah Gül, Rıza Güneri and Ahmet Cemil Tunç from the RP dealt with foreign relations although Tansu Çiller, the DYP leader, was the Foreign Minister. For example, State Minister Tunç was responsible for relations with Iraq and the rest of the Middle East.[476] But the military, the third institution, supported the Western values such as secularism, and advocated strong relations with the US and Israel. The Turkish military-bureaucratic elites championing a more pro-Western state identity played an important role so as to prevent any derailment. Under these conditions, the RP-led coalition was not able to interrupt the building of closer ties between Turkey and Israel. Hence, Turkey's Western-oriented foreign policy outlook did not

---

[473] Yael Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995, p.214.

[474] Galip Dalay and Dov Friedman, "The AK Party and the Evolution of Turkish Political Islam's Foreign Policy", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.2, 2013, p.125.

[475] Umut Uzer, *Identity and Turkish Foreign Policy: The Kemalist Influence in Cyprus and the Caucasus*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2011, pp.76-77.

[476] Çağrı Erhan and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1990-2001: Küreselleşme Ekseninde Türkiye: Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (Ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt II: 1980-2001)*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2002, p.560.

experience an important change despite the fact that the 1990s witnessed discussions on Turkey's state identity. The coalitions-term (1997-2002) once again confirmed this reality.

In short, Turkey and Israel having similar political and economic structures in the Middle East, while also facing the same threat perceptions developed close ties. In Ofra Bengio's terms "the Turkish-Israeli alignment of the 1990s recalls the 'peripheral alliance' of the 1950s, which can be taken as a yardstick for evaluating the changes in the Middle East over the intervening 40 years".[477] In this vein, Chapter 6 and 7 will focus on the next phrase in the Turkish-Israeli relations under the JDP governments in Turkey by studying the foundation of the JDP's foreign policy identity firstly.

---

[477] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.31.

CHAPTER 6

THE FOUNDATION OF JDP'S FOREIGN POLICY IDENTITY

Chapter 6 analyses the ideological background of the JDP highly influenced by the history of political Islam in Turkey. First of all, this Chapter focuses on the 28 February process, which is regarded, or at least labelled by some as a post-modern coup d'état, and then the foundation of the JDP differentiating itself from the traditional *Milli Görüş* (literally National Vision or View) parties. The chapter continues with Turkey's EU accession process and the set of ideas put by Ahmet Davutoğlu. By doing so, Chapter 6 tries to explain the transformation of the domestic factors in order to understand the formation of Turkey's state identity during the JDP rule that has also had consequences for Turkey's foreign policy and its relations with Israel.

6.1.   Learning from the Past

Although an "Islamist party"[478] based on a religious agenda is illegitimate according to Turkish constitutional law,[479] Islamist parties have been a reality in

---

[478] There are a number of studies on Islamism. Lin Noueihed and Alex Warren, for example, define the terms of 'Islamist' and 'Islamism' with the followings: The very term 'Islamist' incorporates such a wide variety of views that it can often be misleading. 'Islamism' views Islam as a framework for political and social action and rule, not just personal conduct or spiritual belief. Islamists use religion to achieve political goals, but those goals can differ as significantly as the tactics used to pursue them. 'Islamist' refers to so many different movements that its meaning has been eroded

Turkish politics in which Necmettin Erbakan[480], founder and leader of the *Milli Görüş*[481], and his pro-Islamic parties- *Milli Nizam Partisi* (National Order Party), *Milli Selamet Partisi* (National Salvation Party), *Refah Partisi* (Welfare Party), *Fazilet Partisi* (Virtue Party) and *Saadet Partisi* (Felicity Party)- have played an important role. On this point, it is noteworthy to indicate that several Islamic sects having different approaches to the interpretation of Islamic rules and their applications in daily life have provided their support for such political parties.

Within this context, the legacy of history and accordingly emulation from the Ottoman Empire go hand in hand with anti-Westernism, which constitutes an indispensable dimension of the *Milli Görüş* parties' identity. From this perspective, other parties are defined as *Batı taklitçisi* (imitator of the West) whereas the followers of the *Milli Görüş* are regarded as *Vatan evlatları* (children of the

over the years and journalists are constantly forced to qualify the term with adjectives such as 'moderate' or 'militant' to distinguish between different groups with different visions. Lin Noueihed and Alex Warren, *The Battle for the Arab Spring: Revolution, Counter-Revolution and the Making of a New Er*a, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012, pp.266-267.

[479] Sultan Tepe, "Moderation of Religious Parties: Electoral Constraints, Ideological Commitments, and the Democratic Capacities of Religious Parties in Israel and Turkey", *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol.65, No.3, 2012, p.475.

[480] Erbakan applied to *Adalet Partisi* (the Justice Party) but he was vetoed. He was elected from Konya as an independent member of the GNAT in 1969, and then founded the National Order Party on January 24, 1970. (http://www.saadet.org.tr/kisi/necmettin-erbakan), January 12, 2014 accessed.

[481] *İslam Toplumu Milli Görüş* explains the idea behind *the Milli Görüş* with the followings: The idea behind "Milli Görüş" is expressed in several verses of the Qur'an: "…the community/way of Abraham (milletu Ibrahim) …" (Qur'an 16:123; 3:95; 4:125). As stated by the Qur'an the concept of "Millet" denotes a community that gathers around a prophet and the values he conveys. It does not refer to a nation or an ethnicity. What is essential are the values, ideals, and traditions that constitute a community. Thus the Qur'an speaks of "milletu Ibrahim", of the community of Abraham, in conjunction with all other prophets who came after Abraham and their congregations as well. The second element of our community's name "Görüş" means "opinion", "view" or "perception". (http://www.igmg.org/gemeinschaft/islamic-community-milli-goerues/what-does-milli-goerues-mean.html?L=/.html), January 12, 2014 accessed.

homeland). Based on this perception, the ruling of the *Milli Görüş* is presented as an end to the imitation of the West. The *Milli Görüş* parties have offered an alternative foreign policy as well. They have inveighed against close relations with the US and Israel. Instead, they have advocated that Turkey- historical and natural leader of the Islamic world- should develop strong relations with the Islamic countries. As explained in the previous chapter, the RP-led coalition invested in better relations with the Islamic world, and Prime Minister Erbakan launched the D-8 initiative.[482]

However, the JDP distinguishes itself from the *Milli Görüş* tradition, and its last political party, the Felicity Party (*Saadet Partisi - the SP*). JDP leader Recep Tayyip Erdoğan stated that *"Milli Görüş gömleğini çıkardık"* (we disposed of the *Milli Görüş* shirt).[483] The statement stressed the difference between the JDP and the SP; both of them were established after the Virtue Party (*Fazilet Partisi - the FP*) had been banned from politics by the Constitutional Court. Different from the *Milli Görüş* parties, the JDP rejected an anti-Western discourse. Where Erbakan adopted an Islamist and deeply anti-capitalist approach, Erdoğan turned toward the West and the EU.[484] Accordingly, Erdoğan referred to a statement used by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk "We shall raise our country to the level of the most prosperous and civilized nations of the world", a statement used by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk.[485]

---

[482] İhsan D. Dağı, *Kimlik, Söylem ve Siyaset: Doğu-Batı Ayrımında Refah Partisi Geleneği*, Ankara: İmge Kitapevi, 1998, pp.11-13.

[483] *Milliyet*, Mayıs 22, 2003.

[484] Tariq Ramadan, *The Arab Awakening: Islam and the New Middle East*, London: Penguin Books, 2012, p.111.

[485] *Sabah*, Ekim 31, 2003.

In this framework, an ideological discussion on the differences between the JDP and the *Milli Görüş* parties is not independent from their perceptions of state identity. Erbakan-led *Milli Görüş* tradition defines itself as *Maneviyatçı* (in favor of spirituality), and attaches importance to religious values in the formation of state identity. Accordingly, Erbakan defended a foreign policy giving priority to the Islamic world. Erdoğan shared the same view when he was the Mayor of Istanbul (1994-1998) elected from the RP, criticized the EU and NATO by calling them both lackeys of the US, opposed Turkey's ambition to join the EU, and declared that "The world's 1.5 billion Muslims are waiting for the Turkish people to rise up. We will rise. With Allah's permission, the rebellion will start".[486]

On the other hand, Erdoğan as the leader of the JDP, for this time, said that he had no demands for "a religion-based state", and joining the EU was now a "necessary goal" for Turkey, and Turkey should maintain "mutually profitable" relations with Israel.[487] On this point, it is noteworthy to indicate the 1997 military memorandum, also called *28 Şubat Süreci* (28 February process), in order to explain the difference between the Milli Görüş and the JDP in terms of state identity and foreign policy.

6.1.1. The 28 February Process

The RP had a victory in the Turkish general elections held on December 24, 1995. The RP won 21.38% of the vote, 158 of 550 parliamentary seats, and became

---

[486] (http://www.economist.com/node/788318), December 13, 2015 accessed.

[487] *Ibid*.

the largest party in the parliament. Before the elections, Erbakan had refused to hold discussion with other party leaders on televisions. However, Erbakan stated in the press release that the RP was ready to negotiate with other parties to form a coalition, the elections were over, and it was the time to leave fights and resentments behind.[488]

On the other side, there were fears that the secular Turkish army would not accept the election results and would inflict another military coup on the country. Under these conditions, Mesut Yılmaz, the leader of the ANAP, cut off coalition negotiations with the RP, and preferred to form a minority coalition government with the DYP supported by the DSP. The minority government received the vote of confidence with 257 in favor to 207 against with 80 abstentions in the Turkish Parliament on March 6, 1996. But this government lasted only three months. On 27 May, the RP tabled a motion of censure against Prime Minister Yılmaz. However, Yılmaz did not wait for the voting and resigned on June 6, 1996.[489]

President Süleyman Demirel (1993-2000) appointed Erbakan to form the new government. In spite of strong criticism, Tansu Çiller, the leader of the DYP, accepted to form the government with the RP. The RP-DYP government was formed on 28 June, and it received the vote of confidence with 278 in favor to 265 against with 1 abstention on July 8, 1996.[490] During the RP-DYP coalition, which

---

[488] İhsan D. Dağı, *Kimlik, Söylem ve Siyaset: Doğu-Batı Ayrımında Refah Partisi Geleneği*, Ankara: İmge Kitapevi, 1998, pp.92-93.

[489] (http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/o53.htm), August 11, 2014 accessed.

[490] (http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/o54.htm), August 11, 2014 accessed.

lasted only one year, Prime Minister Erbakan attached great importance to the Islamic world and accordingly tried to develop an Islamist foreign policy approach[491] that was perceived as a challenge to traditional foreign policy.[492] As explained in the previous chapter, this situation gave rise to discussions on "the duality of Turkey's state identity".

However, this process was broken by the meeting of the *Milli Güvenlik Kurulu* (National Security Council - the NSC) held on February 28, 1997. The NSC advised the government to take a number of measures to protect the secular character of the Turkish state against the Islamism. İhsan Dağı explains those measures in the following:

> The council asked the government headed by Erbakan of the Welfare Party to maintain official dress code in the government offices and universities, to introduce compulsory 8 year elementary school education practically closing down the middle school sections of country-wide Imam Hatip Schools (prayer leaders and preachers), to impose strict control over Qur'anic courses and student dormitories run by religious groups and foundations, to reduce the number of Imam Hatip Schools, to establish a section within the Prime Ministers' office to investigate reactionary/Islamic activities in bureaucracy, and to pass law enabling to fire those civil servants found engaged in Islamic activities.[493]

Within this context, the 28 February process was regarded, or at least labelled by some as a post-modern coup d'état by which "Islam's not only political

---

[491] William Hale, *Türk Dış Politikası: 1774-2000*, Istanbul: Mozaik, 2003, p.319.

[492] Emel Parlar Dal, "The Transformation of Turkey's Relations with the Middle East: Illusion or Awakening?", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.13, No.2, 2012, p.248.

[493] İhsan Dağı, "Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization", *Central European University Center for Policy Studies*, Open Society Institute, 2002, p.18.

but also social and economic bases were targeted".[494] On the other side, in accordance with the coalition protocol, Erbakan resigned on June 18, 1997 in order to hand the prime ministry over to Çiller. But President Demirel appointed Yılmaz, instead of Çiller, to form the government. Yılmaz succeeded in forming the new government, and the RP lost its hopes of coming to power with the DYP again.

In addition, the Turkish Supreme Court of Appeals prosecutor's office prosecuted a file against the RP for the reason of being a focal point for anti-secular activities on May 21, 1997.[495] After the trial, the RP was terminated on January 16, 1998. But İsmail Alptekin founded the FP on December 17, 1997. Recai Kutan was elected party leader on May 14, 1998.[496] In fact, Erbakan was the actual leader although he was sentenced to a five-year ban on politics.

It is noteworthy to remark that different from the RP, the FP did not turn its back to the West, and accordingly to the Westernization process. Kutan explained that the FP would no longer use the old concepts of the *Milli Görüş* tradition such as *Adil Düzen* (Just Order), which were misunderstood, misrepresented and misinterpreted.[497] Furthermore, Kutan stressed the necessity to comply with the Copenhagen criteria required by the EU.[498] Even when the Turkish Parliament took

---

[494] *Ibid*, p.19.

[495] *Hürriyet*, Mayıs 5, 2000.

[496] *Aksiyon*, Mart 7, 2011.

[497] İhsan Dağı, "Transformation of Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.6, No.1, 2005, p.8.

[498] İhsan Dağı, "Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization", *Central European University Center for Policy Studies*, Open Society Institute, 2002, p.22.

the decision to hold elections on November 3, 2002, Kutan said that the FP was supporting the legislation of the new laws required for the EU membership.[499]

However, the change in the party policies did not prevent the emergence of the division between the *Gelenekçiler* (traditionalists) and the *Yenilikçiler* (reformists). The party congress held on May 14, 2000 proved the division clearly once again. Except for Kutan, Abdullah Gül, a moderate member of parliament close to Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, contested for the leadership. Kutan received 633, and Gül received 521 votes.[500] Although Kutan was re-elected in the congress, the *Yenilikçiler* achieved a great success. Indeed, the *Yenilikçiler* realized the limits of the *Milli Görüş* tradition, and started to invest more in the EU accession process in order to gain the support of larger masses in Turkish society.

In other words, the 28 February process had triggered a dramatic transformation process that resulted in political restructuring in pro-Islamist parties. The JDP followed the same path. The rulers of the JDP knew that the Turkish military-bureaucratic elite supporting Western values would not let any derailment from Turkey's Westernization process. As a result, the Erdoğan government gave more importance to Turkey's accession to the EU rather than to pro-Islamic alternatives in its first years.

---

[499] *Hurriyet Daily News*, July 25, 2002.

[500] *Yeni Şafak*, Mayıs 15, 2000.

6.1.2. The EU Accession Process

The process of Turkey's accession to the EU starts with the Ankara Agreement signed between Turkey and the European Economic Community on September 12, 1963 that envisaged the integration of Turkey into the EU with its full membership.[501] Until the JDP rule, the Turkey-EU relations experienced several ups and downs but Turkey's accession process never ended with a final failure. In fact, Turkey's efforts for joining the EU were closely related to its Westernization process and its pro-Western state identity. Accordingly, Turkish Foreign Minister İsmail Cem claims that Turkey has improved its relations with the EU as long as Turkey correctly defines itself. Turkey could gain strength for its targets on the EU by properly arguing the identity problem.[502] That is to say that Turkey's identity discussions have gone hand in hand with its accession process to the EU.

After the JDP's coming to power on November 3, 2002, Turkey's relations with the EU improved until the Brussels Summit of 16-17 December 2004 at which the Council decided to open accession negotiations with Turkey on October 3, 2005.[503] During this period, the JDP tried to advance reforms to fulfil political criteria for the EU accession. The reformation process provided an opportunity for

---

[501] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/relations-between-turkey-and-the-european-union.en.mfa), September 7, 2014 accessed.

[502] İsmail Cem, *Avrupa'nın Birliği ve Türkiye*, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005, p.77.

[503] Sanem Baykal and Tuğrul Arat, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi: AB'yle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt III: 2001-2012)*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2002, p.337.

the JDP to implement its domestic agenda on various issues including economic policy, democratization process and human rights. According to Şaban Kardaş, the JDP attached a special importance to accelerate the EU integration process in order to consolidate its position vis-à-vis other actors in the country and strengthen its domestic legitimization.[504] On this point, it is important to underline that the reforms resulted in the decrease in the military's role on defining Turkey's state identity. This development points to a significant change in terms of the domestic factors taking part in the formation of Turkey's state identity.

6.2. The Impact of Ahmet Davutoğlu

6.2.1. Davutoğlu's Concepts on Civilizations

There is no doubt that Ahmet Davutoğlu has been one of the most influential foreign ministers in modern Turkey's history. Before his appointment as a foreign minister (2009-2014), he served as the chief foreign policy advisor to Prime Minister Erdoğan (2002-2009). Davutoğlu's statements and writings have provided an important indicator about his foreign policy understanding. In particular, his book "*Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*" (Strategic Depth: The International Position of Turkey) is considered the guide of the JDP's foreign policy. This well-known book offers a new approach based on Turkey's history and geography. Besides his book, Davutoğlu's doctoral study also

---

[504] Şaban Kardaş, "Türkiye ve Irak Krizi: Kimlikle Çıkar Arasında AKP", in Hakan Yavuz (ed), *AK Parti: Toplumsal Değişimin Yeni Aktörleri*, Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2010, p.362.

provides a valuable source in this respect. Davutoğlu wrote his doctoral thesis on Islam, more specifically on Islamic philosophy under the supervision of Professor Şerif Mardin, a famous sociologist in Turkey.[505] Moreover, Davutoğlu wrote an article with the title of "*Medeniyetlerin Ben-İdraki*". Davutoğlu primarily examines Basil Mathews' article "*Young Islam on Trek: A Study in the Clash of Civilizations*" of 1926, and Samuel Huntington's article "*Clash of Civilizations*" of 1993 and Huntington's book "*The Clash of Civilizations and The Remaking of World Order*" of 1996. Davutoğlu draws attention to the fact that they prepared their publications in the beginning and in the end of the 20th century. According to him, their writings provide an opportunity to make a comparison. In response to their arguments, Davutoğlu offers a counter-argument against the clash of civilizations.[506]

Within this context, Davutoğlu explains his core argument in which "self-perception" is the key element for the establishment and success of a civilization, and its resistance to other civilizations. Davutoğlu forms a connection between "self-perception" and "identity". He claims that every self-perception turns into an identity.[507] Actually, "the self" is cognitively identified with "the other" from the constructivist perspective.[508] On this basis, Davutoğlu analyses Huntington's "West-Rest" or "self-other" division. Davutoğlu comes to a conclusion that people

---

[505] Gürkan Zengin, *Hoca: Türk Dış Politikası'nda "Davutoğlu Etkisi"*, Istanbul: Inkilap, 2010, p.38.

[506] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Medeniyetlerin Ben-İdraki", *Divan*, Vol.1, 1997, pp.1-3.

[507] *Ibid*, pp.10-11.

[508] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.46, No.2, 1992, pp.394-395.

having different beliefs can live together under the Islamic civilization. This differentiated the Islamic civilization from the Medieval Christian Europe. Hence, the Islamic civilization adopts peaceful methods and cooperates with other civilizations.[509]

In this framework, Davutoğlu provides only two alternative paradigms namely "Western paradigm" and "Islamic paradigm", and does not mention any other civilizations in his writings. Davutoğlu compares the two civilizations, and put them under different categorizations that also imply different identities as a result of the self-perception. Davutoğlu claims that Islamic civilization prefers peaceful methods and cooperation in its relations with other civilizations while Western civilization claims superiority vis-à-vis others. In short, Davutoğlu offers an Islam-centric perspective. By doing so, Davutoğlu rejects the inevitable clash of civilizations[510] argued by Samuel Huntington who claimed that after the end of the Cold War, the main source of conflict would be primarily cultural and the clash of civilizations would dominate global politics.[511]

From his perspective, Turkey, a member of the Islamic civilization, prefers peaceful methods to solve problems. To illustrate, Turkey hosted Khalid Mashal, the leader of Hamas political bureau, in Ankara following Hamas' victory in the Palestinian legislative elections held on 25 January 2006. Israel, a member of the Western civilization, severely criticized Turkey. However, Ankara became the first

---

[509] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Medeniyetlerin Ben-İdraki", *Divan*, Vol.1, 1997, pp.15-22.

[510] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Global Governance", *Center for Strategic Research Vision Papers*, No.2, 2012, p.13.

[511] Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?", *Foreign Affairs,* Vol.72, No.3, 1993, p.22.

door Israel knocked on when Hamas militants captured its soldier Gilad Shalit on 25 January 2006. Ankara responded positively, and became part of the negotiations concluded in 2011.[512]

6.2.2. Davutoğlu's Strategic Depth Theory

Davutoğlu's concepts on civilizations can be regarded from the pro-Islamic point of view. By referring to the importance of the Islamic world, Davutoğlu argues that Turkey possesses a "strategic depth" as a consequence of its history and geographical location, and lists Turkey among a small group of countries which he calls "central powers". According to Şaban Kardaş, there is no common identity driving both the JDP's domestic and foreign policy agendas but a unique "strategic identity" blending both ideology and realpolitik. Moreover, Turkey's foreign policy perspective and its role as a regional power flow from two interrelated influences: "a geopolitical approach involving a desire to conduct international relations according to realpolitik and nineteenth-century diplomacy, and a geocultural approach envisaging a leadership role for Turkey in the historical trajectory of Islamic world".[513] On this basis, Davutoğlu considers that Turkey, in which diverse cultural elements have existed for centuries, has historically been a center of

---

[512] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Teoriden Pratiğe: Türk Dış Politikası Üzerine Konuşmalar*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013, pp.31-32.

[513] Şaban Kardaş, Turkey: "Redrawing the Middle East Map or Building Sandcastles?", *Middle East Policy*, Vol.17, No.1, 2012, pp.123-124.

attraction, and its geography harmonizes these elements.[514] The Balkans, the Caucasus and the Middle East cannot be understood without referring to the Ottoman Empire. For each case, there is a need for historical reference, and Turkey is in the center of history. In geographical terms, Turkey can penetrate in several countries. Hence, the centrality of its history and the penetrability of its geography make Turkey a country, which can be affected at times worst, or reach the greatest potential.[515]

Davutoğlu gives the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 as an example for Turkey not to isolate itself within the context of its historical and geographical depth. He claims that the US could have chosen isolation in accordance with the Monroe Doctrine because it is an island state. Similarly, Japan could have isolated itself. Japan is also an island state. But Turkey cannot. If Turkey isolates itself, fragmentation begins. Turkey should define its position through understanding its temporal, spatial, historical and geographical depths, and open itself to the world as soon as possible.[516] Turkey's hinterlands will serve as a springboard for its power position since Turkey has "the capability of maneuvering in several regions simultaneously".[517] Thus, Turkey must re-define its identity, psychology and

---

[514] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.79.

[515] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Türkiye Söyleşileri 5: Cumhuriyet, Milliyetçilik ve İslamcılık*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2011, pp. 22-23.

[516] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Küresel Bunalım*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları: 2009, pp.194-195.

[517] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.78.

political culture; otherwise, it will not be able to create its own hinterlands.[518] As a result, Bülent Aras considers that currently there is "a process of re-positioning" for Turkey under the JDP rule, which places Turkey in a wider geographical landscape or makes it part of new regions.[519]

On this point, Davutoğlu asserts that Turkey has no gain to formulate a foreign policy based on only one region and should take its near abroad into consideration. If Turkey does not implement a policy derived from its history and geography, Turkey will become a periphery state. For that reason, Davutoğlu defends a new foreign policy framework putting Turkey into a central axis. According to him, there is only one axis: Turkey. By focusing on its near land basin (the Balkans, the Middle East and the Caucasus), its near sea basin (the Black Sea, the Aegean Sea, the Red Sea, the Basra Gulf, the Caspian Sea), and its near continental basin (the Eastern Europe, the Central Asia, the North Africa), its purpose should be to develop a foreign policy based on the Turkey-axis. Hence, the concept of *Merkez Ülke* (the central country) means Turkey, and accordingly its foreign policy understanding is founded on the *Çok Boyutlu Dış Politika* (multi-dimensional foreign policy).[520]

---

[518] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları: 2012, pp.92-93.

[519] Bülent Aras, "Davutoğlu Era in Turkish Foreign Policy", *SETA Policy Brief*, No.32, 2009, p.6.

[520] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Teoriden Pratiğe: Türk Dış Politikası Üzerine Konuşmalar*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013, pp.205-207; Şaban Kardaş, "Türkiye ve Irak Krizi: Kimlikle Çıkar Arasında AKP", in Hakan Yavuz (ed), *AK Parti: Toplumsal Değişimin Yeni Aktörleri*, Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2010, pp.375-376; Ali Balcı and Murat Yeşiltaş, "A Dictionary of Turkish Foreign Policy in the AK Party Era: A Conceptual Map", *SAM Papers*, No.7, 2013, pp.8-9 and pp.13-14.

Based on Davutoğlu's arguments, İbrahim Kalın, the Chief Policy Adviser to Prime Minister Erdoğan and the Director of the Office of Public Diplomacy, claims that Turkey's history and geography were seen as "a burden and impediment to development, modernization, and national unit" by the republican elites in the 1930s and 1940s. However, the new elite and rising social classes are reinterpreting Turkey's history and geography. In addition, this new strategic thinking is also the result of a shift from the nation-state to a new civilizational outlook projecting a cultural, historical and normative dimension into international relations.[521] The emergence of "the new elite and rising social classes" in Kalın's claim points to a change in the domestic factors affecting Turkey's state identity formation process indeed.

Within this context, it seems possible to reach a conclusion that the JDP's domestic agenda is closely related to Turkish foreign policy. Particularly, Davutoğlu's intellectual contributions to the formation of Turkey's state identity such as the concepts of strategic depth, Turkey as the central country and multi-dimensional foreign policy have highly been influential on the definition of Turkey's interests, foreign policy and finally relations with Israel.

---

[521] İbrahim Kalın, "Turkish Foreign Policy: Framework, Values, and Mechanisms", *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis*, Vol.67, No.1, 2012, p.13.

6.2.3. Davutoğlu's Zero-Problem Policy

Davutoğlu considers that Turkey's borders have seemed static because the Cold War formed an international conjuncture based on global fragmentation.[522] However, the end of the Cold War has greatly affected international dynamics, and accordingly the Middle East politics. Its impact has led to new consequences requiring mutual interactions with the regional dynamics.[523] Turkey has experienced the atmosphere of insecurity in the post-Cold War era; in other words, Turkey has faced a variety of security problems with its neighboring countries and regions. In fact, Turkey's relations with its neighbors such as Bulgaria until the early 1990s, and with Iran, Iraq, Syria and Greece until the late 1990s were seriously problematic.

In this Framework, the most important issue for Turkish diplomacy has been "to harmonize Turkey's influential axes with the new international environment".[524] A country in the psychology of being surrounded by enemies shows a defensive reflex rather than taking initiatives.[525] Therefore, Turkey should improve its relations with all neighbors by rescuing itself from this psychology[526]

---

[522] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Teoriden Pratiğe: Türk Dış Politikası Üzerine Konuşmalar*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013, p.343.

[523] Meliha Benli Altunışık, "Ortadoğu ve ABD: Yeni Bir Döneme Girilirken", *Ortadoğu Etütleri*, Vol.1, No.1, 2009, p.70.

[524] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/article-by-h_e_-ahmet-davutoglu-published-in-foreign-policy-magazine-_usa_-on-20-may-2010.en.mfa), May 20, 2013 accessed.

[525] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Teoriden Pratiğe: Türk Dış Politikası Üzerine Konuşmalar*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013, p.113.

[526] *Radikal*, 26 Şubat 2004.

and re-compromise with its own environment in the post-Cold War era. That is to say that Turkey has to achieve an economic and political integration.

Here, the policy of zero-problem with Turkey's neighbors plays an important role as one of the leading principles of Turkish foreign policy under the JDP rule.[527] Davutoğlu believes that Turkey will gain an extraordinary space for maneuver in foreign policy when a zero-problem policy is achieved.[528] This policy aims the creation of a new psychology at home for a new neighboring policy and the minimization of spill-over effect of regional problems to Turkey in its essence.[529] This policy also proposes to form a line of stability around Turkey.[530] According to Aras, the architects of this policy are aware that 'zero problems' is in name only and unattainable. Nevertheless, this policy allowed Turkey to adopt a constructive approach towards its neighborhood and provided new foreign policy tools. So, "this high standard" has helped Turkey avoid "narrow domestic issues" and allowed it to act as an emerging regional power.[531]

In view of that, Turkey attributes great importance to confidence-building measures, acts as a mediator for other countries to overcome differences between

---

[527] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Principles of Turkish Foreign Policy and Regional Political Structuring", *Center for Strategic Research Vision Papers*, No.3, 2012, p.4.

[528] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Teoriden Pratiğe: Türk Dış Politikası Üzerine Konuşmalar*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013, p.114.

[529] Tarık Oğuzlu, "The 'Arab Spring' and the Rise of the 2.0 Version of Turkey's 'zero problems with neighbors' Policy", *SAM Papers*, No.1, 2012, p.4.

[530] Ali Balcı and Murat Yeşiltaş, "A Dictionary of Turkish Foreign Policy in the AK Party Era: A Conceptual Map", *SAM Papers*, No.7, 2013, p.15.

[531] Bülent Aras, "Davutoğlu Era in Turkish Foreign Policy Revisited", *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, Vol.16, No.4, 2014, p.405.

them and finds solutions to long-lasting problems in the neighboring regions.[532] Inspired from the strategic depth theory, the policy of zero-problem in fact shows on which basis Turkey desires to be in interaction with its neighboring countries that continuously defines and re-defines Turkey's state identity.

6.3.   Foreign Policy-Making in the JDP Period

Based on Davutoğlu's ideas affecting both Turkey's state identity and foreign policy indicated above, the JDP has tried to form a new foreign policy methodology that can be explained with three principles. The first methodological principle is having a "visionary" approach. According to this, Turkey prefers adopting a visionary approach to regional issues to accepting a "crisis-oriented" attitude. Turkey has a vision of the Middle East. Turkey focuses on the entire region, and does not confine itself to one specific issue such as terrorism. The second is forming a "consistent and systematic" foreign policy framework dealing with all around the world. This framework opposes to any conflicting approaches to different regions, and regards Turkey's neighboring regions as complementary to each other. The third is adopting a new diplomatic language and style emphasizing Turkish soft power rather than military power. Davutoğlu claims that Turkish foreign policy prioritizes Turkey's civil-economic power in the new term.[533]

---

[532] Bülent Aras, "Davutoğlu Era in Turkish Foreign Policy", *SETA Policy Brief*, No.32, 2009, p.7.

[533] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/article-by-h_e_-ahmet-davutoglu-published-in-foreign-policy-magazine-_usa_-on-20-may-2010.en.mfa), May 20, 2013 accessed.

Besides methodology, there are other mechanisms endorsed by Davutoğlu in order to achieve foreign policy objectives. These mechanisms are an integrated foreign policy approach, a proactive foreign policy line supported by rhythmic diplomacy, a presence on the ground particularly during times of crisis, an equidistance policy, and a total performance in foreign policy.[534] On this point, Davutoğlu stresses that there are no limits to Turkey's diplomacy and it covers the entire world,[535] and accentuates how rhythmic diplomacy, which means Turkey's active involvement in international organizations and its focus on issues of global importance,[536] contributes to other mechanisms.

As for the foreign policy-making, traditionally state and political elites play leading roles. In institutional terms, the state elite comprises from civilian and military officers. After the end of the Cold War, the state elite maintained its primary role on the decision-making processes. William Hale considers that in the 1990s, the Turkish Armed Forces regained their independent policy-maker role because of weak governments.[537] In contrast to the state elite, the political elite had a tendency to represent "the eclectic values of Turkey's societal peripheries".[538] However, the relationship between the state and political elites has changed after

---

[534] Bülent Aras, "Davutoğlu Era in Turkish Foreign Policy", *SETA Policy Brief*, No.32, 2009, pp.7-10.

[535] *Radikal*, Ocak 5, 2010.

[536] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/article-by-h_e_-ahmet-davutoglu-published-in-foreign-policy-magazine-_usa_-on-20-may-2010.en.mfa), May 20, 2013 accessed.

[537] William Hale, *Türk Dış Politikası: 1774-2000*, Istanbul: Mozaik, 2003, p.207.

[538] Philip Robins, "A Double Gravity State: Turkish Foreign Policy Reconsidered", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.33, No.2, 2006, p.208.

the 2002 elections. The JDP's elite, who gained strength from the elections, sociologically represents "an Anatolian counter-elite and a wider, residual population on the edge of the main cities and in the interior towns".[539] Referring to this change, Hüseyin Bağcı highlights the importance of an increasing connection between domestic and foreign policies during the JDP term.[540]

Within this context, it is possible to argue that Turkey has experienced de-securitization and democratization processes. Especially, de-securitization process has rearranged the roles of Turkish military and civil elites. It implies a significant change in the domestic factors defining state identity. De-securitization process has also reduced the military component of foreign policy and opened new rooms for public influence. Therefore, foreign policy has become a more societal process replacing the former elitist structure.[541] As a result, civilian experts and scholars, as well as various think-tanks have begun playing a more important role in foreign policy-making in recent years.[542] On this point, Ali Balcı draws attention to the conservative civil society organizations close to the JDP. Balcı says, different from the past, those organizations such as the IHH Humanitarian Relief Foundation (*İnsan Hak ve Hürriyetleri İnsani Yardım Vakfı - the IHH*) and the Association for Human Rights and Solidarity for the Oppressed (*İnsan Hakları ve Mazlumlar için*

---

[539] *Ibid*.

[540] Interview with Professor Hüseyin Bağcı, July 5, 2013.

[541] Gökhan Bacık, "Turkish-Israeli Relations after Davos: A View from Turkey", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.11, No.2, 2009, p.34.

[542] Kılıç Buğra Kanat, "AK Party's Foreign Policy: Is Turkey Turning Away from the West?", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.12, No.1, 2012, p.216.

Dayanışma Derneği - the Mazlumder) took part in foreign policy process.[543] To exemplify, Gencer Özcan reminds that the IHH's organization of the Mavi Marmara flotilla to break the Israeli blockade on Gaza shaped Turkey's relations with Israel.[544] In this vein, Kılıç Buğra Kanat argues that the participation of more civilian actors in the process of foreign policy-making has increased transparency in comparison to previous decades when foreign policy had been concluded "behind closed doors and with the leadership of the military and foreign policy bureaucracy".[545] In addition, public opinion has gained more importance in foreign policy shaping. Respectively, the Turkish-Israeli relations have been negatively affected by the public opinion. Due to growing skepticism in the public opinion, Tarık Oğuzlu claims that the JDP government cannot easily adopt a cooperative stance toward Israel.[546]

As regards to the role of identity, Davutoğlu argues that the Republic rejected the heritage of the Ottoman state and focused on the construction of a new political culture. In this process, the identity of Islam was abandoned as well.[547]

---

[543] Ali Balcı, *Türkiye Dış Politikası: İlkeler, Aktörler, Uygulamalar*, Istanbul: Etkileşim, 2013, p.289.

[544] Gencer Özcan, "Türk Dış Politikasında Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapı ve Aktörler", in Faruk Sönmezoğlu, Nurcan Özgür Baklacıoğlu and Özlem Terzi (eds), *XXI. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikasının Analizi*, Istanbul: Der Yayınları, 2012, p.47.

[545] Kılıç Buğra Kanat, "AK Party's Foreign Policy: Is Turkey Turning Away from the West?", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.12, No.1, 2012, p.221.

[546] Tarık Oğuzlu, "The Changing Dynamics of Turkey-Israel Relations: A Structural Realist Account", *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol.15, No.2, 2010, p.277.

[547] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları: 2012, p.70.

However, Davutoğlu believes that the Ottoman history is in the center of the Turkish socio-cultural map. An identity excluding the Ottoman identity is too difficult to be maintained. Even though Turkey ignores its Ottoman identity, others continue to define Turkey by it.[548] Hakan Yavuz says, other leading figures of the JDP, especially Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, Abdullah Gül and Bülent Arınç, inspire from the Ottoman Empire as well.[549] Based on the legacy of history in the formation of Turkey's state identity, Davutoğlu believes that every problem in the Middle East is of great interest to Turkey.[550] Hence, Turkey has shown more eagerness to play third party or mediator[551] roles between conflicting parties in the region under the JDP rule.

In fact, Turkey has expressed its interest in playing a third party role in the Middle East as seen in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict since the beginning of the Oslo peace process. While expressing its interest, Turkey often referred to its historical ties with the region. After the outbreak of the second *Intifada* (the Palestinian uprising against Israel) in September 2000, Turkey's mediation in the conflict was pronounced more noticeably owing to an urgent need to end violence. According to Esra Çuhadar Gürkaynak, the calls for Turkey's mediation began

---

[548] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Küresel Bunalım*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları: 2009, p.229.

[549] Hakan Yavuz, "Giriş: Türkiye'de İslami Hareketin Dönüşümünde Yeni Burjuvazinin Rolü", in Hakan Yavuz (ed), *AK Parti: Toplumsal Değişimin Yeni Aktörleri*, Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi: 2010, p.27.

[550] *Ibid*, p.180.

[551] Esra Çuhadar Gürkaynak defines the term of mediation with the followings: "Mediation is a generic term used to define different types of intermediary activities ranging from second track diplomacy/interactive problem-solving workshops to power mediation." Esra Çuhadar Gürkaynak, "Turkey as a Third Party in Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Assessment and Reflections", *Perceptions*, Vol.12, No.1, 2007, p.91.

during the Ecevit government and intensified during the JDP government for the reason that Turkey was seen as a relatively neutral party that both sides had good relations at that time.[552] For the Turkish side, changing geostrategic environment and increasing instability in the region have had repercussions that forced Ankara to become more involved in the management of conflicts. On this point, Turkey's involvement in the resolution of conflicts was regarded as a way to ease Turkey's re-entry into the Middle East.[553] Turkey's attempts for brokering peace in the region will be taken up in detail in Chapter 7.

In this vein, Turkish foreign policy is not independently formed from the state identity. The JDP period has shown that the formation of foreign policy is no longer left only to civilian and military elites. The Anatolian counter-elite coming from conservative socio-cultural background has become an indispensable part in the process of foreign policy-making. This situation has induced an ongoing change in the Turkish state identity indeed.

6.4. Chapter Conclusion

In Chapter 6, this dissertation tries to analyze the ideological background of the JDP government in order to explain the transformation of the domestic factors in Turkey in terms of its impact on Turkey's state identity, and its consequences on

---

[552] *Ibid*, pp.100-101.

[553] Meliha Benli Altunışık, "Turkey's Changing Middle East Policy", *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, No.23, 2012, p.157; Esra Çuhadar Gürkaynak, "Turkey as a Third Party in Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Assessment and Reflections", *Perceptions*, Vol.12, No.1, 2007, p.100; Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2012, p.333.

the formulization and implementation of Turkish foreign policy and accordingly the Turkish-Israeli relations. In the transformation, the 28 February process became decisive on the division of a *Milli Görüş* party, namely the FP, for the first time. The rulers of the JDP coming from the *Yenilikçi kanat* (reformist wing) of the FP realized that the military-bureaucratic elites were pro-Western and would not let any derailment from Turkey's Westernization process as seen during the RP-led coalition. Consistent with this realization, the JDP invested in Turkey's accession to the EU. In fact, the internal reforms, which the EU membership requires, let the JDP find larger maneuver space in domestic politics. Consequently, the role of the military in defining the internal agenda decreased meanwhile the JDP increased its weight on both politics and the public institutions. That is to say that the domestic factors shaping state identity experienced an important internal transformation process implying a change for the Turkish state identity with the impact of the developments in the international system such as the September 11 and afterwards that will be discussed in the following chapters.

In this vein, it will not be wrong to say that since the JDP's coming to power, an identity-related dimension of the JDP leadership's strategic culture, which has been affected by Ahmet Davutoğlu's intellectual contributions, is quite influential on the definition of Turkey's interests and foreign policy-making. To illustrate, Turkey advocates Islamic causes internationally in defending the rights of Palestinians vis-à-vis Israel and expressing concerns over the election of previous Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen as the NATO Secretary-General because of his unpopularity in the Islamic world. These cases could not be

comprehended without the identity-driven aspects of Turkish foreign policy.[554] This situation has had reflections on the Turkish-Israeli relationship which will be studied in the next chapter.

---

[554] Şaban Kardaş, "Turkey: Redrawing the Middle East Map or Building Sandcastles?", *Middle East Policy*, Vol.17, No.1, 2012, p.124-125.

CHAPTER 7

TURKEY-ISRAEL RELATIONS

UNDER THE JDP RULE IN TURKEY (2002-2011)

Following Turkey's relations with Israel in the 1990s defined as "a strategic relationship", the capture of PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan in February 1999 lessened Turkey's need for close cooperation with Israel in the fields of security and intelligence. However, as indicated in Chapter 5, Turkey's state identity did not experience an overall change, instead showed continuity in terms of its pro-Western features in the coalitions term. On this basis, Chapter 7 focuses on the JDP rule (2002-2011) in terms of the role of the domestic factors on the formation of state identity, interests and foreign policy. By taking third parties in the relations, and regional and global developments into account as well, I do argue that in view of both the domestic factors and the international system/dynamics, Turkey's state identity has experienced a crucial change during the JDP period which has been more visible on Turkey-Israel relations.

7.1.   The JDP in Power

7.1.1. The First Term in Power (3 November 2002 - 22 July 2007)

The results of the 2002 national elections dramatically changed the political composition in Turkey. None of the three members of the 1999-2002 coalition government, namely the DSP, the Nationalist Movement Party (*Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi* - the MHP) and the ANAP, was able to win at least 10% of votes to enter the GNAT. Only two parties, the JDP and the CHP, passed the election threshold. The JDP won 34% of the vote and 363 of the 550 parliamentary seats whereas the CHP garnered 19% of the vote and 178 seats, and the Independents gained 9 seats.[555] In other words, the JDP succeeded in holding almost 2/3 of the Turkish parliament and became the single ruling party. Following the first results of the elections, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the leader of the JDP, stated at the Party's headquarters that "We will not spend our time dizzy with victory. We will build a Turkey where common sense prevails". In fact, the emphasis on "common sense" in his statement was regarded as a quick act to soothe fears of overturning Turkey's pro-Western stance.[556]

The new government was formed under Abdullah Gül's premiership because Erdoğan was prevented from participating in the parliamentary elections by a Court decision that stipulated a political ban on Erdoğan who had recited a

---

[555]   (http://www.ysk.gov.tr/ysk/docs/2002MilletvekiliSecimi/turkiye/milletvekilisayisigrafik.pdf), July 23, 2013 accessed.

[556] *Hurriyet Daily News*, November 4, 2002.

poem in Siirt in December 1997. But the Supreme Election Board cancelled the general election results of Siirt in December 2002 because of voting irregularities, and a new election was scheduled on February 9, 2003.[557] This time, Erdoğan was able to run for the parliamentary elections in Siirt thanks to a legal change, his party received 85% of the vote and he was elected to Parliament. After Abdullah Gül handed over the post, Erdoğan became the new prime minister.

The victory of the JDP, a party whose roots come from political Islam and which attaches utmost importance to the Islamic world,[558] signaled further intensification in the process of normalization in the Middle East,[559] a process that had already begun in the coalition governments term during the 1990s. The JDP's coming to power in Turkey had a positive impact in the Muslim world in general.[560]

Similarly, the JDP government was affirmatively assessed in Israel as well. The bilateral relations continued as before. To illustrate, Ambassador Yoav Biran, the Acting Director General at the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Lieutenant General Moshe Yaalon, the IDF Chief of Staff, paid official visits to

---

[557](http://www.ysk.gov.tr/ysk/content/conn/YSKUCM/path/Contribution%20Folders/Kararlar/Ilke%20Kararlari/2002-978-karar.htm?_afrLoop=17898620994558569), July 23, 2013 accessed.

[558] Meliha Benli Altunışık and Özlem Tür, "From Distant Neighbors to Partners? Changing Syrian-Turkish Relations", *SAGE Publications*, Vol.37, No.2, 2006, p.233.

[559] Kılıç Buğra Kanat, "AK Party's Foreign Policy: Is Turkey Turning Away from the West?", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.12, No.1, 2012, p.210.

[560] Özlem Tür, "Turkey and Israel in the 2000s - From Cooperation to Conflict", *Israel Studies*, Vol.17, No.3, p.51.

Turkey in December 2002.[561] Then, two Turkish frigates participated in the fifth "Reliant Mermaid", a trilateral humanitarian search and rescue (SAR) exercise involving naval ships and aircraft from Turkey, Israel and the US[562] in the Mediterranean Sea which took place in December 2002 through January 2003. On this point, Hasan Kösebalaban argues that according to military-bureaucratic elites, Turkey's relations with Israel under the new government would show to what extent the JDP was committed to secularism. If a change in the relations had occurred, it would have been regarded as a clear sign of the government's Islamic identity.[563] On the other hand, there were some Israeli politicians such as Danny Danon, the Deputy Head of the Knesset, who were suspicious of the new Turkish prime minister. Danon believed that after Erdoğan had taken office in 2003, his political agenda was clear: "To flex his country's muscles and prove its ability to lead the Muslim world".[564]

Nevertheless, high-level Turkish-Israeli visits intensified when the US attacked Iraq in March 2003. Israeli Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Silvan Shalom visited Turkey in April 2003. According to Michael Bishku, Shalom reassured the Turkish authorities that Israel was opposed to the formation of a

---

[561] Kılıç Buğra Kanat, "Continuity of Change in Turkish Foreign Policy under the JDP Government: The Cases of Bilateral Relations with Syria and Israel", *Arab Studies Quarterly*, Vol.34, No.4, 2012, p.243.

[562] (http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/reliant-mermaid.htm), July 29, 2013 accessed.

[563] Hasan Kösebalaban, *Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: BigBang, 2014, p.336.

[564] Danny Danon, *Israel: The Will to Prevail*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, pp.34-35.

Kurdish state in northern Iraq.[565] In May 2003, Israeli Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz visited Turkey and met with his Turkish counterpart Vecdi Gönül. The Turkish media indicated that the visit was for fixing the defense relations which had been compromised due to some Israeli companies' failure to abide by the terms of certain defense contracts and "their attempts to increase prices not in line with the contract terms and the delay in projects".[566]

In July 2003, Israeli President Moshe Katsav with a delegation of more than 100 businessmen paid an official visit to Turkey. During the visit, Turkey's possible contributions to the Road Map for a permanent solution to the Middle East conflict, which was prepared by the diplomatic Quartet (UN, US, EU and Russia) and released by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan,[567] were discussed. The visit also highlighted the growing trade relations between the two countries.[568] In the same month, the Interparliamentary Friendship Group between Turkey and Israel was formed. The Group had 289 Turkish Members of Parliament, 183 of them were from the JDP, and JDP Member Suat Kılıç became the head of the Group. On the other side, only 40 Turkish Members of Parliament preferred to participate in the Interparliamentary Friendship Group with Palestine.[569]

---

[565] Michael B. Bishku, "How Has Turkey Viewed Israel?", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, p.180.

[566] *Hurriyet Daily News*, July 10, 2003.

[567] *Milliyet*, Temmuz 9, 2003.

[568] *JTA*, July 15, 2003.

[569] *Milliyet*, Temmuz 22, 2003.

However, the problematic relations between Israel and the PLO made the application of the Road Map for a permanent solution to the conflict difficult, and caused negative consequences for the Turkish-Israeli relations. Referring to the killing of Hamas leader Ahmed Yassin by Israel in March 2004, Prime Minister Erdoğan defined his assassination as "a terrorism incident" and added that there was nothing resembling a road map left.[570] Without any interruption, the frequency and harshness of criticism of Israel significantly increased. Erdoğan once again accused Israel of "state terrorism" after an Israeli operation to root out weapons smuggling tunnels led to the demolition of several houses in Ramah, Jerusalem. In addition, Foreign Minister Gül told that the attacks could adversely affect the Turkish-Israeli relations.[571] At last, Turkey called its Ambassador to Tel Aviv Feridun Sinirlioğlu and Consular-General to Jerusalem Hüseyin Avni Bıçaklı to Ankara for consultations in June 2004.[572]

Under the conditions, Israeli Deputy Prime Minister and Industry, Trade and Labor Minister Ehud Olmert paid an official visit to Turkey in July 2004 for the Turkey-Israel Joint Economic Council meeting. Olmert met President Ahmet Necdet Sezer, along with Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül, State Minister for Economic Affairs Ali Babacan, Transportation and Communications Minister Binali Yıldırım, and Energy and Natural Resources Minister Hilmi Güler. But

---

[570] *Haaretz*, March 26, 2004.

[571] Soner Çağaptay, "Where goes the US-Turkish Relationship?", *Middle East Quarterly*, Vol.11, No.4, 2004, p.48.

[572] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.440.

Prime Minister Erdoğan refused to meet Olmert with the excuse that "the appointment did not fit his schedule and later, that he would be on holiday".[573]

Moreover, Turkish Ambassador Ümit Pamir, the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations, submitted a letter dated 15 July 2004 addressed to the Secretary-General Kofi Annan. The letter transmitted the final communiqué and the resolutions adopted by the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, which was held in Istanbul on 14-16 June 2004:

> The Conference stressed the need for an end to Israel's occupation of Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967 and called for the withdrawal of Israeli occupation forces from all occupied Palestinian territories, including Al-Quds Al-Sharif to the 4 June 1967 borders. It also stressed the need to establish an independent Palestinian State with Al-Quds Al-Sharif as its capital.[574]

Furthermore, on July 20, 2004, Turkey voted in favor of a resolution at the UN General Assembly that declared the construction of a separation barrier in and around the West Bank to be illegal. The resolution ordered Israel "to halt construction on its security barrier in the West Bank, tear down the portions built on Palestinian land, and provide reparations to Palestinians whose lives have been harmed by the wall".[575] In this framework, Palestinian Prime Minister Ahmed Qurei visited Turkey in September 2004. During the visit, Prime Minister Erdoğan received the Palestinian Prime Minister, and Foreign Minister Gül hosted a dinner

---

[573] Özlem Tür, "Turkey and Israel in the 2000s: From Cooperation to Conflict", *Israel Studies*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, p.54.

[574] (http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/D1572095E8C5096585256F6A007459ED), November 4, 2013 accessed.

[575] (http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2004/ga10248.doc.htm), November 4, 2013 accessed.

in honor of Prime Minister Qurei as well. His meeting was scheduled for talks regarding the peace process in the Middle East.[576] Indeed, Palestine/Palestinian issue has gained more importance on Turkey's foreign policy agenda in accordance with the JDP's ideological foundations.

On the other hand, the JDP government developed a pragmatic approach to Turkey's economic and commercial relations with Israel. Both countries continued to enhance their cooperation in different sectors such as water and energy. On March 4, 2004, the two countries signed an agreement on the Manavgat River's water, which committed "Israel to buy 50 million cubic meters of water annually from Turkey for the next twenty years", and then, on May 24, 2004, the Turkish Zorlu Group signed "an $800 million contract with Israel to build and manage three energy plants".[577] However, in 2006, Israel announced that it had given up the project. Nuri Yeşilyurt explains the reasons behind the decision as follows: First, the state guarantee could not be given to Israel because of the privatization of the government-oriented plants in Turkey. Second, the cost of extracting fresh water from the sea basin was lower than importing water. Third, the Israeli opponent parties had objections on their country being dependent upon a Muslim country for water.[578]

---

[576] *Hurriyet Daily News*, September 1, 2004.

[577] (http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/political-troubles-between-turkey-and-israel-implications-of-booming-bilate), July 29, 2013 accessed.

[578] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.450.

Nonetheless, the international system/dynamics have maintained its impact on the Turkish-Israeli relations. Following the death of PLO leader Yasser Arafat, the PLO experienced a process of restructuring. This process calmed down the tense relations between Israel and the PLO, a development welcomed by Turkey as well. In addition, the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip in August 2005 was regarded as an important step towards achieving peace. Moreover, the US, which had plans on its Greater Middle East Project, urged its close allies, Turkey and Israel, to improve their relations.[579] In short, regional and global developments, which were closely linked to the international system/dynamics shaping Turkey's state identity, were influential on Turkey's relations with Israel.

On those lines, Foreign Minister Gül visited Israel on January 3-5, 2005. During the visit, Gul was accepted by Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon who noted that Israel attached great importance to advancing its relations with Turkey, and invited Prime Minister Erdoğan to visit Israel. In return, Foreign Minister Gül said that the bilateral relations were "very special, strong and stable". He added that Turkey and Israel were the only two democracies in the Middle East, and there should be a greater number of democracies in the region.[580] Indeed, the statements of Foreign Minister Gül pointed to the consistency of Turkish foreign policy under the JDP rule in its first years in terms of Turkey's good relations with Israel despite

---

[579] Nuri Yeşilyurt and Atay Akdevelioğlu, "AKP Döneminde Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu Politikası", in İlhan Uzgel and Bülent Duru (eds), *AKP Kitabı: Bir Dönüşümün Bilançosu (2002-2009)*, Ankara: Phoenix, 2013, pp.392-393.

[580](http://mfa.gov.il/MFA/PressRoom/2005/Pages/PM%20Sharon%20meets%20with%20Turkish%20FM%20Gul%204-Jan-2005.aspx), November 7, 2013 accessed.

the fact that Israel was severely criticized by the Turkish statesmen when Israel had violent clashes with the Palestinian side.

In compliance with the spirit of the political relations, a military dialogue meeting was held between the Turkish and Israeli officials in January 2005. Moreover, Turkey and Israel, along with the US, held military exercises off the coast of Syria in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea in early 2005.[581] On February 1, 2005, Israeli Chief of Staff Moshe Yaalon paid a visit to Ankara, and met with his Turkish counterpart Hilmi Özkök to strengthen military cooperation.[582] Following the visit, in April 2005, Turkey decided to buy unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) from the Israel Aircraft Industries (IAI) and an Israeli company Elbit Systems at a cost of $183 million. Through this deal, Turkey would acquire 10 Heron UAVs, surveillance payloads and ground control stations.[583] However, it will not be until 2009 that the two countries would reach an agreement on this issue.[584]

---

[581] (http://www.globalresearch.ca/triple-alliance-the-us-turkey-israel-and-the-war-on-lebanon/2906), November 7, 2013 accessed.

[582] Özlem Tür, "Turkey and Israel in the 2000s: From Cooperation to Conflict", *Israel Studies*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, p.54.

[583] (http://www.defenseindustrydaily.com/israeli-manufacturers-win-150m-turkish-uav-contract-updated-0389/), October 27, 2013 accessed.

[584] A crisis occurred between Turkey and Israel due to the delivery of 10 Heron UAVs. Upon the constant delays of the above-mentioned delivery due to technical reasons, in November 2009, it was reported that Turkey gave the Israeli contractors a 50 day ultimatum so as for them to fulfil their contract. In December 2009, Turkey and Israel reached an agreement on the issue. Moreover, Israeli Defence Minister Ehud Barak paid an official visit to Ankara on January 17, 2010. Barak was not accepted by President Gül and Prime Minister Erdoğan but met with Foreign Minister Davutoğlu and National Defence Minister Gönül. During the visit, the delivery of the UAVs was discussed. Finally, the delivery process was completed in August 2010; regardless of this, problems did not end. The UAVs broke down in 2011 and were sent to Israel for the repair. The long reparation process was perceived as an arbitrary application and was criticized by Turkey. http://defense-update.com/newscast/1109/news/heron_turkey_251109.html; Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: İletişim, 2013, p.449.

In April 2005, Israel announced its support of the Turkish candidacy for non-permanent membership in the UN Security Council. After the announcement, Prime Minister Erdoğan visited Israel in May 2005. The purpose of the visit was to prevent any cost of deteriorating relations with the US due to Erdoğan's criticism of Israel.[585] But Turkey and Israel shared common interests on combating the existing threats being posed. Therefore, Erdoğan and Sharon agreed on the establishment of a "hot line" for the exchange of intelligence on terror between the two countries.[586] In addition, the purchase of missiles from Israel and the modernization of Turkish F-4 fighters were also discussed during the visit.[587] On this point, Özlem Tür draws attention to the timing of the visit: "The fact that Arafat had died in the meantime also provided a convenient context for this visit. Erdoğan's visit was influential in relieving pressure and putting relations back on track".[588] Prime Minister Erdoğan also visited the West Bank and met with Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas and Prime Minister Ahmet Qurei. Before his visit to Palestine, Erdoğan said "I came here to contribute to the peace process" at a news conference with Israeli Prime Minister Sharon.[589] Within this context, his

---

[585] Philip Robins, Turkish Foreign Policy since 2002: Between a 'Post-Islamist' Government and a Kemalist State, *International Affairs,* Vol.83, No.2, 2007, pp. 299-300.

[586] Ofra Bengio, "Altercating Interests and Orientations between Israel and Turkey: A View from Israel", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.11, No.2, 2009, pp.48-49.

[587] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.448.

[588] Özlem Tür, "Turkey and Israel in the 2000s: From Cooperation to Conflict", *Israel Studies*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, p.54.

[589] *The New York Times*, May 2, 2005.

statement was regarded as a reflection of Turkey's interest in taking a third party role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Prime Minister Erdoğan visited the US on June 6-7, 2005. In the visit, the Anti-Defamation League awarded Erdoğan *the Courage to Care Award*.[590] In the award ceremony, Erdoğan strongly condemned anti-Semitism and stressed close relations between Turkey and Israel.[591]

Before taking a third party role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Turkey had brokered the direct talks between Israeli Foreign Minister Silvan Shalom and Pakistani Foreign Minister Khurshid Mahmud Kasuri in Istanbul in September 2005. Simon Henderson and Soner Çağaptay consider this to have been a historic moment because up to then there had been no public official contacts between the two states since their establishments.[592]

But then again the Turkish-Israeli relations experienced a period of crisis following the success of Hamas in the Palestinian parliamentary elections of January 2006. A Hamas delegation headed by Khaled Mashal visited Ankara in February 2006 when "Israel stepped up its violence in Gaza, withheld funds it was legally obligated to transmit to the Palestinian Authority, tightened its siege and even cut off the flow of water to the arid Gaza Strip".[593] Under these conditions,

---

[590] (http://archive.adl.org/PresRele/ASInt_13/4730_13.htm), October 26, 2013 accessed.

[591] Banu Eligür, "Crisis in Turkish-Israeli Relations (December 2008-June 2011): From Partnership to Enmity", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.48, No.3, 2012, p.430.

[592] (http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/engaging-israel-the-significance-of-the-istanbul-meeting-between-israel-and), October 27, 2013 accessed.

[593] Noam Chomsky, *Making the Future: Operations, Interventions, Empire and Resistance*, London: Penguin Books, 2012, p.31.

the purpose of Turkey was to mediate between Israel and Hamas. Hüseyin Bağcı says, "Ankara offered Hamas a political platform is a significant event because Turkey gave Hamas exactly the signals that the Americans and Israelis wanted: Recognize Israel, renounce terrorism and be a democratic organization".[594] Bağcı asks, "Who else could give Hamas such messages except Turkey?"[595] So, Turkey became the first country which officially met with Hamas.[596]

This mediation caused tension between Turkey and Israel. Concerning the meeting, Israeli Foreign Ministry Spokesman Raanan Gissin: "I wonder what the Turkish authorities would think if we were to invite Abdullah Öcalan for talks in Israel?"[597] The Turkish Foreign Ministry announced that the comparison in Gissin's statement was completely groundless and wrong.[598] Then, Israeli Ambassador to Ankara, Pinhas Avivi was called to the Turkish Foreign Ministry but Avivi refused. Avivi explained the reason for the refusal: "If we had met in the Foreign Ministry, we would have been formally accepting a Hamas which has not embraced the ideas of recognizing Israel and giving up armed violence."[599] Instead of the Foreign Ministry, Avivi visited the JDP headquarters, and met Şaban Dişli,

---

[594] Hüseyin Bağcı, *Zeitgeist: Global Politics and Turkey*, Ankara: Orion, 2008, pp.578-579.

[595] *Ibid,* p.579.

[596] Özlem Tür, "Turkey and Israel in the 2000s: From Cooperation to Conflict", *Israel Studies*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, p.55.

[597] (http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/4724498.stm), November 8, 2013 accessed.

[598](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_26---17-subat-2006_-israil-basbakanlik-sozcusunun-aciklamasi-hk_.tr.mfa), November 8, 2013 accessed.

[599] *Hurriyet*, February 22, 2006.

the JDP's Deputy Head, and Akif Gülle, the advisor of the Prime Minister, in order to discuss on the diplomatic crisis. After the meeting, Ambassador Avivi said that "There is no problem between the two friendly countries; Turkey and Israel. Official ties ought to be kept as pleasant as they were in the past, because Israel does not intend to end the amity".[600]

Ofra Bengio argues that Mashal's visit to Turkey was "a harbinger of things to come" which would be experienced in the Turkish-Israeli relations. The JDP, which aimed at enhancing its position in the Muslim world, preferred granting Hamas legitimacy to excluding Hamas from the political arena as most countries did.[601] Different from Bengio, Bülent Aras claims that the target of Turkish foreign policy was to integrate Hamas into the political arena, which might have resulted in the persuasion of Hamas to accept a truce with Israel in exchange for Israel's lifting of Gaza's blockade.[602] In that regard, Bengio reminds us that Israel did choose Egypt, not Turkey, for the mediation with Hamas.[603]

In fact, the ongoing formation of Turkey's state identity under the JDP rule had important political implications for the Turkish-Israeli relations in the shade of Mashal's visit. First of all, different from its traditional policy towards the Middle East, the JDP government chose a pro-active foreign policy in the region. Within

---

[600] *Today's Zaman*, February 22, 2006.

[601] Ofra Bengio, "Altercating Interests and Orientations between Israel and Turkey: A View from Israel", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.11, No.2, 2009, p.44.

[602] Bülent Aras, "Davutoğlu Era in Turkish Foreign Policy", *SETA Policy Brief*, No.32, 2009, pp.10-11.

[603] Ofra Bengio, "Turkey's Quiet Revolution and Its Impact on Israel", *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs,* Vol.4, No.1, 2010, p.18.

this context, it was possible to claim that Turkey gradually began to experience a change in its state identity as a consequence of both the domestic factors and the international environment influenced by the September 11 and the 2003 US-Iraq War. In parallel to the consolidation of the JDP's power and rule in the state apparatus/institutions, the Erdoğan government began to mention Turkey's leading role inspired by its socio-historical background, in other words the Ottoman legacy, in the Middle East. On this point, the election victory of Hamas paved the way for Turkey to get more involved in the regional issues. Mashal's visit gave Turkey a significant opportunity to send a clear message to the West and the Arab/Islamic world that Turkey would try to increase its political weight in the Middle East. To achieve this aim, Turkey would rhetorically make particular emphasis on its common identity with the region. To illustrate, Ahmet Davutoğlu argues that Turkey has historical and geographic depth in the Middle East. None of the problems in the region can be understood without the historical background of which Turkey is in the center.[604] To him, there is a historical fact that Turkey is the successor of the Ottoman Empire. All those people or nations, who were ruled by the Empire, have certain expectations from Turkey today.[605] Hence, it is no longer possible to say that "the Middle East does not interest Turkey"; instead, whatever

---

[604] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Teoriden Pratiğe: Türk Dış Politikası Üzerine Konuşmalar*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013, pp.68-89.

[605] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Turkish Vision of Regional and Global Order: Theoretical Background and Practical Implementation", *Political Reflection*, Vol.1, No.2, 2010, p.41.

happens in the Middle East is important for Turkey, and this has power to influence the internal parameters of Turkey.[606]

On this basis, in January 2006, Foreign Minister Gül paid visits to Israel and Palestine in order to discuss a plan for a tripartite industrial zone between Turkey, Israel and Palestine to be built in the Gaza Strip. However, despite Turkey's efforts, the Israeli and Palestinian counterparts did not come together for the signing ceremony. Therefore, Foreign Minister Gül signed agreements with the two sides separately.[607] Gül signed the agreement with his Palestinian counterpart Nasser al-Qudwa in Ramallah, and then met with his Israeli counterpart Silvan Shalom in Jerusalem on the same day.[608]

In addition, Israeli Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni visited Turkey in May 2006. During the visit, the bilateral relations, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and regional issues were discussed.[609] In return, in June 2006, President Ahmet Necdet Sezer paid a visit to Israel and met his Israeli counterpart Moshe Katsav, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and opposition leader Benjamin Netanyahu. In the meetings, the bilateral political and economic relations and the then current regional issues were discussed.[610] President Sezer also visited the West

---

[606] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Teoriden Pratiğe: Türk Dış Politikası Üzerine Konuşmalar*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013, p.83.

[607] *Turkish Weekly*, January 5, 2006.

[608] *Hurriyet Daily News*, March 7, 2006.

[609] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_84---24-mayis-2006_-israil-basbakan-yardimcisi-ve-disisleri-bakani-tzipi-livni_nin-ulkemizi-ziyareti-hk_.tr.mfa), November 10, 2013 accessed.

[610] (http://www.tccb.gov.tr/ahmet-necdet-sezer-basin-aciklamalari/494/60412/israile-ve-filistine-resmi-ziyaret.html), November 10, 2013 accessed.

Bank to meet Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas. President Sezer indicated a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict based on the UN Security Council Resolutions and the Road Map,[611] and expressed the thought that "We want an independent and peaceful Palestine state next to Israel with internationally-recognized borders".[612]

Such high-level visits proved that Turkey would prefer to develop a multi-dimensional approach to the Middle East including good relations with Israel rather than focus only on the Arab/Islamic world. While having stressed its close historical and cultural ties to the region, Turkey did not ignore the importance of Israel. Özlem Tür confirms that pragmatic interests particularly in the fields of economy, trade and military were the main subjects of the Turkish-Israeli relations in this term.[613]

On June 10, 2006, the Turkish Foreign Ministry condemned Israel for the death of seven Palestinian civilians on a Gaza beach, and expressed concerns about the escalations of tension in the Middle East.[614] After the Palestinian groups had organized an attack on the Kerem Shalom Crossing and abducted an Israeli soldier on 25 June, the Israel army entered the Gaza Strip on June 28. Israel Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Livni phoned Foreign Minister Gül to seek Turkey's

---

[611] (http://www.tccb.gov.tr/ahmet-necdet-sezer-basin-aciklamalari/494/60414/israil-cumhurbaskani-moshe-katsav-ile-gorusmelerinden-sonra-basina-yaptiklari-aciklama.html), November 10, 2013 accessed.

[612] *Today's Zaman*, June 9, 2006.

[613] Interview with Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür, April 14, 2016.

[614] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_90---10-haziran-2006_-israil-ordusu-tarafindan-atilan-top-mermileri-nedeniyle-yasamini-yitiren-filistinliler-hk_.tr.mfa), November 10, 2013 accessed.

support for rescuing the abducted soldier, and Gül called Palestinian Prime Minister Ismail Haniyeh on the issue. The Turkish Foreign Ministry issued a statement, which called on the Palestinians to give the abducted Israeli soldier back, and the Israelis to put an end to the military operation at the Gaza Strip in order to prevent the tension from converting into a deep crisis in the Middle East.[615] Moreover, in July 2006, Foreign Minister Gül visited Washington D.C. for talks with US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice on the crisis while Ahmet Davutoğlu, the Chief Adviser to the Prime Minister, visited Damascus to convince Syrian President Bashar al-Assad to defuse the escalating crisis between Israel and Palestine.[616]

On July 18, 2006, the Turkish Foreign Ministry stated that Turkey would send 630 tons of flour to the Palestinians as the first batch of humanitarian aid by the Turkish Red Crescent, which would provide a total of 10,000 tons of flour to the Palestinians. In addition, the statement reported that Turkey was working on sending food aid worth 1 million US dollars to the Palestinians through the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. Furthermore, Turkey would donate 1 million US dollars to the Palestinians for the development of small and medium scale industries by the end of 2006.[617]

---

[615](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_99---28-haziran-2006_-israil-ordusu_nun-gazze-seridi_ne-girmesi-hk_.tr.mfa), November 10, 2013 accessed.

[616](http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/9245AB5CBAD33674852571CE006C5DDF), November 10, 2013 accessed.

[617](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_113---18-temmuz-2006_-turkiye_nin-filistin_e_yaptigi-insani_yardimlar-hk__.tr.mfa), November 10, 2013 accessed.

On July 12, 2006, three IDF soldiers were killed in an assault and the Hezbollah militants on the Israeli-Lebanese border abducted two others. In response, the IDF sent troops across the border, attacked the Hezbollah military targets and imposed an air and naval blockade. The regional crisis was an important test for the Turkish-Israeli relations. On 30 July, the Turkish Foreign Ministry stated Israel used disproportionate and indiscriminate force in Lebanon, and this course of affairs eroded "the foundation of peaceful coexistence in the region."[618] 26 members resigned from the Turkish-Israeli Inter-Parliamentary Friendship Group on 1 August. On the following day, all opposition CHP members of the 263-member group also resigned their membership.[619] Deputy Group Chairman Haluk Koç from the CHP said, Israel had implemented state terrorism and used disproportionate force.[620] Turkish-Palestinian Inter-Parliamentary Friendship Group Chairman Hüseyin Tanrıverdi from the JDP called the Qana bombing in Lebanon worse than Hitler's practices, and claimed that Israel blew winds of terror in the Middle East with the support of the UN, the US and Western countries.[621] On 3 August, the Commission on Human Rights of the GNAT held a meeting on the Israeli attack on Lebanon. Head of the Commission Mehmet Elkatmış from the JDP repeatedly expressed the opinion that "Israel was exercising state terror" and Elkatmış had an impression that "Israel was taking the revenge of

---

[618](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_115---30-july-2006_-press-release-regarding-the_israeli-military-operations-in-lebanon__unofficial-translation_.en.mfa), July 5, 2014 accessed.

[619] *Milliyet*, Ağustos 2, 2006.

[620] (http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/develop/owa/haber_portal.aciklama?p1=36386), July 5, 2014 accessed.

[621] *Hürriyet*, Ağustos 2, 2006.

the genocide carried out by Hitler from innocent people".[622] Despite the Turkish criticism of the Israeli attacks on Lebanon, Israeli officials supported the participation of the Turkish army in the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). After the deployment of the Turkish soldiers in south Lebanon in December 2006, a direct communication mechanism was set up as a guarantee for their security.[623]

In the same vein, Israeli Prime Minister Olmert visited Ankara in February 2007. The Israeli side, as a symbolic sign of its trust to Turkey, accepted the visit of a Turkish delegation to the Al-Aqsa Mosque on 20 March in order to investigate the construction around the Mosque.[624] In addition, a face-to-face meeting between Erdoğan and Olmert resulted in Turkey's mediation between Israel and Syria to reach a peace agreement. In other words, the indirect talks between Israel and Syria began with this visit.[625]

To make an assessment for the JDP's first term (2002-2007), as mentioned before, the JDP government invested in Turkey's EU accession process which provided the JDP rulers an important opportunity to pursue its own agenda on various policies and consolidate its place in domestic politics. During this period, the JDP increased its presence in the state apparatus/institutions whereas the role of

---

[622] Mehmet Mücahit Ekinci, *Turkish-Israeli Relations: Past and Present*, Ankara: Ankamat Matbaacılık, 2011, p.136.

[623] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.448.

[624] *Ibid*, pp.441-442.

[625] *Yedioth Ahronoth*, February 12, 2007.

the military decreased in internal affairs. The confrontation between the two sides revealed when an online statement, also known as E-Memorandum (*E-Muhtıra*), was released on the website of the General Staff in 2007 before the presidential elections. In spite of the statement, the JDP won almost 47% of the vote and 341 parliamentary seats in the general elections held on July 22, 2007. Then, Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül, whose wife wears the Islamic headscarf, was elected president. Those developments showed the domestic factors were in the process of change.

However, as indicated in this dissertation's state identity definition, change in the international system/dynamics is required for an overall change. Within this context, it can be argued that the September 11 before the JDP rule, and then the 2003 US-Iraq War during the first JDP rule highly affected regional developments, and meant indeed a continuation of the dramatic change in the international system following the end of the Cold War. To clarify, Davutoğlu argues that he defines the period from 1989 to 2001 as "long ceasefires term" (*uzun ateşkesler dönemi*) since this period did not offer a new global order. Accordingly, Davutoğlu believes that September 11 proved this term could no longer be maintained, and let the US reshape the international order.[626] Nuri Yeşilyurt and Atay Akdevelioğlu consider that the transformation of the US' Middle East policy after the September 11 forced Turkey to focus on its southern borders. There were two turning points for Turkey: 1998 and 2003. In 1998, Turkey began to solve its chronic problems with its neighboring countries that provided needed ground for Turkey's possible opening to the Middle East. In 2003, the US-Iraq War formed a regional conjuncture in

---

[626] *Radikal*, Şubat 26, 2004.

which Turkey could be a more influential actor.[627] As a consequence, Davutoğlu discusses that Turkey must reinterpret its geography and history when international context is changing. He adds that international context has change when he wrote his book "*Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*" (Strategic Depth: The International Position of Turkey).[628]

7.1.2. The Second Term in Power (22 July 2007 - 12 June 2011)

Foreign Minister Ali Babacan visited Israel on a Middle Eastern tour on October 7-8, 2007. Babacan invited Israeli President Peres to Turkey on behalf of President Gül. On October 8, Foreign Minister Babacan met Palestinian President Abbas in Ramallah. In an interview given at the Palestinian Television, President Abbas said that joint Palestinian-Israeli teams were working to construct a document as a basis for peace negotiations while Babacan stated in an interview at Israel's Channel 2 television that he was trying to facilitate communication in the Middle East.[629] President Abbas was also invited to Turkey. Israeli President Peres and Palestinian President Abbas came together in Ankara in November 2007 before the Annapolis Summit. On the occasion of the visit, Shimon Peres became the first

---

[627] Nuri Yeşilyurt and Atay Akdevelioğlu, "AKP Döneminde Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu Politikası", in İlhan Uzgel and Bülent Duru (eds), *AKP Kitabı: Bir Dönüşümün Bilançosu (2002-2009)*, Ankara: Phoenix, 2013, pp.384-385.

[628] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Turkish Vision of Regional and Global Order: Theoretical Background and Practical Implementation", *Political Reflection*, Vol.1, No.2, 2010, p.43.

[629] *ITN Source*, October 9, 2007.

Israeli head of state to address the GNAT.[630] According to Selin Bölme, this important initiative represented the changing vision of Turkish foreign policy. In fact, the Turkish government was invited to the Annapolis Summit as a result of the success in the Ankara meeting.[631]

During the winter of 2008-2009, a three-week armed conflict in the Gaza Strip caused a new period of crisis in the Turkish-Israeli relations. Israel launched airstrikes on the Gaza Strip so as to destroy Hamas security facilities in a response to its rocket fire on December 27, 2008; regrettably, the military operation caused more than 225 civilian deaths.[632] In January 2009, Prime Minister Erdoğan asked for reconsideration of Israel's membership to the UN.[633] Erdoğan asked: "How is such a country, which does not implement resolutions of the UN Security Council, allowed to enter through the gates of the UN (headquarters)?"[634] Erdoğan personally felt betrayed since Olmert visited Turkey just before Israel's operation, participated in meeting between himself and the Syrian foreign minister in Ankara, and promised that Israel would not use force in Palestine.[635]

---

[630] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/sub.en.mfa?3be23940-2ce6-4541-bcf2-66e4a2bb5ea5), November 27, 2014 accessed.

[631](http://setadc.org/pdfs/SETA_Policy_Brief_No_05_Ankara_Annapolis_Selin_Bolme.pdf), November 24, 2014 accessed.

[632] *The New York Times*, December 27, 2008.

[633] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.442.

[634] *Yedioth Ahronoth*, January 16, 2009.

[635] Hasan Kösebalaban, *Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: BigBang, 2014, p.340.

Furthermore, in the margin of a World Economic Forum debate held in Davos at the end of January, Erdoğan clashed with Peres over Israel's offensive against Gaza, and stormed out of the debate. Erdoğan said to Peres: "Mr. Peres, you are older than me. Your voice is too loud. I know that it is because of a guilty conscience. When it comes to killing, you know very well how to kill. I know very well how you hit and killed children at the beaches".[636] The tension revealed the level of the crisis between the two countries.[637] According to Bengio, there were apparent reasons for the Erdoğan government to manipulate the developments. First, Erdoğan was trying to mobilize support for the JDP at the Turkish local elections to be held in March 2009. Second, he was trying to deflect attention from the domestic PKK problem to another area. Third, Erdoğan intended to challenge the Turkish army, in other words, the architect of the relations with Israel. Finally, Erdoğan wanted to enhance Turkey's role among Arab and Muslim countries.[638]

Moreover, after Turkey had approved the Ottawa Treaty of 1999, which banned the use of anti-personnel land mines, a relevant law came into effect in Turkey in 2004. In parallel to improving relations with Syria, the dismantlement and destruction of almost 615.000 land mines in the Turkish lands close to the Syrian border came to the agenda. An Israeli company won the tender for clearing the land mines. However, the Turkish government was accused of "wanting to sell

---

[636] *Hurriyet Daily News*, January 30, 2009.

[637] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.442.

[638] Ofra Bengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.184.

the land to Israel" by the opposition parties.[639] Such speculations in the Turkish public opinion had a negative impact on Israeli investors.

In addition, Turkey's policy to the Israeli campaign on the Gaza Strip, and the clash between Erdoğan and Peres negatively affected the American Jewish lobby towards Turkey. On February 1, 2009, Executive Director of the American Jewish Committee David Harris wrote a letter to Prime Minister Erdoğan. Harris stated the following:

> Mr. Prime Minister, you have described Israeli policy in Gaza as a "massacre" and a "crime against humanity" that would bring about Israel's "self-destruction" through divine punishment. These words are inflammatory, and they are wrong… You contend that Hamas is a reasonable negotiating partner... It still seeks Israel's destruction with weapons imported from your neighbor, Iran… Maybe you gained popularity in the Turkish street, where anger against Israel and Jews has been stoked in recent weeks, but you did your country no service by your unstatesmanlike behavior.[640]

In return, Erdoğan met with 50 representatives of leading American Jewish groups in New York in September 2009.[641] The meeting was held in a tense climate because of the existence of the divergent approaches to the situation at the Gaza Strip and Iran although Erdoğan's goal in meeting with the Jewish representatives was to repair damaged ties.[642] Erdoğan paid another visit to the US in December

---

[639] *Today's Zaman*, May 29, 2009.

[640] *Turkish News*, February 4, 2009.

[641] *Today's Zaman*, September 23, 2009.

[642] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.447.

2009. This time, Erdoğan's program did not include a meeting with the Jewish groups. By doing so, Ali Aslan claimed that Erdoğan wanted to transmit a strong message to the Jewish lobby and Israel.[643]

On 31 March 2009, Benjamin Netanyahu, the leader of the conservative Likud Party, formed the government in Israel with *Kadima*, *Yisrael Beitenu*, *Mifleget Ha Avoda Ha Yisraelit* (Israeli Labor Party), *Shas*, *Ha Atzma'ut* (Independence), *Ha Bayit Ha Yehudi* (Jewish Home), and *Yahadut Ha Torah Ha Meukhedet* (United Torah Judaism).[644] The right-wing and far-right members had the majority in the coalition. The Netanyahu government has attached more importance to security, and acted in accordance with the concern of protecting the Jewish identity and community.[645] Within this context, Netanyahu proved his tough position towards the Middle East peace process. Netanyahu's sharp statement that "Jerusalem is, and will always be, the capital of the Jewish state" possibly added "the final shovel of soil over the peace talks' coffin".[646] Netanyahu's Palestine policy cooled off the Turkish-Israeli relations. Ertuğrul Apakan emphasizes that there was an incompatibility between Netanyahu's government and Turkey's political leadership.[647]

---

[643] *Today's Zaman*, December 19, 2009.

[644] (https://www.knesset.gov.il/govt/eng/GovtByNumber_eng.asp?govt=32), November 11, 2013 accessed.

[645] Interview with Ambassador Ertuğrul Apakan, September 10, 2014.

[646] Milan Vesely, "Obama's Mid East Policy in Disarray", *The Middle East*, January 2011, p.19.

[647] Interview with Ambassador Ertuğrul Apakan, September 10, 2014.

In this vein, in October 2009, Turkey cancelled the international exercises of the Anatolian Eagle[648] in which Israel would have participated. Tel Aviv perceived the decision as a political act.[649] In response to a question on why Turkey excluded Israel from the exercise, Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu said: "We hope that the situation in Gaza will be improved, that the situation will be back to the diplomatic track. And that will create a new atmosphere in Turkish-Israeli relations as well. But in the existing situation, of course, we are criticizing this approach, Israeli approach".[650] That is to say that Turkey's relations with Israel were not independent of the peace process in the Middle East.

On this point, Yoav Peled remarks that the Turkish-Israeli military cooperation stopped. The Israeli Air Force currently uses Greek and Bulgarian airspaces. Although the American and Israeli navies continue joint exercises, the trilateral naval exercises between the US, Israel and Turkey have ended as well. According to Peled, Turkey does not let the military cooperation continue anymore. However, Peled claims that Israel actually prefers Turkey to Greece and Bulgaria for the military training.[651]

---

[648] The Anatolian Eagle is an air force exercise, which includes national and international exercises hosted by Turkey with a usual participation of NATO forces and some other countries.

[649] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.442.

[650] (http://edition.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/meast/10/11/turkey.israel.nato.drill/), November 11, 2013 accessed.

[651] Interview with Professor Yoav Peled, June 24, 2013.

Nevertheless, President Gül met Israeli President Peres in the margin of the Summit of the Heads of State and Government of the 15th UN Climate Change Conference held in Copenhagen in December 2009. The two leaders agreed that "the former friendly and stable" ties between the two countries would be restored.[652] The Turkish press reported that President Peres repeated his invitation for President Gül to visit Israel.

In spite of this, Turkey and Israel faced another crisis. On January 11, 2010, Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Danny Ayalon accepted Oğuz Çelikkol, the Turkish Ambassador to Israel, in his office at the Knesset. Ayalon also invited Israeli TV crews to watch the meeting, and humiliated the ambassador by "placing him on a lower chair and refusing to shake his hand".[653] Former Foreign Minister Yaşar Yakış (November 2002-March 2003) told that Ayalon's attitude, his returning to the journalists and saying: "I am sitting higher and placing him lower" in Hebrew, showed his bad intentions.[654] After the meeting, the Turkish Foreign Ministry summoned Gaby Levy, the Israeli Ambassador to Turkey, on 12 January, the attitude of the Deputy Foreign Minister of Israel was protested, and "Ambassador Levy was notified that we expect an explanation and an apology concerning this issue".[655] Moreover, President Gül said "if they do not apologize

---

[652] Ofra Bengio, "Turkey's Quiet Revolution and Its Impact on Israel", *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs,* Vol.4, No.1, 2010, p.20.

[653] (http://www.nbcnews.com/id/34843811/ns/world_news-mideast_n_africa/t/israel-writes-letter-apology-turkey/#.V4dGXdKLSM8), November 11, 2013 accessed.

[654] *Hurriyet Daily News*, January 13, 2010.

[655] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_-7_-12-january-2010_-press-release-regarding-the-attitude-of-israeli-deputy-foreign-minister-during-his-meeting-with-turkey_s-ambassador-to-tel-aviv.en.mfa), November 11, 2013 accessed.

till the evening (Wednesday), the ambassador will fly back to Turkey by the first plane".[656] On Wednesday (13 January), Ayalon's letter of apology to Çelikkol diffused the tension.[657] In June 2010, Ayalon met in Jerusalem with a group of Turkish journalists, and claimed that he actually had not intended on humiliating the Turkish Ambassador.[658]

On January 17, 2010, Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak visited Turkey to repair ties between the two countries. During his visit, Barak and National Defense Minister Vecdi Gönül took up military cooperation projects such as M-60 tank modernization and Turkey's purchase of Israeli Heron unmanned aircraft.[659] It should be underlined that after this visit, no more visits were realized between the two countries at a ministerial or any higher level.[660]

The Turkish-Israeli relations experienced one of the most difficult situations on May 31, 2010 when Israel decided to attack on the Turkish Mavi Marmara flotilla that was attempting to carry humanitarian aid and construction materials to the Gaza Strip in order to break the Israeli blockade. The attack caused the death of nine civilians; eight of them were Turkish citizens and one American-Turkish

---

[656] *Today's Zaman*, January 12, 2009.

[657] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.443.

[658] Nimrod Goren, "An Unfulfilled Opportunity for Reconciliation: Israel and Turkey during the Arab Spring", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, p.124.

[659] *New York Times*, January 17, 2010.

[660] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/relations-between-turkey-and-israel%20.en.mfa), November 30, 2014 accessed.

citizen, as well as the injury of several people on board. The rest were arrested and detained by Israel. Within this frame, Taha Özhan considers that Turkey had manifested its goodwill during the process of Israel's membership to the OECD, only a few days before the Israeli attack on the Mavi Marmara flotilla, because Turkey had not wish to veto its candidacy; however, Israel did not change its negative attitude towards Turkey.[661] Finally, Deputy Prime Minister Bülent Arınç warned Israel that Turkey was planning to reduce its relations with Israel to a minimum.[662]

According to the Turkish thesis, the attack on the flotilla carrying civilian passengers and 10,000 tons of aid, this also was 73 miles off the coast of Gaza, in other words, in international waters.[663] Foreign Minister Davutoğlu stated that "Psychologically this attack is like 9/11 for Turkey because Turkish citizens were attacked by a state, not by terrorists, with an intention, a clear decision of political leaders of that state".[664] Contrastingly, the Israeli side claimed that the flotilla was organized by the IHH Humanitarian Relief Foundation (*İnsani Hak ve Hürriyetleri İnsani Yardım Vakfı* - the IHH), an organization on the Israeli terror watch list, and the Foundation had links to "global Jihadist terrorist movements, including Al

---

[661] Taha Özhan, "Turkey, Israel and the US in the Wake of the Gaza Flotilla Crisis", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.12, No.3, 2010, p.10.

[662] *The Guardians*, June 4, 2010.

[663] Taha Özhan, "Turkey, Israel and the US in the Wake of the Gaza Flotilla Crisis", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.12, No.3, 2010, p.8.

[664] *Yedioth Ahronoth*, June 1, 2010.

Qaeda".[665] Before the incident, in 2008, Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak called the IHH an "impermissible association" in Israel.[666]

On May 31, 2010, the UN Security Council condemned the Israeli operation against the Gaza-bound aid convoy resulting in civilian deaths, and called for an investigation. The presidential statement mentioned the use of force during the Israeli military operation in "international waters", and the Security Council urged "Israel to permit full consular access, to allow the countries concerned to retrieve their deceased and wounded immediately, and to ensure the delivery of humanitarian assistance from the convoy to its destination".[667] On June 6, Israel released all the passengers. On June 14, the Israeli government resolved to establish an independent public commission to investigate the operation. Supreme Court Justice Emeritus Jacob Turkel guided the Commission. The Commission was appointed to examine whether or not "the naval blockade imposed on the Gaza Strip complied with the rules of international law" and "the actions carried out by Israel to enforce the naval blockade on 31 May 2010 complied with the rules of international law".[668]

Part I of the Commission's Report was published on January 23, 2011. According to the report, after the Hamas "terrorist organization" seized the control

---

[665] Danny Danon, *Israel: The Will to Prevail*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, pp.88-89. (http://www.terrorism-info.org.il/data/pdf/PDF_10_126_2.pdf), accessed July 16, 2013.

[666] (http://www.turkel-committee.com/files/wordocs/7896summary-eng.PDF), May 8, 2013 accessed.

[667] (http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2010/sc9940.doc.htm), May 8, 2013 accessed.

[668] (http://www.turkel-committee.com/content-192.html), May 8, 2013 accessed.

of the Gaza Strip in June 2007, the Israeli government adopted various measures, one of which was a naval blockade on the coastline of the Gaza Strip. The report supported the Israeli blockade with the followings:

> The Government of Israel imposed the naval blockade on the Gaza Strip for military-security reasons, which mainly concerned the need to prevent weapons, terrorists, and money from entering the Gaza Strip, and the need to prevent the departure of terrorists and additional threats from the Gaza Strip by sea.[669]

Hence, the Commission concluded that the naval blockade was lawful and complied with the rules of international law. Concerning the capture of the Flotilla Vessels, the report indicated that the vessels did attempt to breach the naval blockade; thus, the IDF forces captured them to enforce the blockade. In addition, the report claimed that neutral vessels do not have a right to resist the capture, and following the prior warning to the vessels, the IDF forces were entitled to the option of employing fire but "the IDF forces did not attack the flotilla vessels; in other words, they did not use force or "violence" against the ships".[670] In response, Foreign Minister Davutoğlu remarked that it was not an independent report. By referring to Israeli newspapers, Davutoğlu concluded that it was like a Netanyahu report, and added that its objectivity could in no way be accepted.[671]

---

[669] (http://www.turkel-committee.com/files/wordocs/7896summary-eng.PDF), May 8, 2013 accessed.

[670] *Ibid*.

[671](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-davutoglu_nun-esenboga-havalimani_nda-gerceklestirdigi-basin-toplantisi_-28-ocak-2011.tr.mfa), May 8, 2013 accessed.

Banu Eligür draws attention to the fact that Turkey and Israel had never experienced a violent clash in their bilateral relations until the Mavi Marmara Flotilla incident, and this event was "the lowest point in the history of Turkish-Israeli relations".[672] President Gül stated: "From now on, Turkish-Israeli ties will never be the same. This incident has left an irreparable and deep scar".[673] Yoav Peled believed the Mavi Marmara just symbolized the deterioration in the relations; indeed, there was much broader issue between Turkey and Israel.[674]

Still, the two countries did not totally cease the diplomatic relations. Instead, high-level actors arranged some meetings. To illustrate, Foreign Minister Davutoğlu met Israeli Industry, Trade and Labor Minister Benyamin Ben-Eliezer in Brussels on June 31, 2010 in order to discuss ways of resolving the crisis between the two countries. The Turkish side underlined its demands for normalization of relations: Apology, compensation, independent enquiry, lifting of the blockade on Gaza, and release of the three ships.[675] Israeli sources in Jerusalem claimed that the meeting was held due to pressure from American President Barack Obama, and during the two-hour meeting, Davutoğlu reiterated the demand that the Israeli apologize for their raid on the flotilla.[676] After the meeting, the Turkish demands of

---

[672] Banu Eligür, "Crisis in Turkish-Israeli Relations (December 2008-June 2011): From Partnership to Enmity", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.48, No.3, 2012, p.447.

[673] *Al Jazeera*, June 3, 2010.

[674] Interview with Professor Yoav Peled, on June 24, 2013.

[675] Özlem Tür, "Turkey and Israel in the 2000s: From Cooperation to Conflict", *Israel Studies*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, p.61.

[676] *Haaretz*, July 1, 2010.

the independent enquiry and the release of the three ships were accepted. First, on August 2, 2010, the UN Secretary-General established the Panel of Inquiry under the chairmanship of Sir Geoffrey Palmer that "received and reviewed reports of the detailed national investigations conducted by both Turkey and Israel" on the Flotilla Incident.[677] Second, Israel released the three ships to Turkey in the same month.[678]

In December 2010, Turkey offered to provide Israel with two fire-fighting aircrafts to help control the huge brushfire widely known as "the Carmel fire" that had been ranging through northern Israel, and the Israeli government accepted the offer. The Turkish offer was welcomed in the Israeli public opinion. Israeli journalist Anshel Pfeffer reported that the aid sent by Turkey had provided an opportunity to improve the relations between the two countries.[679]

Under these conditions, there were also reports on private discussions between Israeli Deputy Prime Minister Moshe Ya'alon and Undersecretary of the Turkish Foreign Ministry Feridun Sinirlioğlu concerning the reconciliation. For example, the Israeli Haaretz newspaper claimed that meetings were being held

---

[677] (http://www.un.org/News/dh/infocus/middle_east/Gaza_Flotilla_Panel_Report.pdf), November 16, 2013 accessed.

[678] Following those developments, in November 2010, the US diplomatic cable leak began with the release of 251,287 classified cables sent by American missions to the capital. 7.918 of the classified cables had been sent from the US Embassy in Ankara. The documents provided an overall unprecedented insight into American foreign policy. Accordingly, the documents included important information on Turkey. Yalçın Akdoğan, a close name to Prime Minister Erdoğan, defined *Wikileaks*, the internet website publishing the cables, as a psychological operation targeting the Erdoğan government. Akdoğan claimed that Israel was not content with the course of the relations between Turkey and the US, and aimed at breaking the increasing Turkish influence increasing in the Middle East. Consequently, the release of the American cables was a way to cool off the Turkish-American relations. (https://wikileaks.org/cablegate.html), June 22, 2015 accessed; (http://www.gazete5.com/haber/israilin-akp-operasyonu-64764), June 22, 2015 accessed.

[679] *The Jewish Chronicle Online*, December 9, 2010.

through two different channels. Ya'alon was meeting directly with Sinirlioğlu.[680]

There were other talks taking place between Yosef Ciechanover, the Israeli

representative on the UN Panel of Inquiry, and Özdem Sanberk, the Turkish

representative on the UN Panel of Inquiry. These two channels were passing

messages between Turkey and Israel to draft understandings to end the crisis.[681] In

July 2011, Alon Ben-Meir wrote that Ya'alon had held private discussions with

Sinirlioğlu regarding a government-to-government reconciliation document.[682] On

the other side, the Turkish newspapers claimed that Israeli Prime Minister

Netanyahu had written a letter to Prime Minister Erdoğan to congratulate Erdoğan

on winning a third term in Turkey and repair the relations. Turkish newspaper

Today's Zaman published a paragraph obtained from Netanyahu's letter:

> My government will be happy to work with the new Turkish government
> on finding a resolution to all outstanding issues between our countries, in
> the hope of re-establishing our cooperation and renewing the spirit of
> friendship which has characterized the relations between our peoples for
> many generations.[683]

Meanwhile, the Turkish newspapers indicated that although Prime Minister

Netanyahu had primarily accepted the request for an apology, he eventually backed

out of it due to the fear that his government might fall. In particular, Deputy Prime

---

[680] *Haaretz,* June 24, 2011.

[681] *Haaretz,* June 23, 2011.

[682] *Jerusalem Post*, July 1, 2011.

[683] *Today's Zaman*, June 21, 2011.

Minister, Foreign Minister and Leader of *Yisrael Beytenu* (Israel Our Home)[684] Avigdor Lieberman could have pulled out of the government by using the apology as an excuse, as well as for his nationalist propaganda. In this context, the meetings and other efforts until the end of 2012 did not result in a final breakthrough.[685] In March 2013, Israeli Prime Minister apologized to Erdoğan for the loss of nine lives on board the Mavi Marmara.

7.1.3. The Third Term in Power (12 June 2011 - 31 December 2011)

On September 1, 2011, the leak of the Palmer Report of the Flotilla Incident to the press caused further problems for the bilateral relations. On September 2, Foreign Minister Davutoğlu said that the leak of the report to the press was "quite thought-provoking", and accused Israel of not acting in "a manner compatible with State solemnity and confidentiality in this process". In this vein, Foreign Minister Davutoğlu explained the measures which the Turkish government decided to take with the following:

> 1. Diplomatic relations between Turkey and Israel will be downgraded to the Second Secretary level. 2. Military agreements between Turkey and Israel have been suspended. 3. Turkey will take whatever measures it deems necessary in order to ensure the freedom of navigation in the Eastern Mediterranean. 4. Turkey does not recognize the blockade

---

[684] This political party defends revisionist Zionism inspired from Ukrainian revisionist and Zionist leader Ze'ev Jabotinsky who supported giving military training to young Jews and to the increasing Jewish population in Jerusalem. Its leader Lieberman claimed that the bargaining process with the Palestinian authority on borders, refugees and the status of Jerusalem will be the end of Israel. Ufuk Ulutaş, Selin Bölme, Gülşah Neslihan Demir, Furkan Torlak and Salih Ziya, *İsrail Siyasetini Anlama Kılavuzu*, SETA, December 2012, pp.96-97.

[685] Nimrod Goren, "An Unfulfilled Opportunity for Reconciliation: Israel and Turkey during the Arab Spring", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, pp.122-123.

imposed on Gaza by Israel. Turkey will ensure the examination by the International Court of Justice of Israel's blockade imposed on Gaza as of 31 May 2010. To this end we are starting initiatives in order to mobilize the UN General Assembly. 5. We will extend all possible support to Turkish and foreign victims of Israel's attack in their initiatives to seek their rights before courts.[686]

After Davutoğlu's press statement, Israeli Ambassador to Ankara Gabby Levy was expelled from Turkey over the refusal to apologize for the flotilla raid. The diplomatic relations downgraded back to the level of 1991. In addition, Prime Minister Erdoğan said that Turkish warships would from then on escort any Turkish aid vessels to the Gaza Strip; Turkey would strengthen its presence in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea, and would also take steps to stop Israel from unilaterally exploiting natural resources in this region.[687] Accordingly, the Erdoğan government suspended all military agreements with Israel. As a response to journalists' questions regarding the issue, Necdet Özel, the Chief of the General Staff, stated that the military activities between the two countries were suspended, there was no any military channel or contact to overcome the crisis, there was no need for this as well, and this was not the matter of the military, but that of politics.[688] In view of that, Ali Balcı and Tuncay Kardaş underline that the JDP government took control of the Turkish-Israeli relations into its own hands.[689] In

---

[686](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/press-statement-by-h_e_-mr_-ahmet-davutoglu_-minister-of-foreign-affairs-of-the-republic-of-turkey_-regarding-turkish-israeli-re.en.mfa), November 16, 2013 accessed.

[687] *Haaretz*, September 3, 2011.

[688] *Hürriyet*, Ekim 25, 2011.

[689] Ali Balcı and Tuncay Kardaş, "The Changing Dynamics of Turkey's Relations with Israel: An Analysis of Securitization", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, p.115; Ali Balcı, *Türkiye Dış Politikası: İlkeler, Aktörler, Uygulamalar*, Istanbul: Etkileşim, 2013, p.300

fact, this situation points to the change in the role of the domestic factors defining Turkey's state identity.

Following the massive earthquake, a destructive 7.2 magnitude quake that took place in Eastern Turkey on October 23, 2011, Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu called Erdoğan to offer his condolences for the several casualties. According to the Israeli sources in the Prime Minister's Office, Netanyahu phoned Erdoğan and asserted "Israel's offer to send rescue crews and aid", and Erdoğan thanked him for the offer.[690] In fact, it was for the first time that Erdoğan and Netanyahu had spoken to each other for the first time since December 2010. On October 26, the Israeli Foreign Ministry issued a statement that Defense Minister Ehud Barak ordered the defense system to "send a special aid delegation to Turkey in response to the recent earthquake" and Israeli President Peres spoke to President Gül to express his condolences; and the Ministry followed up its statement in February 2012 with the statement that "Israel transported a total of 50 mobile structures and 80 housing structures. The construction work is expected to be completed by mid-March".[691]

Furthermore, a senior officer in the Israeli Air Force (IAF) said that the IAF had re-established a coordination mechanism with its Turkish counterpart in order to prevent aerial misunderstandings in case the Israeli and Turkish pilots would encounter one another when they flew over the Mediterranean Sea. The officer added that the Turkish military attaché had attended an IAF briefing for foreign

---

[690] *Haaretz*, October 24, 2011.

[691] (http://mfa.gov.il/MFA/ForeignPolicy/Aid/Pages/Israel_sends_aid_Turkey_26-Oct-2011.aspx), May 15, 2013 accessed.

military officers at the Uvda Air Force Base which is located in the south of Israel.[692] Additionally, in his response to a question, President Gül stated, "the current situation in Turkish-Israeli relations has not impacted our military options or our armed forces".[693]

On this point, Burcu Gültekin-Punsmann draws attention to the private entrepreneur as the third actor in the Turkish-Israeli relations in addition to the diplomat and the soldier. She underlines that "Business has become an area immune from political upheavals, as the trade volume between Turkey and Israel is today at its highest level in history".[694] Similarly, the trade figures released by the Turkish Ministry of Economy revealed that the trade volume was not affected by the political turmoil between Turkey and Israel. The bilateral trade capacity, which was 2,597 billion US dollars in 2009, rose to 3,440 billion US dollars in 2010 and to 4,448 billion US dollars in 2011.[695]

On the other hand, Yeşilyurt claims that there were now three differences in the crises between Turkey and Israel compared to the past. First, the dialogue channels were severely damaged. Except for the visits by Ben-Eliezer and Barak, there were no high level visits. Second, Israel began to hit below Turkey's belt. To

---

[692] *Jerusalem Post*, December 21, 2011.

[693] Jonathan Tepperman, "Turkey's Moment: A Conversation with Abdullah Gul", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.92, Vol.1, 2013, p.5.

[694] Dr. Burcu Gültekin-Punsmann, who is a senior foreign policy analyst at the Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey, or TEPAV, gave an interview to *Hurriyet Daily News*, July 9, 2011.

[695](http://www.ekonomi.gov.tr/index.cfm?sayfa=7155BE01-D8D3-8566-45208351967592CF), October 19, 2013 accessed.

illustrate, in February 2009, Israeli Ground Forces Command Major-General Avi Mizrahi said that Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan should "take a look at himself" and criticized Turkey by alluding to claims on the Armenian genocide, the oppression of the Kurds, and the Turkish invasion of Cyprus.[696] Moreover, in December 2011, the Knesset Education Committee began discussing the Armenian genocide for the first time. Leader of *Meretz* (Energy), a left-wing and Zionist political party in Israel, Zahava Gal-On initiated the discussion at the Knesset by arguing "For years, Israel always took into account its relations with Turkey. That is the central issue in terms of recognition of the murder of the Armenian people, which has yet to take place in Israel's Knesset".[697] Third, contrary to President Gül's statement, the military relations were seriously affected by the developments. The *Anatolian Eagle* joint air maneuvers signaled this change. According to Yeşilyurt, Turkey's decision on freezing all military agreements with Israel in September 2011 confirmed the situation.[698]

To evaluate the following JDP term (2007-2011) in line with the state identity definition used by this dissertation, the domestic factors having roles in shaping state identity have had a significant change. In this framework, the civilian component has increased its weight in the military-civilian relations. To illustrate, the Erdoğan government brought civilians to the NSC, which had long been

---

[696] *Yedioth Ahronoth*, February 14, 2009.

[697] *The Times of Israel*, June 12, 2012.

[698] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.444.

dominated by the military. The government also introduced new legislation that subjected active-duty military officers to review by civilian courts for crimes not related to their military duties. On the other side, it is noteworthy to indicate that the trials of Ergenekon and Operation Sledgehammer (*Balyoz Harekatı*) took place in Turkey during this period, and a number of high profiles including military officers were accused of preparing a secularist coup plan and plotting against the JDP government. The investigation tarnished the military's reputation. By taking the advantage of this process, the JDP strengthened its rule both in state apparatus/institutions and domestic politics. Similarly, the JDP's ideological discourse on foreign policy found more supporters. On this point, the international system/dynamics, the other factor defining a state's identity, provided the JDP a suitable ground for making a shift in the formation of Turkey's state identity in accordance with its ideological stance. This situation caused negative results for the Turkish-Israeli relations that transformed from "a strategic relationship" in the 1990s to "a set of crises" under the JDP rule.

7.2.   The Third Parties in the Turkish-Israeli Relations

Third parties such as Palestine or the Palestinian issue have always affected the Turkish-Israeli relations, and the crises of the third parties are fundamentally bilateral in nature.[699]

---

[699] Özlem Tür, "Turkey and Israel in the 2000s: From Cooperation to Conflict", *Israel Studies*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, p.56.

7.2.1. Palestine or the Palestinian Issue

In the post-Cold War term, the peace process between Israel and the PLO provided an important ground for the improvement of the Turkish-Israeli relations. Turkey supported the solution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by a negotiated settlement on the basis of the UN Security Council Resolutions 242, 338, 1397 and 1515, the principle of land for peace, the Arab Peace Initiative and the Road Map that would ensure two states living side by side within secure and recognized borders.[700]

However, the failure of the peace talks between Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and PLO leader Arafat, who met at Camp David on July 11, 2000, and then the visit of *Likud* (Consolidation) leader Ariel Sharon to the Temple Mount on September 28, 2000 caused the second *Intifada*, the Palestinian uprising against the IDF, that lasted for more than four years. To suppress the Intifada, the IDF adopted a hardline policy of war against the Palestinian Authority.[701] Israeli forces invaded the Palestinian lands, began to build the West Bank barrier, and encircled Arafat's headquarters compound in Ramallah and put the city under curfew. On this point, Turkey was called for mediation between the two sides. Israel asked Turkey to convince the Palestinian authority to stop the violence. Similarly, the Palestinian authority asked Turkey to convince Israel to put an end to its military operations,

---

[700](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey_s-political-relations-with-the-palestinian-national-authority.en.mfa), November 30, 2014 accessed.

[701] Yoram Peri, "The Political-Military Complex: The IDF's Influence Over Policy Towards the Palestinians Since 1987", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.11, No.2, 2005, pp.324-325.

and return to the negotiation table.[702] To show Turkey's interest in the mediation, Nur Bilge Criss reminds the speech of Abdullah Gül as Foreign Minister which was rendered at a local party convention in 2006. Gül said that the Turks were not cognizant of Turkey's greatness, and asked who was better situated than ourselves to engage in the Palestinian problem.[703] However, Israel was not really interested in the Turkish mediation because Israel wanted to keep the situation unchangeable.[704]

Nonetheless, Turkey continued improving its relations with Palestine. In particular, the future of the peace process gained more importance for the future of the Turkish-Israeli relations under the JDP rule. In line with the announcement of a comprehensive economic and social action plan for Palestine in December 2003, the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TIKA) opened a branch in Ramallah in May 2005. In addition, Turkey and Palestine signed a Free Trade Agreement in 2004 for commercial and economic relations.[705] The Agreement contributed to the bilateral trade that increased from 5.7 million US dollars (2000) to 40.8 million US dollars (2010).[706] Turkey provided 300 million US dollar worth

---

[702] Esra Çuhadar Gürkaynak, "Turkey as a Third Party in Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Assessment and Reflections", *Perceptions*, Vol.12, No.1, 2007, p.101.

[703] Nur Bilge Criss, "Parameters of Turkish Foreign Policy under the AKP Governments", *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, No.23, 2010, p.13.

[704] Interview with Professor Yoav Peled, June 24, 2013.

[705](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey_s-political-relations-with-the-palestinian-national-authority.en.mfa), November 30, 2014, accessed.

[706] The Turkish Foreign Ministry claims that "Trade indexes do not represent the real figures. Because trade with Palestine is generally made through Israel and some Israeli companies sell the products imported from Turkey to the companies in Palestine with re-export. In this context, it is considered that Turkey takes the second rank after Israel among countries exporting to Palestine. It is also estimated that Turkey's export to Palestine is around 200-300 million USD and the trade volume is around 350-400 million USD." (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey_s-commercial-and-economic-relations-with-palastine.en.mfa), November 30, 2014, accessed

of direct and indirect assistance and 70 million US dollars of technical development aid to Palestine as well.

Following this period, the Middle East experienced the 2006 Lebanon War and then the 2008-2009 Gaza War that severely damaged Israel's image in Turkey. In the latter, the Turkish government harshly criticized Israel's attack on the Gaza Strip. That criticism was welcomed in the Arab world, and Prime Minister Erdoğan gained popularity in the region.[707] The change in the Turkish-Israeli relations was not confined only to rhetoric. At the expense of the deterioration of the relations with Israel, Turkey gave its full support to the Palestinian Authority aiming at gaining more international recognition. On 29 November 2012, the UN General Assembly voted and accorded to Palestine non-Member Observer State status in the UN by an overwhelming majority: 138 in favor to 9 against with 41 abstentions. Before the voting, Turkey had lobbied for the Resolution. At the UN General Assembly meeting, Foreign Minister Davutoğlu said in his speech that "our vision for justice, international order and human rights will not be achieved until the moment we […] see the flag of the State of Palestine side by side with ours, as a full Member of the United Nations."[708] Consequently, Turkey voted in favor of the Resolution.

Within this context, by referring to the situation in the Gaza Strip, İbrahim Kalın summarizes the Turkish perception of the Palestinian issue and its impact on the Turkish-Israeli relations. According to him, the Gaza Strip is still a time bomb.

---

[707] Meliha Benli Altunışık, "Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu'daki Yumuşak Gücü ve Önündeki Engeller", *TESEV*, July 2011, p.1 (It is possible to reach from internet).

[708] (https://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2012/ga11317.doc.htm), February 2, 2014 accessed.

Kalın says that if we do not intervene so as to provide aids to Palestinian improve living-standards, an estimate of almost 1.5 million people will have to face very difficult living conditions. This situation will cause new confrontations. It is not a unilateral campaign against Israel.[709] However, Ahmet Davutoğlu, who delivered a speech at Oxford University in May 2010, said, "We cannot tolerate now what is going in Gaza… People of our region -Middle East- have certain expectations from Turkey… If they continue to isolate innocent people of Gaza, via creating a ghetto in Gaza, we cannot allow these to continue".[710] On this basis, Israeli diplomat Nizar Amer indicates that there is a clear correlation between the Turkish-Israeli relations and the Palestinian issue. Any advancement in the Middle East Peace Process will reflect positively on the Turkish-Israeli relations as well.[711] Therefore, the Palestinian issue has been an important dimension of the Turkish-Israeli relations.

7.2.2. The United States

In the Gulf War of 1990-1991, Turkey joined the UN coalition led by the US against Saddam Hussein's Iraq in response to the Iraqi invasion and its following annexation of Kuwait. After the Iraqi forces had invaded on August 2,

---

[709] İbrahim Kalın, *Türkiye Söyleşileri 5: Cumhuriyet, Milliyetçilik ve İslamcılık*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2011, p.166.

[710] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Turkish Vision of Regional and Global Order: Theoretical Background and Practical Implementation", *Political Reflection*, Vol.1, No.2, 2010, pp.45-46.

[711] Interview with Nizar Amer, Deputy Chief of Mission of the Israeli Embassy in Ankara, July 4, 2013.

1990, within the framework of NATO's operation "ANCHOR GUARD" from 10 August 1990 to 9 March 1991,[712] NATO Airborne early Warning aircraft to Konya, Turkey, was deployed in order to "monitor Iraq's actions following its invasion of Kuwait and to provide coverage of south-eastern Turkey in case of an Iraqi attack".[713] As for the humanitarian side of the war, hundreds thousands of the Iraqi Kurds who were fleeing from Saddam's forces passed across the mountains to Turkey. In short, Turkey, a neighboring country of Iraq, faced heavy costs due to the war in all aspects.

During the War, Israel was contemplating on whether or not to retaliate against the Iraqi missile offensive that had hit some parts of the Israeli lands. Although Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Arens and Commander in Chief of the Israeli Air Force Major General Avihu Ben-Nun, favored the retaliation whereas Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, Chief of Staff of the IDF Lieutenant General Dan Shomron and Head of Intelligence Division of the IDF Major General Amnon Lipkin-Shahak believed that "Israel should not operate without US consent and potentially jeopardize the progress of coalition forces in their war against Iraq. In the event, the latter view prevailed".[714]

Deviating from their positions during the Gulf War, Turkey and Israel, both close allies of the US, had different stances to the American invasion of Iraq in 2003. Just before the invasion, on March 1, 2003, the GNAT voted to refuse the US

---

[712] (http://www.aco.nato.int/resources/21/NATO%20Operations,%201949-Present.pdf), November 17, 2013 accessed.

[713] Anders Fogh Rasmussen, "NATO and Turkey-Meeting the Challenge of Change", *Perceptions*, Vol.17, No.1, 2012, pp.3-5.

[714] Yoram Peri, "The Political-Military Complex: The IDF's Influence Over Policy Towards the Palestinians Since 1987", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.11, No.2, 2005, p.329.

Army "the permission to invade Iraq from the north on Turkish soil".[715] Meliha Altunışık believes that the Turkish parliament's rejection of giving support to the US dramatically challenged the common belief that Turkey only acts in alliance with the US.[716] The decision of the Turkish parliament caused tactical changes in American plans to overthrow the Saddam regime; however, the outcome did not change: the war started in March 2003. The war increased anti-American sentiments in the Turkish society. Similarly, there was widespread criticism against Israel, which had voiced its support for the War as one of the main regional allies of the US.[717] On the Israeli side, the Israeli leadership regarded the war with Iraq as "the first step in an ambitious campaign to remake the Middle East".[718]

Likewise, Turkey had a different perspective on the future of Iraq and divergent strategic interests after the Saddam regime. In particular, the war caused the resurgence of the PKK terrorism in Turkey and the formation of a semi-autonomous regional government in northern Iraq.[719] For Turkey, Israel's policy towards northern Iraq was suspicious, and it was rumored that Israeli soldiers were

---

[715](http://www.thewashingtonreview.org/articles/the-story-behind-turkeys-no-vote-on-iraq-in-2003.html), October 19, 2013 accessed.

[716] Meliha Benli Altunışık, "Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu'daki Yumuşak Gücü ve Önündeki Engeller", *TESEV*, July 2011, p.1 (It is possible to reach from internet).

[717] Binnur Özkeçeci-Taner, "From Allies to Frenemies and Inconvenient Partners: Image Theory and Turkish-Israeli Relations", *Perceptions*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, p.117.

[718] John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy", *Middle East Policy*, Vol.13, No.3, 2006, p.59.

[719] Banu Eligür, "Crisis in Turkish-Israeli Relations (December 2008-June 2011): From Partnership to Enmity", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.48, No.3, 2012, p.429.

training Kurdish Peshmergas.[720] According to Çağaptay, the war also poured "fuel to the Islamist fire in Turkey". *Yeni Şafak*, a newspaper providing a window into the JDP thinking, and *Vakit*, which opposes the JDP only in its pro-EU agenda, joined "the mainstream with conspiracy theories to explain how the Iraq campaign is a U.S.-Jewish-Israeli attempt to dominate the Middle East".[721]

In brief, the 2003 US-Iraq War degraded Turkey's relations with the US and caused negative effects on the Turkish-Israeli relations regarding the Turkish perceptions of Israel's role in the region, particularly regarding northern Iraq and the Kurdistan Regional Government[722] which could threaten Turkey's security in the long term.

7.2.3. Iran

After the Second World War, the Soviets had claims on the Turkish Straits, and Kars and Ardahan areas of Turkey. The Soviets had demanded oil concessions from Iran as well. The Soviet policy led both countries to the Western security umbrella.[723] On the other side, Israel tried to secure its survival with the support of

---

[720] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.446.

[721] Soner Çağaptay, "Where goes the US-Turkish Relationship?", *Middle East Quarterly*, Vol.11, No.4, 2004, pp.46 and 48.

[722] Ofra Bengio, "Turkey's Quiet Revolution and Its Impact on Israel", *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs*, Vol.4, No.1, 2010, p.18.

[723] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, Nisan 2012, p.430.

the US, and accordingly became a natural ally of the West in the Middle East. Within this context, Turkey and Iran, together with Iraq and Pakistan, formed the Baghdad Pact of 1955. Similarly, Israel and Iran also enjoyed a relatively wide-ranging politico-military relationship until the Islamic Revolution of 1979 in Iran.

However, the fall of the Shah in 1979 was a 'major setback' for Iranian foreign policy that had important repercussions on its relations with Turkey and Israel as well. Founded on an Islamic doctrine mainly shaped by Humeyni, Iran's new political regime showed changes in the essentials of its foreign policy. The religious principles or norm-defining formations took precedence and the ideological discourse gained priority. The political legitimacy was formed on the rejection of the alignment with the West and the East. Mohammad Reza Dehshiri and Mohammad Reza Majidi draw attention to fact that "the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in Article 11, exhorts the government to achieve unity with other Islamic countries to establish an Islamic world order founded on solidarity."[724] Indeed, Iran positioned itself against the US and Israel. Moreover, Iranian revolutionaries and rulers began to call for the elimination of the state of Israel. Thus, the regime change in Iran weakened Israel's security environment.[725]

As for Iran's relations with Turkey, it is noteworthy to remember the Iraq-Iran War (September 1980-July 1988) and Turkey's position in that war. Turkey preferred to remain neutral and not side with any of the conflicting parties. Thanks

---

[724] M. R. Dehshiri and M. R. Majidi, "Iran's Foreign Policy in Post-Revolution Era: A Holistic Approach", *The Iranian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.21, No.1-2, Winter-Spring 2008-09, p.103.

[725] Trita Parsi, "Israel-Iranian Relations Assessed: Strategic Competition from the Power Cycle Perspective", *Iranian Studies*, Vol.38, No.2, 2005, p.254.

to its neutrality, Turkey became a trusty neighbor to both Iraq and Iran that finally left the protection of their interests to the Turkish missions in Baghdad and Tehran in July 1987. In addition, Turkey mediated between Iraq and Iran during the war.[726] Turkey's strong position improved its trade and economic relations with Iraq and Iran as well.

On the other side, the end of the Cold War dramatically changed regional and international dynamics. That is to say "the geo-political map of the Middle East was significantly redrawn".[727] Turkey, Israel and Iran faced different parameters. During this new period, Turkey and Israel strengthened their bilateral relations. The military agreements of 1996 between the two countries symbolized the peak in the relations. The Turkish-Israeli military agreements meant "the expansion of American military and political influence in the Muslim world" for Tehran. But Cengiz Dinç argues that Turkey began to follow a pragmatic policy on its relations with Iran over the course of time.[728] Bayram Sinkaya explains this pragmatism in the following:

> Ideological and security issues that dominated the relations between the two neighbours have been gradually replaced by pragmatic considerations on each side. A number of developments both at the state level and regional level have promoted pragmatism. The ensuing improvement of Turkish-Iranian relations has been crowned by a rapidly

---

[726] Atay Akdevelioğlu and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1980-1990: Batı Bloku Ekseninde Türkiye-2: Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt II: 1980-2001*, Istanbul: İletişim, 2013, pp.155-156.

[727] *Ibid*, p.257.

[728] Cengiz Dinç, "Turkey as a New Security Actor in the Middle East: Beyond the Slogans", *Perceptions*, Vol.16, No.2, 2011, p.62.

increasing volume of economic interactions between the two countries as well as security and diplomatic cooperation on a number of issues.[729]

On this point, Sinkaya claims that two factors affected the Turkish-Iranian relations: the new strategic context following the 2003 US-Iraq War and the change in Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East.[730] The Erdoğan government has attached great importance to close relations with the Middle Eastern countries. In this framework, Turkey improved its relations with Iran. Based on good neighborhood policy, the JDP aimed at preventing any possible alienation of Turkey in the region. Therefore, Turkey's bilateral ties with Iran were interpreted as being part of Erdoğan's strategy of maintaining pragmatic and positive relations with neighboring countries.[731]

In fact, this policy provided Turkey with an opportunity to diffuse and eliminate the PKK threat, and to import energy from Iran.[732] Concerning the energy cooperation, Turkey imports around 93 per cent of its oil and gas needs, its demand for energy increases and wants to be an energy corridor; consequently, Iran is crucial to its energy strategy.[733] Similarly, Foreign Minister Davutoğlu says, "As a

---

[729] Bayram Sinkaya, "Rationalization of Turkey-Iran Relations: Prospects and Limits", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, p.137.

[730] *Ibid*, pp.142 and 148.

[731] Joshua Walker, "Turkey and Israel's Relationship in the Middle East", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.17, No.4, 2006, p.88.

[732] H. Sönmez Ateşoğlu, "Security of Turkey with Respect to the Middle East", *Perceptions*, Vol.16, No.2, 2011, p.100.

[733] Cengiz Dinç, "Turkey as a New Security Actor in the Middle East: Beyond the Slogans", *Perceptions*, Vol.16, No.2, 2011, p.73.

growing economy and surrounded by energy resources, Turkey needs Iranian energy as a natural extension of its national interests".[734] Turkey's trade with Iran reached to 10.6 billion US dollars in 2010 while it was only 1 billion US dollars in 2000. Turkey's natural gas import played an important role in a steady growth.[735]

Regarding Iran's relations with Israel, the Iranian leaders decided not to recognize Israel's right to exist. In particular, former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad famously described Israel as a "disgraceful blot" that should be wiped off the face of the earth.[736] Moreover, Iran has tried to create the image of "the defender of the Palestinians".[737] Also, the Iranian involvement in Lebanon and its support of Islamist movements such as Hamas, Hezbollah and Islamic Jihad were viewed as another serious challenge by Israel.[738] At this point, it is noteworthy to remark that there were conflicting assertions on the Turkish position to Iran's involvement in the Lebanese war. Some argue that during the Lebanese war, Turkey rejected Israel's demand for imposing an air and ground embargo to prevent Iran from using Turkish territory to provide arms to Hezbollah.[739]

---

[734] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.91.

[735](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey_s-commercial-and-economic-relations-with-iran.en.mfa), November 30, 2014 accessed.

[736] *The Guardian*, October 26, 2005.

[737] Tariq Ramadan, *The Arab Awakening: Islam and the New Middle East*, London: Penguin Books, 2012, p. 69.

[738] David Menashri, "Iran, Israel and the Middle East Conflict", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, p.109.

[739] Nuri Yeşilyurt, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, p.446.

However, Israeli sources confirmed Turkey's cooperative stance to the issue that "at least two Iranian planes have been forced to land in Turkey in recent weeks after Israel told the Turkish military that they were carrying arms for Hezbollah".[740]

On the other side, Steven David asserts that apart from outside invasion and civil conflict, the use of weapons of mass destruction may cause the annihilation of Israel. David mentions that "Even more alarming are nuclear weapons. Israel's population is so concentrated that as few as three nuclear weapons could destroy 70% of its people, effectively ending its existence as a Jewish state".[741] By reason, Yoav Peled emphasizes that although the current budget deficit of Israel is around NIS 40 billion (about US dollars 10.1 billion); Israel spends almost NIS 60 billion (about US dollars 15.150 billion). In other words, the possibility of a military conflict with Iran keeps the military expenditures high.[742] Hence, Israel fears from the possibility that the Iranian army can catch up with the IDF in qualitative terms if Iran succeeds in nuclear proliferation. After his reportage with Ehud Barak, Jonathan Tepperman writes the following:

> Even if Iran never attacks, Barak continued, Iran's getting the bomb would still enable its hegemonic pretensions in the neighborhood, empower its proxies, set off a regional arms race, undermine Israel's strategic

---

[740] *Haaretz*, March 31, 2011.

[741] Steven R. David, "Existential Threats to Israel: Learning from the Ancient Past", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.18, No.4, 2012, p.504.

[742] Interview with Professor Yoav Peled, June 24, 2013.

monopoly in the Middle East, and raise the risk that nuclear weapons could fall into the hands of terrorists.[743]

Thus, Iran's nuclear program has increased the Israeli security concerns. However, Turkey and Israel's policies have diverged on this issue. Mainly, the divergence has been about the means rather than the final outcome. Ateşoğlu underlines that "if Iran is to succeed in developing nuclear weapon systems, this development will lead to a decline in the security of Turkey by raising the military power of Iran with respect to Turkey".[744] President Gül gave a response to Tepperman's question on nuclear disarmament across the Middle East as follows:

> Turkey does not want to see any neighboring country possess nuclear weapons. Turkey will not accept a neighboring country possessing weapons not possessed by Turkey herself. But we are more realistic, and what we need is a more comprehensive solution and approach to this problem. What matters here is to guarantee the security of Israel in the region, and once that is guaranteed, then the next step must be to eradicate all such weapons from the region.[745]

Within this context, Peled remarks that the installation of an early warning radar system in Kürecik, Turkey, by the NATO confirms that Turkey and Israel have joint concerns against Iran.[746] In the same way, Turkey's approval to this

---

[743] Jonathan Tepperman, "Barak's Last Battle: An Israeli Lion in Winter", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.92, No.1, January/February 2013, p.98.

[744] H. Sönmez Ateşoğlu, "Security of Turkey with Respect to the Middle East", *Perceptions*, Vol.16, No.2, 2011, p.100.

[745] Jonathan Tepperman, "Turkey's Moment: A Conversation with Abdullah Gul", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.92, No.1, January/February 2013, p.6.

[746] Interview with Professor Yoav Peled, June 24, 2013.

NATO project is regarded as a positive sign for the Turkish-Israeli relations.[747] On the other hand, Turkey officially opposes the program but perceives less risk from Iran compared with European countries; accordingly, Turkey prefers diplomatic channels to economic sanctions and military action.[748] On this basis, Turkey objected to any sanctions and armed conflicts and followed an independent policy putting Turkey into the center of a compromise solution.[749] As a result, Turkey, together with Brazil, has attempted to find a solution through mediating between Iran and the West. After a meeting held in Tehran, Turkey and Brazil agreed with Iran on the joint declaration of 17 May 2010 having proposed that Iran would deposit 1200 kg low-enriched uranium in Turkey, and in return, 120 kg of fuel needed for the Tehran Research Reactor would be delivered by the Vienna Group (the US, Russia France and the IAEA).[750] However, the West did not support the fuel swap. Mark Fitzpatrick claims that the Iranian position during the nuclear negotiations was regarded as "an obvious ploy to sidetrack the growing momentum for tough UN sanctions".[751] The Turkish-Brazilian plan did not prevent the UN Security Council from imposing additional sanctions on Iran, expanding an arms

---

[747] Interview with Professor Hüseyin Bağcı, July 5, 2013.

[748] Talip Küçükcan and Müjde Küçükkeleş, "European Views of Turkish Foreign Policy", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.1, 2013, p.134.

[749] Ioannis N. Grigoriadis, "The Davutoğlu Doctrine and Turkish Foreign Policy", *ELIAMEP Working Paper*, No.8, 2010, p.9.

[750](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/17_05_2010-joint-declaration-of-the-ministers-of-foreign-affairs-of-turkey_-iran-and-brazil_.en.mfa), October 11, 2014 accessed.

[751] Mark Fitzpatrick, "Containing the Iranian Nuclear Crisis: The Useful Precedent of a Fuel Swap", *Perceptions*, Vol.16, No.2, 2011, p.35.

embargo and tightening restrictions on financial and shipping enterprises related to "proliferation-sensitive activities".[752] So, Resolution 1929 (2010) was adopted by a vote of 12 in favor to 2 against (Turkey and Brazil), with 1 abstention (Lebanon).

7.2.4. The Arab World in the Wake of the Arab Spring

Since the late 2010, an unfamiliar process in the Arab world, which is widely called "the Arab Spring" (*Ar-Rabi Al-Arabi*), has existed. Due to various factors such as authoritarian ruling, corrupt order and economic hardship, widespread public protests have been organized and violent conflicts have occurred in a number of countries in the Arab world. The process began with public protests launched in Tunisia soon after Mohamed Bouazizi's self-immolation in protest of public humiliation. The protests resulted in Tunisian President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali's fleeing to Saudi Arabia on January 14, 2011. Similar to Tunisia, public protests in a wave of massive mobilizations which started on January 25, 2011 in the Liberation Square (*Midan at-Tahrir*) toppled Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak on February 11, 2011. This wave of change caused tremendously hard situations to arise in other countries such as Libya, Yemen and Syria.[753]

In this context, the Arab Spring that has changed the status in the Middle East has become an important litmus test for Turkey's regional leadership claims.[754] Turkey's foreign policy preferred to take an active part in this process.

---

[752] (http://www.un.org/press/en/2010/sc9948.doc.htm), October 11, 2014 accessed.

[753] The Syrian uprising began four years ago. The current conflict characterized by heavy fighting on many fronts still continues. For this reason, the Syrian case is not studied in this dissertation.

225

Prime Minister Erdoğan was the first leader in Europe and the Middle East to call on Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak "to heed the legitimate demands of the Egyptian people and step down".[755] Additionally, for many, Turkey could become a model for the Arab countries in transition. Indeed, several mainstream Islamist parties in those countries would certainly prefer "a Turkish-style system than an Afghan one".[756] In May 2011, as a regional partner, Turkey participated in the Deauville Partnership with the Arab countries in transition, an international effort launched by the G-8 countries, in order to provide financial assistance to the Arab countries such as Egypt and Tunisia in democratic transitions.[757] Furthermore, Turkey provided a $2 billion economic aid package to Egypt to overcome the intensifying economic crisis.[758] Militarily, Turkey supported NATO's Operation Unified Protector against the Qaddafi regime of Libya, which lasted from March to October 2011, with both the support of its naval and air force.

Although the slogans of the Egyptian massive demonstrations had universal appeals such as freedom, equality and democracy, there was "a battle for power between Islamist and secular forces" rather than "any unity of purpose among

---

[754] Burhanettin Duran, "Understanding the AK Party's Identity Politics: A Civilizational Discourse and Its Limitations", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.1, 2013, p.102.

[755] Talip Küçükcan and Müjde Küçükkeleş, "European Views of Turkish Foreign Policy", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.1, 2013, p.133.

[756] Lin Noueihed and Alex Warren, *The Battle for the Arab Spring: Revolution, Counter-Revolution and the Making of a New Era*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012, p.276.

[757] *Ibid*, p.289.

[758] Taha Özhan, "New Egypt versus the *Felool*: Struggle for Democracy", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.1, 2013, p.16.

Egyptians" after toppling the Mubarak regime.[759] The formation of Egypt's new constitution caused serious debates in the country and the conflictual political process did not end. At last, on July 3, 2013, under the leadership of Defense Minister and Commander-in-Chief General Abdel Fattah El Sisi, the Egyptian army ousted Mohamed Morsi, Egypt's first civilian and Islamist president elected on June 30, 2012. Regarding the developments in Egypt, the Turkish Foreign Ministry issued the following press release:

> The situation in Egypt, following the removal from office yesterday of President Muhammed Mursi by the Egyptian Armed Forces and the suspension of the Constitution, has reached an extremely sensitive and alarming stage… It is not possible for any democratic country to comprehend nor to accept that an elected President is removed from office through undemocratic means other than elections. We expect all due respect to be extended to elected President Mursi in this new period in Egypt as well.[760]

Prime Minister Erdoğan said that his president in Egypt was Morsi because he had been elected by the people.[761] Erdoğan accused "the coup rulers" of acting dictatorially, and claimed that Israel was behind the coup.[762] His statements were not welcomed in Egypt. The tension between Turkey and Egypt increasingly

---

[759] Marina Ottaway, "After the Constitution, a New Battle in Egypt", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.1, 2013, pp.7-8.

[760] (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_-192_-4-july-2013_-regarding-the-latest-developments-in-egypt.en.mfa), February 16, 2014 accessed.

[761] *Today's Zaman*, July 14, 2013.

[762] *Hurriyet Daily News*, August 20, 2013.

continued. Finally, Hüseyin Avni Botsalı, the Turkish Ambassador to Cairo, returned home after being expelled in a diplomatic spat over Ankara's support for Egypt's ousted Islamist president.

Besides the Egyptian case, Turkey's ability to lead the liberal-democratic transformations in the region has faced obstructions, as seen in the Iranian response to the Syrian crisis in the name of maintaining its pre-Arab Spring influence in the Middle East.[763] The situation has proved that Turkey is not alone in the region, and the third actors participating in the drama are influential on Turkey's relations with the countries experiencing the Arab Spring.

Israel has viewed the process from a different perspective and adopted a more passive approach in comparison to Turkey. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stresses that "Israel should wait and see how developments in the Middle East progress, and should not take any major diplomatic initiatives until the region is stable once again".[764] The Arab Spring has had a mixed effect on Israel itself. On the one hand, the Arab Spring has enabled the strengthening of a quiet relationship with moderate Arab countries such as Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia, which all feel that they have a common interest in combating Islamist forces. Israel has to deal with non-state actors which are sometimes more difficult to deal with than with states.[765] Therefore, Israel has preferred the regional status quo to the Arab Spring.[766]

---

[763] Tarık Oğuzlu, "The 'Arab Spring' and the Rise of the 2.0 Version of Turkey's 'zero problems with neighbors' Policy", *SAM Papers*, No.1, 2012, pp.11-12.

[764] Nimrod Goren, "An Unfulfilled Opportunity for Reconciliation: Israel and Turkey during the Arab Spring", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, p.121.

[765] Interview with Professor Ofra Bengio, December 2, 2014.

Similarly, Ewan Stein gives the Egyptian case as an example. Stein argues that Mubarak's Egypt prioritized a stronger economy, maintaining its status as a lynchpin of stability in the region, and ensuring US support for the regime.[767] However, the future of Egypt and its relations with Israel remain uncertain in the post-Mubarak era. In spite of its financial and military power, Israel could find itself in substantial political, economic and ideological difficulty.[768] In this vein, Peled considers that the Arab Spring has not created better conditions for Israel. Instead, the process has triggered the sentiment of the Israeli conservatives as well. Peled compares the Israeli domestic politics of 1990s to today. He states that in 1992, the Israeli liberal parties, the Labor and Meretz, held 56 seats in the Knesset, out of 120 seats. Today, these two parties hold 19 seats in the Knesset.[769]

On the other side, Yossi Shain claims that the state system in the Middle East is undermined. In reality, there are very few states in the region that could be defined as "a systematically state". That is to say that there is a lack of a state system which is a big challenge. Shain asks who the responsible authority to negotiate and make a deal with is. He argues that there is a big dilemma. Only big armies can threaten Israel's security. To Shain, Israel is now stronger than all of its

---

[766] Nimrod Goren, "An Unfulfilled Opportunity for Reconciliation: Israel and Turkey during the Arab Spring", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, p.125.

[767] Ewan Stein, "The Camp David Consensus: Ideas, Intellectuals, and the Division of Labor in Egypt's Foreign Policy toward Israel", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.55, No.3, 2011, pp.738-739.

[768] Tariq Ramadan, *The Arab Awakening: Islam and the New Middle East*, London: Penguin Books, 2012, p.155.

[769] Interview with Professor Yoav Peled, June 24, 2013.

surrounding countries, and there is no security problem in this respect. However, he draws attention to the fact that there are many other great dangers such as terrorism, misuse of weapons and suicide attacks.[770]

On the contrary, Nizar Amer stresses that the Arab Spring has negative effects in the short run; eventually, there will be good results in the long run if democracies starts to form in these countries. According to him, democratic states do not prefer to wage wars against each other. He adds that for a long time, Arab dictators controlling the media have been cultivating in hatred among the Arabs against Israel. If the Arab states become more democratic in the long run, people could begin to see reality.[771]

In short, the Arab Spring has not helped the two countries get closer. Instead, they have adopted different approaches towards the changes in the Arab world. Turkey was acting as a revisionist/aspirant power whereas Israel remained a supporter of the status quo.[772] Within this context, the bilateral relations could be negatively affected by unforeseen developments in the region which might have consequences for the wider area. As such the visit of Hamas' Ismail Haniyeh's visit to Ankara in January 2012, and then Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's

---

[770] Interview with Professor Yossi Shain, June 26, 2013.

[771] Interview with Nizar Amer, Deputy Chief of Mission of the Israeli Embassy in Ankara, July 4, 2013.

[772] Tarık Oğuzlu, "The 'Arab Spring' and the Rise of the 2.0 Version of Turkey's 'zero problems with neighbors' Policy", *SAM Papers*, No.1, 2012, p.12.

visit to Nicosia in February 2012, the first-ever visit of an Israeli Prime Minister to the island, have affected the Turkish-Israeli relations in a negative manner.[773]

7.3.   Chapter Conclusion

The JDP, a party coming from the tradition of political Islam, gained a decisive victory in the elections held on November 3, 2002 and a new term began in Turkey. During this term, the pro-Western military elite, a strong supporter of the Turkish-Israeli cooperation, lost its privileged position in Turkish politics, and accordingly its ability to dictate foreign policy in the 2000s.[774] The shift within Turkey was dramatic and this shift was not independent from the rise of the JDP which was strong enough to dictate policies without respect to the secular opposition in the country.[775] By taking its advantage, the JDP's investment in the EU accession process played an important role in this transformation. The Erdoğan government made a number of reforms required by the EU. The decision of the European Council to open membership talks with Turkey on December 17, 2004, and then the commencement of the Accession Negotiations on October 3, 2005 accelerated the transformation. In this process, a growing number of non-governmental/civil society organizations have begun to enter the domestic political

---

[773] Nimrod Goren, "An Unfulfilled Opportunity for Reconciliation: Israel and Turkey during the Arab Spring", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, pp.126 and 133.

[774] Ofra Bengio, "Altercating Interests and Orientations between Israel and Turkey: A View from Israel", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.11, No.2, 2009, p.45; Ali Balcı, "Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası ve İsrail: 1990'lar ve 2000'lere İlişkin Bir Karşılaştırma", *Ortadoğu Etütleri*, Vol.2, No.2, 2011, p.133.

[775] Soner Çağaptay, "Where goes the US-Turkish Relationship?", *Middle East Quarterly*, Vol.11, No.4, 2004, pp.43-44.

process and foreign policy. It is consistent with Davutoğlu's claim that Turkey's success in foreign policy cannot be based on the success of state policies alone but also relies on the cooperation of business organizations such as the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB) which held the Ankara Forums for Economic Cooperation between Turkey, Palestine and Israel so as to bring businessmen together, and develop industrial zones in Palestine.[776] In this vein, it seems possible to argue that actors coming from political Islam tradition in Turkey have been more pragmatic and democratic in comparison to other cases in the Middle East, and have cooperated with the Western institutions.[777]

As for foreign policy, the JDP has tried to implement a dynamic, proactive and multilateral foreign policy that has been associated with the name of Ahmet Davutoğlu who is widely accepted as the architect of foreign policy in the JDP era. Davutoğlu offers a new geopolitical approach. According to him, Turkey which is located in the midst of Afro-Eurasia occupies a unique space and cannot be explained geographically or culturally by associating it with one single region.[778] Davutoğlu's geographical approach claims that Turkey has multiple regional identities indeed. For this reason, Turkey should benefit from both its Western and Eastern identities when discussing regional problems in the West and in the East.[779]

---

[776](http://www.tobb.org.tr/AvrupaBirligiDairesi/Dokumanlar/Eng/InternationalCommunity/ankaraforum1stjointdeclaration.pdf), August 27, 2014 accessed.

[777] Interview with Assoc. Prof. Şaban Kardaş, March 27, 2015.

[778] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, p.78.

[779] Gürkan Zengin, *Hoca: Türk Dış Politikasında Davutoğlu Etkisi*, Istanbul: İnkilap 2010, p.92.

With respect to foreign policy, Davutoğlu has called for a "new strategic theory" that should help policy-makers make use of the opportunities provided by the post-Cold War "geopolitical and geoeconomic vacuum".[780] It is remarkable to note that in the Turkish case, "geopolitics is put to work in shaping not only foreign policy (as per practice) but also (perhaps more so) domestic political processes".[781]

On this basis, in parallel to the EU accession process, Turkey's focus on the developments in the Middle East has steadily increased. In particular, the Erdoğan government had to face the serious consequences of the US-Iraq War of 2003. Turkey was challenged with the resurgence of the PKK terrorism. In addition, Turkey had to deal with the process following the foundation of a semi-autonomous regional government in northern Iraq that might ignite the desire of Kurds living in Turkey for the establishment of an independent Kurdish state. Hence, the Middle East has been as important as Europe to Turkish foreign policy. In other words, its foreign policy was *Middle Easternized* without a breakup with the West.[782]

On the contrary, Turkey's rapprochement with the Middle Eastern countries has had significant repercussions on its relations with Israel. As indicated before, in the 1990s, Turkey and Israel had developed close relations that were defined as "a strategic relationship". During this term, securitization played an indispensable role in the Turkish-Israeli relations. But the signing of the Adana Accords in 1998 and

---

[780] Pınar Bilgin, "Only Strong States Can Survive in Turkey's Geography: The Uses of Geopolitical Truths in Turkey", *Political Geography*, No.26, 2007, p.749.

[781] *Ibid*, p.741.

[782] Tarık Oğuzlu, "Middle Easternization of Turkey's Foreign Policy: Does Turkey Dissociate From the West?", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.9, No.1, 2008, p.3.

the final capture of PKK leader Öcalan in 1999 paved the way for good relations between Turkey and Syria. In the 2000s, especially from 2002 onwards, with the impact of Turkey's Policy of Zero Problems with Neighbors, Turkey no longer perceived Syria or Iran as a threat anymore but as neighboring countries with which Turkey should not have any problems. In this framework, Turkey followed the policy of an active involvement in the Middle East and accordingly tried to play a facilitator role to solve the regional problems. However, Turkey's vision on the Middle East has resulted in confrontations with Israel as seen in many cases such as Israel's attack on the Gaza Strip, Prime Minister Erdoğan's publicly rebuking to Israeli President Peres at the World Economic Forum, and the IDF's raid on the Mavi Marmara flotilla.[783]

In conclusion, the JDP rule highlights two specific points in line with the state identity definition used by this study: First, how the Turkish state identity experiences a change towards becoming an insider of the Middle East, despite the Erdoğan government has ascribed importance to the EU accession process. Increasingly, there has been more Islamic call as seen in the case of Palestine. Second, how this shift affects the Turkish-Israeli relations. Although Turkey's need for making cooperation with Israel in the fields of security and intelligence decreased with the capture of PKK's leader Öcalan, Turkey's state identity did not experience a shift in the term 1999-2002. However, the JDP's coming to power and afterwards showed that the roles of different domestic actors were changing. It was a process implying a shift in the definition of Turkey's interests and accordingly its

---

[783] Interview with Assoc. Prof. Şaban Kardaş, March 27, 2015.

foreign policy. Hence, Turkey's relations with Israel have not been independent

from the process of forming and reforming Turkey's state identity.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this dissertation is to study how explanatory Turkey's state identity in the Turkish-Israeli relations is, whether or not there is a change in its state identity particularly under the JDP rule (2002-2011), and if so, how this change affects Turkey's relations with Israel. Accordingly, the dissertation focuses on the effectiveness of the concept of state identity as an analytical framework for Turkish foreign policy and the Turkish-Israeli relations. As it was analyzed in this dissertation, state identity is a combination of the domestic factors such as political leaders and state apparatus/institutions, and the international system/dynamics.

By taking these elements into consideration, the dissertation finds out that Turkey's relations with Israel can be explained from the concept of state identity. In addition, Turkey's state identity has gone through radical transformation under the JDP rule. This shift is from the pro-Western stance to *the Middle Easternized Central Country/Heir of the Ottoman Empire* stance.

8.1.   Evaluation

In the period of 1948-1991, Turkey felt obliged to take part in the Western camp because of the increasing Soviet threat. The country's pro-Western governing elites invested in Turkey's integration into the Western institutions in parallel to its

Westernization process. Under the Cold War dynamics, Turkey and Israel, the only two democratic countries in the Middle East region, preferred the Western camp, and their "self" perception included each other by defining the remaining actors in the region as "others". In view of that, Turkey and Israel formed their interests within this context and developed close relations.

However, the Turkish-Israeli relations also faced ups and downs during this period. The downs lasted for only a limited period of time and did not cause a radical crack in the relations indeed. In the Turkish side, both the army and intelligentsia were deeply committed to the Turkish state identity strongly linked to the Western values even when Turkey conducted a multidimensional foreign policy including better relations with the Arab/Islamic countries, many of which were supported by the Soviet Union. Again, both the army and intelligentsia continued to follow a pro-Israel line even in times of crises such the Knesset's passing of "Basic Law: Jerusalem, Capital of Israel" in July 1980. As indicated before, although Turkey decided first to close its Consulate General in Jerusalem, and then to limit its relations with Israel and withdraw all diplomatic personnel except for a secretary, Turkey did not cut off the relations entirely; instead, strengthened its ties with Israel. In short, the pro-Western domestic factors and the bipolar international system became influential on the formation of Turkey's state identity which defined its interest, foreign policy and good relations with Israel during the Cold War.

On the other side, the demise of the socialist camp in the late 1980 and the final dissolution of the Soviet Union in December 1991 drastically changed the international dynamics that put an end to the bipolar system. In accordance with the state identity definition used by the dissertation, the newly emerging international

environment in this era implied a limited change for the Turkish state identity, and became an important process of defining situation for Turkey.

But facilitating factors for Turkey's relations with Israel such as the continuing importance of securitization provided Turkey maintain its pro-Western state identity. Since Turkey's main purpose became to protect its own security and stability against the grave repercussions of the violent conflicts in the neighboring regions under the new conditions, Turkey once again adhered itself to a common identity with the West. Accordingly, Turkey continued to make political and security cooperation with Israel despite the growing domestic discussions on that Turkey should have followed more independent policies from the West.

On this point, it should be noted that there were also Kurdish, Islamic and neo-Ottomanist/pan-Turkist alternative visions for the formation of Turkey's state identity. In particular, the rise of political Islam became an undeniable fact with the pro-Islamic RP's coming to power in 1996 that caused serious concerns about Turkey's state identity for pro-Western forces. Some scholars defined the RP-led coalition as a term of "the duality of Turkey's state identity". But the military-bureaucratic elites, other domestic factors championing a pro-Western stance, prevented any derailment with the fall of the RP from power as a result of "a postmodern or soft coup on 28 February 1997".

After the RP experience, the coalition governments (1997-2002) preserved Turkey's pro-Western state identity and conducted foreign policy accordingly. Consequently, this dissertation comes to the conclusion that those alternative arguments were not strong enough to challenge Turkey's traditional pro-Western domestic structure and Western-oriented foreign policy. The signing of the Adana Accords between Turkey and Syria in October 1998 and then the final capture of

PKK leader Öcalan in February 1999 did not shift this reality while Turkey's need for Israel in the fields of security and intelligence decreased. Even when the second *Intifada*, the Palestinian uprising against the IDF, erupted in September 2000, and later on, Prime Minister Ecevit had defined the Israeli attack on the Jenin refugee camp in April 2002 as "genocide", the bilateral relations remained stable. The Turkish government's decision to give military modernization projects to the Israeli companies confirmed the stability. In the light of both international and domestic factors, Turkey's pro-Western state identity was still a significant factor to determine its relations with Israel in the new era.

The evolution of Turkey's state identity and

Its impact on the relations with Israel in a timeframe:

Term	State Identity	Turkish-Israeli Relations
1948-1991	Domestic continuity International continuity Pro-Western	Good: Limitation is Turkey's relations with the Arab World
1991-2002	Domestic continuity International change Pro-Western	Better: Strategic Relationship / Limitation is the *Intifada*
2002-2011	Domestic change International change From Pro-Western to Middle Easternized Central Country / Heir of the Ottoman Empire	From Bad to Worse: From Strategic Relationship To Crisis

From 2002 onwards, Turkey's state identity has begun to play more crucial role in foreign policy. Now, it seems not possible to reduce Turkish foreign policy to only one specific issue such as the EU membership process. Instead, the JDP rule has attached priority to ideational-sentimental factors. In this regard, the JDP experience shows that domestic politics might influence foreign policy whereas developments in foreign policy may have consequences in domestic politics. In the domestic politics, the JDP leadership gives strong messages which refer to the historical heritage closely linked to the legacy of history, in other words the Ottoman Empire. The common values, especially the religion of Islam, have been more often used in rhetoric in Turkey's relations with the Middle Eastern states as seen in the case of Palestine or the Palestinian issue. Therefore, a constructivist perspective is needed in order to make a comprehensive analysis on its foreign policy toward the Middle East region and more specifically toward Israel. Without studying Turkey's state identity, we cannot explain the Turkish-Israeli relations concretely.

On the basis of the arguments presented in the previous chapters, this dissertation comes to the conclusion that Turkey's domestic factors have had an important shift in which the EU accession process was influential. Different from the traditional pro-Islamist parties using strong anti-Western rhetoric, the JDP had experienced a reconsideration process on "the Western/modern political values and the West itself"[784] with the impact of the 28 February process. However, the internal reforms made for the EU membership dramatically decreased the leading

---

[784] İhsan Dağı, "Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization", *Central European University Center for Policy Studies and Open Society Institute*, International Policy Fellowship Program 2001-2002, p.40.

role of the military in defining the agenda while the JDP government found larger maneuver space. Furthermore, an increasing number of non-governmental/civil society organizations have begun to contribute to the formation of domestic and foreign policy. As a result, the pro-Western military-civilian bureaucracy, powerful supporter of the Turkish-Israeli relations, lost its privileged position in domestic politics and its ability to define foreign policy.

As regards to the international system/dynamics, this dissertation reaches the result that the September 11 and afterwards could be evaluated as a continuation of the period of change that had already started with the end of the Cold War. During this process, there were some attempts, for example, to call Turkey the representative of *Ilımlı İslam* (moderate Islam) in order to reposition it in the new emerging dynamics although the Turkish side rejected such claims. In fact, those discussions were related to the future of Turkey in the Middle East region.

Under the circumstances, the JDP found fertile ground to impose its ideological stance and implement its own foreign policy agenda. As demonstrated in the previous chapters, it is useful to remember that there is a close relationship between state identity, interest and foreign policy. Based on Turkey's new state identity, which is named as *the Middle Easternized Central Country/Heir of the Ottoman Empire* by this dissertation, a new foreign policy vision emerged as well. There is no doubt that Turkey's relations with Israel have been influenced from this process. The relations first declined, then worsened and finally turned into a set of crises. This transformation can be explained with Turkey's changing state identity.

In accordance with the evolution of Turkey's state identity and its impact on the bilateral relations, this dissertation argues that the Ottoman Empire or the

legacy of history has of special importance. Several leading figures of the JDP such as Cüneyt Zapsu, Ahmet Davutoğlu and Yasin Aktay point to this Ottoman factor in the JDP's strategic thinking. To explain Turkey's perception of history together with interest and foreign policy, Cüneyt Zapsu for example, one of the founders of the JDP and a close advisor to Prime Minister Erdoğan (2001-2008), says, "A new, positive role for Turkey in the world requires reconciliation with its own past, the overcoming of societal taboos and a positive new concept of Turkish identity. We are the Ottomans' successors and should not be ashamed of this".[785]

Similar to Zapsu, Ahmet Davutoğlu presents his geostrategic approach founded precisely on the lands dominated by the Ottoman Empire for a long time: the Middle East (including the North Africa as well), the Balkans and the Caucasus. On this point, for Davutoğlu, "self-perception" is the key element to reach an identity since every self-perception turns into identity. In this context, Davutoğlu mentions the process of redefining self-perception for Turkey and claims that Turkey must find a common ground with its Ottoman past.

By referring to Turkey's Ottoman legacy, Davutoğlu believes that Turkey is "a central country" in the Middle East region. On the basis of its diverse cultural features which Turkey's geography harmonizes for centuries, it has been a center of attraction. Thus, Turkey possesses a "strategic depth" as a consequence of its history and geographical location. According to him, every problem in the region is of great interest to Turkey even if Turkey does not interest. In fact, it was another change for Turkey in terms of its foreign policy toward the region from avoiding

---

[785] (http://en.qantara.de/content/a-shift-in-turkish-foreign-policy-turkeys-strategic-depth), June 22, 2015 accessed.

getting involved in regional conflicts to playing third party or mediator role. As argued before, this change caused negative repercussions to the Turkish-Israeli relations.

Inspired from the strategic depth theory, the policy of zero-problem with Turkey's neighbors aimed the creation of a new psychological environment in order to let Turkey gain an extraordinary space for maneuver in foreign policy and the minimization of spill-over effect of regional problems to Turkey. Actually, the policy of zero-problem tried to define the frame in which Turkey desires to be in interaction with its neighboring countries. In other words, it points to an interactive process which is influential on shaping and reshaping Turkey's state identity.

Davutoğlu's ideas affecting both Turkey's state identity and foreign policy required new foreign policy methodology and mechanisms. Turkey's new foreign policy methodology was founded on the basis of having a "visionary" approach, forming a "consistent and systematic" foreign policy framework and adopting a new diplomatic language and style highlighting Turkey's soft power instead of its military power. In addition to methodology, there are mechanisms of an integrated foreign policy approach, a proactive foreign policy line supported by rhythmic diplomacy, a presence on the ground particularly during times of crisis, an equidistance policy, and a total performance in foreign policy. Within this context, Turkey's foreign policy-making process experienced a change as well.

8.2. Epilogue

Turkey's state identity has been an inseparable part of Turkish foreign policy since the establishment of the Republic of Turkey. The recent emergence of

an Islamic alternative vision motivated by the Ottoman legacy to its traditional pro-Western state identity and Western-oriented foreign policy relates to domestic politization of foreign policy.[786] Consistent with the state identity definition of this thesis, the domestic factors such as leaders, political parties and public institutions changed under the JDP rule. In addition, the international system/dynamics continued to experience a change in this period. As a result of the simultaneous changes of these factors, Turkey's state identity and consequently its interest and foreign policy formulations shifted. This dissertation defines Turkey's new state identity as *the Middle Easternized Central Country/Heir of the Ottoman Empire.*

Turkey's new state identity provided an important analytical framework for its relations with Israel as well. During the 1990s, the Turkish-Israeli relations were on the peak. However, today there is no a strong alliance anymore despite the fact that there are lots of mutual interests in the Middle East. On this point, Turkey's state identity plays a critical and decisive role. Accordingly, Turkish foreign policy is under the impact of its state identity now.[787]

In conclusion, the concept of state identity has been relevant to explain Turkey's relations with Israel since the establishment of the state-to-state relations in January 1950. In accordance with the definition of state identity referring the domestic factors and the international system/dynamics that continuously shape and reshape state identity by interacting with each other, this dissertation reveals that Turkey's changing state identity has also shifted its relations with Israel. In this vein, I do assume that this study will provide an important opportunity to

---

[786] Interview with Ambassador Ertuğrul Apakan, September 10, 2014.

[787] Interview with Professor Yossi Shain, June 26, 2013.

244

understand the future developments in the bilateral relations more comprehensively from the perspective of state identity.

REFERENCES

Articles and Books:

Adler, Emanuel, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.3, No.3, 1997, pp.319-363.

Akdevelioğlu, Atay and Kürkçüoğlu, Ömer, "1980-1990: Batı Bloku Ekseninde Türkiye-2: Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt II: 1980-2001*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, pp.152-157.

Akgün, Mensur, Senyücel Gündoğar, Sabiha and Görgülü, Aybars, "Politics in Troubled Times: Israel-Turkey Relations", *TESEV Foreign Policy Program*, 2014, pp.1-12.

Alaranta, Toni, *The Transformation of the Republic's Status in the International System: National and State Identity in Turkey*, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2015.

Alemdari, Cihangir Moini, "İran'da Kimlik, Tarih ve Anlatı", in Hamid Ahmedi (ed), *İran: Ulusal Kimlik İnşası*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2009, pp.3-24.

Altoraifi, Adel, *Understanding the Role of State Identity in Foreign Policy Decision-Making: The Rise and Demise of Saudi-Iranian Rapprochement (1997–2009)*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation submitted to the London School of Economics and Political Science, 2012.

Altunışık, Meliha, "The Turkish-Israeli Rapprochement in the Post-Cold War Era", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.36, No.2, 2000, pp.172-191.

Altunışık, Meliha Benli and Tür, Özlem, *Turkey: Challenges of Continuity and Change*, London: Routledge, 2005.

Altunışık, Meliha Benli and Tür, Özlem, "From Distant Neighbors to Partners? Changing Syrian-Turkish Relations", *SAGE Publications*, Vol.37, No.2, 2006, pp.217-236.

Altunışık, Meliha Benli, "Ortadoğu ve ABD: Yeni Bir Döneme Girilirken", *Ortadoğu Etütleri*, Vol.1, No.1, 2009, pp.69-81.

Altunışık, Meliha Benli, "Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu'daki Yumuşak Gücü ve Önündeki Engeller", *TESEV*, July 2011, (It is possible to reach from internet).

Altunışık, Meliha Benli, "Turkey's Changing Middle East Policy", *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, No.23, 2012, pp.149-162.

Aras, Bülent, *Palestinian Israeli Peace Process and Turkey*, New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc., 1998.

Aras, Bülent, "The Academic Perceptions of Turkish-Israeli Relations", *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, Vol.1, No.1, 2002, pp.1-17.

Aras, Bülent and Bıçakçı, Salih, "Europe, Turkey and the Middle East: Is Harmonization Possible?", *East European Quarterly*, Vol.40, No.3, 2006, pp.367-381.

Aras, Bülent, "Davutoğlu Era in Turkish Foreign Policy", *SETA Policy Brief*, No.32, 2009, pp.1-16.

Aras, Bülent, "Davutoğlu Era in Turkish Foreign Policy Revisited", *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, Vol.16, No.4, 2014, pp.404-418.

Arı, Tayyar, *Geçmişten Günümüze Orta Doğu: Siyaset, Savaş ve Diplomasi Cilt I*, Bursa: MKM Yayınları, 2012.

Arian, Asher, *Politics in Israel: The Second Republic*, Washington: CQ Press, 2005.

Armaoğlu, Fahir, *20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi*, Istanbul: Alkım, 2010.

Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal, *Nutuk*, Istanbul: ATAM Yayınları, 2013.

Ateşoğlu, H. Sönmez, "Security of Turkey with Respect to the Middle East", *Perceptions*, Vol.16, No.2, 2011, pp.99-110.

Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya, *İkinci Adam Birinci Cilt (1884-1938)*, Istanbul: Remzi Kitapevi, 2012.

Aydın, Mustafa, "Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy: Historical Framework and Traditional Inputs", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.35, No.4, 1999, pp.152-186.

Aytürk, İlker, "Between Crisis and Cooperation: The Future of Turkish-Israeli Relations", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.11, No.2, 2009, pp.57-74.

Bacık, Gökhan, "Turkish-Israeli Relations after Davos: A View from Turkey", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.11, No.2, 2009, pp.31-41.

Bağcı, Hüseyin, *Türk Dış Politikasında 1950'li Yıllar*, Ankara: METU Press, 2001.

Bağcı, Hüseyin, *Zeitgeist: Global Politics and Turkey*, Ankara: Orion, 2008.

Balcı, Ali, "Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası ve İsrail: 1990'lar ve 2000'lere İlişkin Bir Karşılaştırma", *Ortadoğu Etütleri*, Vol.2, No.2, 2011, pp.117-136.

Balcı, Ali and Kardaş, Tuncay, "The Changing Dynamics of Turkey's Relations with Israel: An Analysis of Securitization", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, pp.99-120.

Balcı, Ali, *Türkiye Dış Politikası: İlkeler, Aktörler, Uygulamalar*, Istanbul: Etkileşim, 2013.

Balcı, Ali and Yeşiltaş, Murat, "A Dictionary of Turkish Foreign Policy in the AK Party Era: A Conceptual Map", *SAM Papers*, No.7, 2013, pp.1-37.

Bali, Rıfat N., *Devlet'in Yahudileri ve "Öteki" Yahudi*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2010.

Bali, Rıfat, *Model Citizens of the State: The Jews of Turkey during the Multi-Party Period*, Plymouth: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2012.

Banchoff, Thomas, "German Identity and European Integration", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.5, No.3, 1999, pp.259-289.

Barın, Büşra, *The Ottoman Policy towards Jewish Immigration and Settlement in Ottoman Empire: 1882-1920*, unpublished master thesis submitted to Middle East Technical University, 2014.

Barnett, Michael, "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.5, No.1, 1999, pp.5-36.

Barnett, Michael, "Israeli Identity and the Peace Process", in Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett (eds), *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, New York: Cornell University, 2002, pp.58-87.

Barnett, Michael, "Social Constructivism", in John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens (eds), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008, p.160-173.

Baykal, Sanem and Arat, Tuğrul, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi: AB'yle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt III: 2001-2012)*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2002, pp.337-400.

Bengio, Ofra, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Outsiders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Bengio, Ofra, "Altercating Interests and Orientations between Israel and Turkey: A View from Israel", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.11, No.2, 2009, pp.43-55.

Bengio, Ofra, "Turkey's Quiet Revolution and Its Impact on Israel", *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs,* Vol.4, No.1, 2010, pp.15-21.

Bilgin, Pınar, "Only Strong States Can Survive in Turkey's Geography: The Uses of Geopolitical Truths in Turkey", *Political Geography*, No.26, 2007, pp.740-756.

Bishku, Michael B., "How has Turkey Viewed Israel?", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, pp.177-194.

Bozdağlıoğlu, Yücel, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2003.

Bozdağlıoğlu, Yücel, "Modernity, Identity and Turkey's Foreign Policy", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, pp.55-76.

Bölükbaşı, Süha, "Behind the Turkish-Israeli Alliance: A Turkish View", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.29, No.1, 1999, pp.21-35.

Bölükbaşı, Süha, "Türkiye ve İsrail: Mesafeli Yakınlıktan Stratejik Ortaklığa", in Şaban H. Çalış, İhsan D. Dağı and Ramazan Gözen (eds), *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberté Yayınları, 2001, pp.243-269.

Campbell, David, *Writing Security, United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992.

Cem, İsmail, *Avrupa'nın Birliği ve Türkiye*, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.

Cem, İsmail, *Türkiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi*, Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2007.

Chafetz, Glenn, Spirtas, Michael and Frankel, Benjamin, "Introduction: Tracing the Influence of Identity on Foreign Policy", *Security Studies*, Vol.8, No.2-3, Winter 1998-1999, Spring 1999, pp.VII-XXII.

Checkel, Jeffrey, "The Constructive Turn in International Relations Theory", *World Politics*, Vol.50, No.2, 1998, pp.324-348.

Chomsky, Noam, *Making the Future: Operations, Interventions, Empire and Resistance*, London: Penguin Books, 2012.

Cleveland, William L., and Bunton, Martin, *A History of the Modern Middle East*, Boulder: Westview Press, 2009.

Cohen, Erik, "Citizenship, Nationality and Religion in Israel and Thailand", in Baruch Kimmerling (ed), *The Israeli State and Society: Boundaries and Frontiers*, New York: State University of New York Press, 1989, pp.66-92.

Cohen-Almagor, Raphael, "The Failed Palestinian-Israeli Peace Process 1993-2011: An Israeli Perspective", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.18, No.4, 2012, pp.563-576.

Criss, Nur Bilge, "Parameters of Turkish Foreign Policy under the AKP Governments", *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, No.23, 2010, pp.9-22.

Çağaptay, Soner, "Where goes the US-Turkish Relationship?", *Middle East Quarterly*, Vol.11, No.4, 2004, pp.43-52.

Çalış, Şaban, "The Turkish State's Identity and Foreign Policy Decision-Making Process", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.6, No.2, 1995, pp.135-155.

Çalış, Şaban, "Ulus, Devlet ve Kimlik Labirentinde Türk Dış Politikası", in Şaban Çalış, İhsan D. Dağı and Ramazan Gözen (eds), *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberte Yayınları, 2001, pp.3-34.

Dağı, İhsan, *Kimlik, Söylem ve Siyaset: Doğu-Batı Ayrımında Refah Partisi Geleneği*, Ankara: İmge Kitapevi, 1998.

Dağı, İhsan, "Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization", *Central European University Center for Policy Studies and Open Society Institute*, International Policy Fellowship Program 2001-2002, pp.1-53.

Dağı, İhsan, "Transformation of Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.6, No.1, 2005, pp.21-37.

Dal, Emel Parlar, "The Transformation of Turkey's Relations with the Middle East: Illusion or Awakening?", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.13, No.2, 2012, pp.245-267.

Dalay, Galip and Friedman, Dov, "The AK Party and the Evolution of Turkish Political Islam's Foreign Policy", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.2, 2013, pp.123-139.

Danon, Danny, *Israel: The Will to Prevail*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

David, Steven R., "Existential Threats to Israel: Learning from the Ancient Past", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.18, No.4, 2012, pp.503-525.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet, "Medeniyetlerin Ben-İdraki", *Divan*, Vol.1, 1997, pp.1-53.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet, "Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, pp.77-96.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet, *Küresel Bunalım*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2009.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet, "Turkish Vision of Regional and Global Order: Theoretical Background and Practical Implementation", *Political Reflection*, Vol.1, No.2, 2010, pp.36-50.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet, *Türkiye Söyleşileri 5: Cumhuriyet, Milliyetçilik ve İslamcılık*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2011.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet, "Global Governance", *Center for Strategic Research Vision Papers*, No.2, 2012, pp.1-14.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet, "Principles of Turkish Foreign Policy and Regional Political Structuring", *Center for Strategic Research Vision Papers*, No.3, 2012, pp.1-14.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet, *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2012.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet, *Teoriden Pratiğe: Türk Dış Politikası Üzerine Konuşmalar*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013.

Dehshiri, M. R. and Majidi, M. R., "Iran's Foreign Policy in Post-Revolution Era: A Holistic Approach", *The Iranian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.21, No.1-2, Winter-Spring 2008-09, pp.101-114.

Demirtaş-Coşkun, Birgül, "Identity: Turkish and German Responses", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.1, 2008, pp.31-54.

Demirtaş, Birgül, "İnşacılık", in Şaban Kardaş and Ali Balcı (eds), *Uluslararası İlişkilere Giriş: Tarih, Teori, Kavram ve Konular*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2014, p.110-121.

Dershowitz, Alan, *The Case for Israel*, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 2003.

Dinç, Cengiz, "Turkey as a New Security Actor in the Middle East: Beyond the Slogans", *Perceptions*, Vol.16, No.2, 2011, pp.61-80.

Duran, Burhanettin, "Understanding the AK Party's Identity Politics: A Civilizational Discourse and Its Limitations", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.1, 2013, pp.91-109.

Ekinci, Mehmet Mücahit, *Turkish-Israeli Relations: Past and Present*, Ankara: Ankamat Matbaacılık, 2011.

Eligür, Banu, "Crisis in Turkish-Israeli Relations (December 2008-June 2011): From Partnership to Enmity", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.48, No.3, 2012, pp.429-459.

Erdemir, Halil, "How Worthy Israeli Relations for Turkey?", *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, Vol.9, No.2, 2010, pp.24-38.

Erhan, Çağrı and Kürkçüoğlu, Ömer, "1990-2001: Küreselleşme Ekseninde Türkiye: Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt II: 1980-2001)*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2002, pp.568-579.

Fırat, Melek and Kürkçüoğlu, Ömer, "1945-1960: Batı Bloku Ekseninde Türkiye-1, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: I) Arap Devletleriyle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (Ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: Iletişim 2005, pp.615-635.

Finnemore, Martha and Sikkink, Kathryn, "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics", *Annual Review of Political Science,* Vol.4, 2001, pp.391-416.

Fitzpatrick, Mark, "Containing the Iranian Nuclear Crisis: The Useful Precedent of a Fuel Swap", *Perceptions*, Vol.16, No.2, 2011, pp.27-42.

Flockhart, Trine, "Constructivism and Foreign Policy", in Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne (eds), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, pp.78-93.

Gilbert, Martin, *Israel: A History*, New York: Harper Perennial, 2008.

Gilbert, Martin, *The Story of Israel*, London: Andre Deutsch, 2011.

Golden, Peter B., "Khazar Studies: Achievements and Perspectives", in Peter B. Golden, Haggai Ben-Shammai and András Róna-Tas (eds), "The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives", *Handbook of Oriental Studies*, Vol.17, 2007, pp.7-57.

Goldscheider, Calvin, *Israel's Changing Society: Population, Ethnicity and Development*, Colorado: Westview Press, 2002.

Goodarzi, Jubin M., *Syria and Iran: Diplomatic Alliance and Power Politics in the Middle East*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2009.

Goren, Nimrod, "An Unfulfilled Opportunity for Reconciliation: Israel and Turkey during the Arab Spring", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, pp.121-135.

Gould, Harry D., "The Agent-Structure Debate", in Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert (Eds), *International Relations in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 1998, pp.79-98.

Gönlübol, Mehmet, *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1995)*, Ankara: Siyasal Kitapevi, 1996.

Grigoriadis, Ioannis N., "The Davutoğlu Doctrine and Turkish Foreign Policy", *ELIAMEP Working Paper*, No.8, 2010, pp.1-12.

Gruen, George E., "Review of the Year 2003 in for Countries: Turkey", in Lawrence Grossman and David Singer (eds), *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol.102, 2004, pp.218-230.

Guttstadt, Corry, *Turkey, the Jews and the Holocaust*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Gürkaynak, Esra Çuhadar, "Turkey as a Third Party in Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Assessment and Reflections", *Perceptions*, Vol.12, No.1, 2007, pp.89-108.

Hale, William, *Türk Dış Politikası: 1774-2000*, Istanbul: Mozaik, 2003.

Herzl, Theodor, *The Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Marvin Lowenthal (trans.), New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1962.

Herzl, Theodor, *The Jewish State*, London: Penguin Books, 2010.

Hopf, Ted, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory", *International Security*, Vol.23, No.1, 1998, pp.170-200.

Hopf, Ted, *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*, New York: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Hudson, Valerie M., *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*, Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2007.

Huntington, Samuel P., "The Clash of Civilizations?", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.72, No.3, 1993, pp.22-49.

Inbar, Efraim, "Israeli-Turkish Tensions and Beyond", *Israeli Journal of Foreign Affairs*, Vol.4, No.1, 2010, pp.27-35.

Jackson, Robert and Sorensen, Georg, *Introduction to International Theories and Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Jung, Dietrich and Piccoli, Wolfango, *Turkey at the Crossroads: Ottoman Legacies and a Greater Middle East*, New York: Zed Book Ltd., 2001.

Kalın, İbrahim, *Türkiye Söyleşileri 5: Cumhuriyet, Milliyetçilik ve İslamcılık*, Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2011, pp.157-171.

Kalın, İbrahim, "Turkish Foreign Policy: Framework, Values, and Mechanisms", *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis*, Vol.67, No.1, 2012, pp.7-21.

Kanat, Kılıç Buğra, "Continuity of Change in Turkish Foreign Policy under the JDP Government: The Cases of Bilateral Relations with Israel and Syria", *Arab Studies Quarterly*, Vol.34, No.4, 2012, pp.230-249.

Kanat, Kılıç Buğra, "AK Party's Foreign Policy: Is Turkey Turning Away from the West?", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.12, No.1, 2012, pp.205-225.

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali, "A Turkish View of Bilateral Relations with Israel" in Ali İhsan Bağış (ed), *Actual Situation and Prospects of Turkey's Bilateral Relations with Israel*, Ankara: Friedrich Neumann Foundation, 1992, pp.1-5.

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali, "The Evolution of the National Security Culture and the Military in Turkey", *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.54, No.1, 2000, pp.199-216.

Kardaş, Şaban, Turkey: "Redrawing the Middle East Map or Building Sandcastles?", *Middle East Policy*, Vol.17, No.1, 2012, pp.115-136.

Kardaş, Şaban, "Türkiye ve Irak Krizi: Kimlikle Çıkar Arasında AKP", in Hakan Yavuz (ed), *AK Parti: Toplumsal Değişimin Yeni Aktörleri*, Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2010, pp.359-389.

Karpat, Kemal H. (ed), *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition: 1950-1974*, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1975.

Karpat, Kemal H., *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*, Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Karpat, Kemal H., *Türk Dış Politikası Tarihi*, Istanbul: Timaş, 2015.

Kasım, Kamer, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri: İki Bölgesel Gücün Stratejik Ortaklığı", in Idris Bal (ed.), *21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: Ankara Global Araştırmalar Merkezi (AGAM), 2006, pp.837-848.

Katzenstein, Peter, "Alternative Perspectives on National Security", in Peter Katzenstein (ed), *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996, pp.1-32 (It is possible to reach from internet).

Kennedy, Paul, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, New York: Vintage, 1989.

Keyman, Fuat, "Globalization, Modernity and Democracy: Turkish Foreign Policy 2009 and Beyond", *Perceptions*, Vol.15, No.3-4, Autumn-Winter 2010, pp.1-20.

Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

Kissinger, Henry, *Does America Need a Foreign Policy?*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001.

Kogan, Eugene, "Cooperation in the Israeli-Turkish Defense Industry", *Conflict Studies Research Center Middle East Series*, Vol.5, No.43, 2005, pp.1-24 (It is possible to reach from internet).

Kowert, Paul, "The Construction of National Identity", in Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert (eds), *International Relations in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 1998, pp.101-122.

Kösebalaban, Hasan, "The Crisis in Turkish-Israeli Relations: What is its Strategic Significance?", *Middle East Policy Council*, Vol.17, No.3, 2010 (It is possible to reach from internet).

Kösebalaban, Hasan, *Türk Dış Politikası*, Ankara: BigBang, 2014.

Kubálková, Vendulka, Onuf, Nicholas and Kowert, Paul, "Constructing Constructivism", in Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert (eds), *International Relations in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 1998, pp.3-21.

Kubálková, Vendulka, "Foreign Policy, International Politics and Constructivism", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, pp.3-37.

Kubálková, Vendulka, "A Constructivist Primer", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, pp.56-76.

Kubálková, Vendulka, "Soviet "New Thinking" and the End of the Cold War", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, pp.99-145.

Küçükcan, Talip and Küçükkeleş, Müjde, "European Views of Turkish Foreign Policy", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.1, 2013, pp.127-144.

Laçiner, Sedat, "Turgut Özal Period in Turkish Foreign Policy: Özalism", *USAK Yearbook*, Vol.2, 2009, pp.153-205.

Lewin, Anat, "Turkey and Israel: Reciprocal and Mutual Imagery in the Media, 1994-1999", *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.54, No.1, 2000, pp.239-264.

Lewis, Bernard, *What Went Wrong?*, London: Phoenix, 2002.

Lewis, Bernard, *The Crisis of Islam*, London: Phoenix, 2003.

Liel, Alon, *Turkey in the Middle East: Oil, Islam, and Politics*, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2001.

Lindenstrauss, Gallia, "Operation Protective Edge: Deepening the Rift between Israel and Turkey", in Anat Kurz and Shlomo Brom (eds), *The Lessons of Operation Protective Edge*, Tel Aviv: Institute for National Security Studies, 2014, pp.173-177.

Lynch, Marc, "Abandoning Iraq: Jordan's Alliances and the Politics of State Identity", *Security Studies*, Vol.8, No.2-3, 1999, pp.347-388.

Mahler, Gregory S., *Politics and Government in Israel: The Maturation of a Modern State*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2011.

Maoz, Zeev, *Defending the Holy Land: A Critical Analysis of Israel's Security & Foreign Policy*, the United States: The University of Michigan Press, 2006.

Marlowe, Christopher, *The Jew of Malta with Related Texts*, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2009.

Matsumura, Masahiro, The Japanese State Identity As a Grand Strategic Imperative, *The Brookings Institution Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies*, 2008, pp1-28.

Mearsheimer, John J. and Walt, Stephen, "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy", *Middle East Policy*, Vol.13, No.3, 2006, pp.29-87.

Menashri, David, "Iran, Israel and the Middle East Conflict", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.12, No.1, 2006, pp.107-122.

Messari, Nizar, "Identity and Foreign Policy: The Case of Islam in U.S. Foreign Policy", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, pp.227-246.

Müftüler-Bac, Meltem, "Turkey and Israel: An Evolving Partnership", *Ariel Center for Policy Research*, Policy Paper No.47, 1998 (It is possible to reach from internet).

Noueihed, Lin and Warren, Alex, *The Battle for the Arab Spring: Revolution, Counter-Revolution and the Making of a New Er*a, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012.

Nye, Joseph S., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York: Public Affairs, 2004, p.31.

Oded, Arye, "Africa in Israeli Foreign Policy-Expectations and Disenchantment: Historical and Diplomatic Aspects", *Israel Studies*, Vol.15, No.3, 2010, pp.121-142.

Oğuzlu, Tarık, "Middle Easternization of Turkey's Foreign Policy: Does Turkey Dissociate From the West?", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.9, No.1, 2008, pp.3-20.

Oğuzlu, Tarık, "The Changing Dynamics of Turkey-Israel Relations: A Structural Realist Account", *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol.15, No.2, 2010, pp.273-288.

Oğuzlu, Tarık, "The 'Arab Spring' and the Rise of the 2.0 Version of Turkey's 'zero problems with neighbors' Policy", *SAM Papers*, No.1, 2012, pp 1-16.

Onuf, Nicholas, "Constructivism: A User's Manual", in Vendulka Kubálková, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert (eds), *International Relations in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 1998, pp.58-78.

Oran, Baskın, "Giriş: Türk Dış Politikası'nın Teoriği ve Pratiği", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar (Cilt I: 1919-1980)*, Istanbul: Iletişim 2005, pp.17-93.

Oron, Yitzhak (ed), *Middle East Record Volume 1, 1960*, London: George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Limited, 1965.

Ortaylı, İlber, *Üç Kıtada Osmanlılar*, Istanbul: Timaş, 2007.

Ortaylı, İlber, *Türkiye'nin Yakın Tarihi*, Istanbul: Timaş, 2014.

Ottaway, Marina, "After the Constitution, a New Battle in Egypt", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.1, 2013, pp.7-11.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, Sixth Edition.

Öke, Mim Kemal, *Ortadoğu ve Filistin Sorunu*, pp.1-22 (It is possible to reach from internet).

Öymen, Onur, *Silahsız Savaş: Bir Mücadele Sanatı Olarak Diplomasi*, Istanbul: Remzi, 2002.

Özakman, Turgut, *Cumhuriyet (1922-1938): Türk Mucizesi Birinci Kitap*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2013.

Özakman, Turgut, *Cumhuriyet (1922-1938): Türk Mucizesi İkinci Kitap*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2010.

Özcan, Gencer, "Aynalar Galerisi: Türkiye-İsrail İlişkilerinde Yansımalar, Yanılsamalar ve Gerçekler", *Ortadoğu Analiz*, Vol.2, No.18, 2010, pp.36-44.

Özcan, Gencer, "Türk Dış Politikasında Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapı ve Aktörler", in Faruk Sönmezoğlu, Nurcan Özgür Baklacıoğlu and Özlem Terzi (eds), *XXI. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikasının Analizi*, Istanbul: Der Yayınları, 2012, pp.5-54.

Özcan, Mesut, "From Strategic Partnership to Successive Crises: Turkish-Israeli Relations in the 2000s", in Özden Zeynep Oktav (ed), *Turkey in the 21ˢᵗ Century: Quest for a New Foreign Policy*, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011, pp.31-51.

Özhan, Taha, "Turkey, Israel and the US in the Wake of the Gaza Flotilla Crisis", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.12, No.3, 2010, pp.7-18.

Özhan, Taha, "New Egypt versus the *Felool*: Struggle for Democracy", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.1, 2013, pp.13-24.

Özkeçeci-Taner, Binnur, "From Allies to Frenemies and Inconvenient Partners: Image Theory and Turkish-Israeli Relations", *Perceptions*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, pp.105-129.

Parsi, Trita, "Israel-Iranian Relations Assessed: Strategic Competition from the Power Cycle Perspective", *Iranian Studies*, Vol.38, No.2, 2005, pp.247-269.

Patten, Howard A., *Israel and the Cold War: Diplomacy, Strategy and the Policy of the Periphery at the United Nations*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013.

Payne, Rodger, "Persuasion, Frames and Norm Construction, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.7, No.1, 2001, pp.37-61.

Peri, Yoram, "The Political-Military Complex: The IDF's Influence over Policy towards the Palestinians Since 1987", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.11, No.2, 2005, pp.324-344.

Polatcı, Türkan and Ünalmış, A. Nafiz, "Son Dönem Osmanlı Dini Jeopolitiği", in Engin Akçay, Erkan Ertosun and Mahmut Akpınar (eds), *Dini Jeopolitik Yaklaşımıyla Orta Doğu*, Ankara: Akçağ, 2013, pp.225-255.

Prizel, Ilya, *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia and Ukraine*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Qaradawi, Yusuf Al, *Jerusalem: The Concern of Every Muslim*, 2012 (It is possible to reach from internet).

Ramadan, Tariq, *The Arab Awakening: Islam and the New Middle East*, London: Penguin Books, 2012.

Rasmussen, Anders Fogh, "NATO and Turkey-Meeting the Challenge of Change", *Perceptions*, Vol.17, No.1, 2012, pp.7-17.

Reich, Bernard, *A Brief History of Israel*, New York: InfoBase Publishing, 2008.

Robins, Philip, *Turkey and the Middle East*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1991.

Robins, Philip, *Suits and Uniforms: Turkish Foreign Policy since the Cold War*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003.

Robins, Philip, "A Double Gravity State: Turkish Foreign Policy Reconsidered", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.33, No.2, 2006, pp.199-211.

Robins, Philip, "Turkish Foreign Policy since 2002: Between a 'Post-Islamist' Government and a Kemalist State", *International Affairs*, Vol.83, No.1, 2007, pp.289-304.

Robins, Philip, *The Middle East: A Beginner's Guide*, Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2009.

Rubin, Barry, *Israel: An Introduction*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Sander, Oral, *Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Ankara: Imge Kitapevi, 2006.

Scheller, Bente, *The Wisdom of Syria's Waiting Game: Foreign Policy under the Assads*, London: Hurst Publishers, 2013.

Shapira, Anita, *Israel: A History*, Massachusetts: Brandeis University Press, 2012.

Shaw, Bernard J., *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic*, New York: New York University Press, 1991.

Shaw, Stanford J., *Yahudi Soykırımı ve Türkiye: Türkiyeli ve Avrupalı Yahudilerin Nazi Zulmünden Kurtarılmasında Türkiye'nin Rolü, 1933-1945*, Istanbul: Timaş, 2014.

Shimoni, Gideon, "Postcolonial Theory and the History of Zionism", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.13, No.4, 2007, pp.859-871.

Sinkaya, Bayram, "Rationalization of Turkey-Iran Relations: Prospects and Limits", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.2, 2012, pp.137-156.

Smith, Anthony, *National Identity*, Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press, 1991.

Smith, Steve, "Foreign Policy is What States Make of it: Social Construction and International Relations Theory", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, pp.38-55.

Snow, David, "Collective Identity and Expressive Forms", *CSD Working Papers, University of California Center for the Study of Democracy*, 2001, pp.1-12.

Stein, Ewan, "The Camp David Consensus: Ideas, Intellectuals, and the Division of Labor in Egypt's Foreign Policy toward Israel", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.55, No.3, 2011, pp.737-758.

Swidler, Ann, "What Anchors Cultural Practices", in Theodore R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr Cetina and Eike von Savigny (eds), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, London: Routledge, 2001, pp.83-101.

Şimşir, Bilal N., *Türk Yahudiler II*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2010.

Telhami, Shibley and Barnett, Michael, *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, New York: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Tepe, Sultan, "Moderation of Religious Parties: Electoral Constraints, Ideological Commitments, and the Democratic Capacities of Religious Parties in Israel and Turkey", *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol.65, No.3, 2012, pp.467-485.

Tepperman, Jonathan, "Turkey's Moment: A Conversation with Abdullah Gul", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.92, Vol.1, 2013, pp.2-7.

Thies, Cameron G., "International Socialization Processes vs. Israeli National Role Conceptions: Can Role Theory Integrate IR Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis?", *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Vol.8, No.1, 2012, pp.25-46.

Timothy, Dallen J. and Olsen, Daniel H., *Tourism, Religion and Spiritual Journey*, New York: Routledge, 2006.

Toktaş, Şule, "Citizenship and Minorities: A Historical Overview of Turkey's Jewish Minority", *Journal of Historical Sociology*, Vol.18, No.4, 2005, pp.394-429.

Toktaş, Şule, "Citizenship and Migration from Turkey to Israel: A Comparative Study on Turkish Jews in Israel, *East European Quarterly*, Vol.41, No.2, 2007, pp.117-148.

Tuncer, Nil, "Süleyman Demirel", in Ali Faik Demir, *Türk Dış Politikasında Liderler*, Istanbul: Bağlam, 2007, pp.125-240.

Tür, Özlem, "Türkiye ve Filistin (1908-1948): Milliyetçilik, Ulusal Çıkar ve Batılılaşma", *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol.62, No.1, 2007.

Tür, Özlem, "Turkish-Syrian Relations - Where are we going?", *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, No.23, 2010, pp.163-176.

Tür, Özlem, "Turkey and Israel in the 2000s: From Cooperation to Conflict", *Israel Studies*, Vol.17, No.3, 2012, pp.45-66.

Ulusoy, Hasan, *A Constructivist Analysis of Turkey's Foreign and Security Policy in the Post-Cold War Era*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation submitted to Middle East Technical University, 2005.

Ulutaş, Ufuk, "Turkey-Israel: A Fluctuating Alliance", *SETA Policy Brief*, No.42, 2010, pp.1-12.

Ulutaş, Ufuk, Bölme, Selin, Demir, Gülşah Neslihan, Torlak, Furkan and Ziya, Salih, *İsrail Siyasetini Anlama Kılavuzu*, SETA, 2012.

Uzer, Umut, "Türkiye-İsrail İlişkilerinde Bunalım", *Ortadoğu Etütleri*, Vol.2, No.2, 2011, pp.137-168.

Uzer, Umut, *Identity and Turkish Foreign Policy: The Kemalist Influence in Cyprus and the Caucasus*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2011.

Vali, Ferenc A., *Bridge across the Bosphorus*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.

Vital, David, "Israel at Sixty: Some Reflections", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.14, No.3, 2008, pp.552-582.

Walker, Joshua, "Turkey and Israel's Relationship in the Middle East", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.17, No.4, 2006, pp.60-90.

Waxman, Dov, *The Pursuit of Peace and the Crisis of Israeli Identity: Defending/Defining the Nation*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Weldes, Jutta, "Constructing National Interests", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.2, No.3, 1996, pp.275-318.

Weldes, Jutta and Laffey, Mark et al. (eds), *Cultures of Insecurity*, Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1999.

Wendt, Alexander, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization,* Vol.46, No.2, 1992, pp.391-425.

Wendt, Alexander, "Collective Identity Formation and the International State", *American Political Science Review*, Vol.88, No.2, 1994, pp.384-396.

Wendt, Alexander, "Constructing International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.20, No.1, 1995, pp.71-81.

Wendt, Alexander, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Wendt, Alexander, "Social Theory as Cartesian Science: An Auto-Critique from a Quantum Perspective", in Stefano Guzzini and Anna Leander (eds), *Constructivism and International Relations: Alexander Wendt and His Critics*, London: Routledge, 2006, pp.178-216.

Yavuz, Hakan, "Political Islam and the Welfare (Refah) Party in Turkey", *Comparative Politics*, Vol.30, No.1, 1997, pp.63-82.

Yavuz, Hakan, "Turkish-Israeli Relations Through the Lens of the Turkish Identity Debate", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol.27, No.1, 1997, pp.22-37.

Yavuz, Hakan, "Değişen Türk Kimliği ve Dış Politika: Neo-Osmanlıcılığın Yükselişi", İhsan D. Dağı, Şaban H. Çalış, Ramazan Gözen (eds) *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, Ankara: Liberté Yayınları, 2001, pp.35-63.

Yavuz, Hakan, *Islamic Political Identity in Turkey*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Yavuz, Hakan, "Giriş: Türkiye'de İslami Hareketin Dönüşümünde Yeni Burjuvazinin Rolü", in Hakan Yavuz (ed), *AK Parti: Toplumsal Değişimin Yeni Aktörleri*, Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi: 2010, pp.7-28.

Yeşilyurt, Nuri, "11 Eylül Olayı Ertesinde AKP Dönemi, Orta Doğu'yla İlişkiler: II) Arap Olmayan Devletlerle İlişkiler", in Baskın Oran (ed), *Türk Dış Politikası: Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt III: 2001-2012*, Istanbul: Iletişim, 2013, pp.438-462.

Yeşilyurt, Nuri and Akdevelioğlu, Atay, "AKP Döneminde Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu Politikası", in İlhan Uzgel and Bülent Duru (eds), *AKP Kitabı: Bir Dönüşümün Bilançosu (2002-2009)*, Ankara: Phoenix, 2013, pp.381-409.

Yetener, Meltem, "Adnan Menderes", in Ali Faik Demir (ed), *Türk Dış Politikasında Liderler*, Istanbul: Bağlam, 2007, pp.25-124.

Yılmaz, Muzaffer Ercan, "Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Dönemde Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri", *Akademik Orta Doğu*, Vol.4, No.2, 2010, pp.49-66.

Zengin, Gürkan, *Hoca: Türk Dış Politikası'nda "Davutoğlu Etkisi"*, Istanbul: Inkilap, 2010.

Zerubavel, Yael, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Zheng, Shiping, "Conflict between Mainland China and Taiwan", in Vendulka Kubálková (ed), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, 2001, pp.203-226.

Zisser, Eyal, "The Israeli-Syrian-Lebanese Triangle: The Renewed Struggle over Lebanon", *Israel Affairs*, Vol.15, No.4, 2009, pp.397-413.

Internet Websites:

Website of Anti-Defamation League:	www.adl.org
Official Website of Israel State Archives:	www.archives.gov.il
Website of British Broadcasting Company	www.bbc.co.uk/www.bbc.com
Website of Berkeley, University of California:	www.berkeley.edu
Website of Encyclopedia Britannica:	www.britannica.com
Website of Council on Foreign Relations:	www.cfr.org
Website of Cable News Network	www.cnn.com
Website of Defense Industry Daily:	www.defenseindustrydaily.com
Website of Defense Update:	www.defense-update.com
Website of "The Economist" Magazine:	www.economist.com
Official Website of Turkish Ministry of Economy:	www.ekonomi.gov.tr
Website of Qantara (Bridge) Project:	www.en.qantara.de
Website of "Gazete 5" Internet News:	www.gazete5.com
Website of Center for Research on Globalization:	www.globalresearch.ca
Website of Global Security:	www.globalsecurity.org
Website of Herzl Center:	www.herzl.org
Website of History:	www.history.com
Website of Islamische Gemeinschaft Milli Görüş:	www.igmg.org
Website of Jabotinsky Institute in Israel:	www.jabotinsky.org
Website of Jewish Agency for Israel:	www.jewishagency.org
Website of Jewish Encyclopedia:	www.jewishencyclopedia.com
Website of Jewish Virtual Library:	www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org
Official Website of Israeli Parliament:	www.knesset.gov.il

Website of Koç University: www.ku.edu.tr

Official Website of Israeli Foreign Ministry: www.mfa.gov.il

Official Website of Turkish Foreign Ministry: www.mfa.gov.tr

Official Website of NATO: www.nato.int

Official Website of Permanent Observer Mission

Website of NBC News www.nbcnews.com

Of State of Palestine to the UN: www.palestineun.org

Personal Website of George A. Papandreou: www.papandreou.gr

Website of Princeton University: www.princeton.edu

Website of Saadet Partisi (Felicity Party): www.saadet.org.tr

Website of Şalom Newspaper: www.salom.com.tr

Website of Foundation for Advancement of

Sephardic Studies and Culture (FASSAC): www.sephardicstudies.org

Website of Foundation for Political, Economic

And Social Research, Washington D.C.: www.setadc.org

Official Website of US Department of State: www.state.gov

Official Website of the GNAT: www.tbmm.gov.tr

Official Website of Turkish Presidency: www.tccb.gov.tr

Website of Washington Review of

Middle Eastern and Eurasian Affairs: www.thewashingtonreview.org

Website of Union of Chambers and

Commodity Exchange of Turkey: www.tobb.org.tr

Official Website of Turkish Statistical Institute: www.tuik.gov.tr

Official Website of Public Commission to

Examine Maritime Incident of 31 May 2010: www.turkel-committee.com

Website of Turkish Jewish Community: www.turkyahudileri.com

Official Website of the UN: www.un.org

Website of Washington Institute: www.washingtoninstitute.org

Official Website of American Presidency: www.whitehouse.gov

Website of Wikileaks: www.wikileaks.org

Website of World Statesmen: www.worldstatesmen.org

Official Website of Supreme Electoral Council

Of Turkey: www.ysk.gov.tr

Website of Zionism and Israel Information Center: www.zionism-israel.com

Newspapers and News Agencies Serving Online:

Al Jazeera, 3 June 2010

Haaretz, 26 March 2004, 1 July 2010, 31 March 2011, 23 June 2011, 24 June 2011,

3 September 2011 and 24 October 2011

Hurriyet Daily News, 19 June 1999, 25 July 2002, 4 November 2002, 10 July 2003,

1 September 2004, 7 March 2007, 30 January 2009, 9 July 2009, 13 January 2010

and 20 August 2013

Hürriyet, 5 May 2000, 2 August 2006 and 25 October 2011

ITN Source, 9 October 2007

Jerusalem Post, 1 July 2011 and 21 December 2011

Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA), 15 July 2003

Milliyet, 22 May 2003, 9 July 2003, 22 July 2003 and 2 August 2006

NBC News, 13 January 2010

The Guardian, 26 October 2005 and 4 June 2010

The Jewish Chronicle Online, 9 December 2010

The New York Times, 2 May 2005 and 27 December 2008

The Times of Israel, 12 June 2012

Today's Zaman, 21 February 2006, 9 June 2006, 12 January 2009, 29 May 2009, 23 September 2009, 19 December 2009, 21 June 2011 and 14 July 2013

Yedioth Ahronoth, 12 February 2007, 16 January 2009, 14 February 2009 and 1 June 2010

Yeni Şafak, 15 Mayıs 2010

APPENDICES

A. LIST OF INTERVIEWS

Prof. Dr. Yoav Peled, Tel Aviv, June 24, 2013.

Prof. Dr. Yossi Shain, Tel Aviv, June 26, 2013.

Mr. Nizar Amer, the Deputy Chief of Mission of the Israeli Embassy in Ankara, July 4, 2013.

Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı, Ankara, July 5, 2013.

Prof. Dr. Ofra Bengio, December 2, 2014 (through e-mail).

Assoc. Prof. Şaban Kardaş, Ankara, March 27, 2015.

Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür, Ankara, April 14, 2016.

Ambassador Ertuğrul Apakan, the Former Undersecretary of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs between 2006 and 2009, September 10, 2014 (through e-mail).

B. TURKISH SUMMARY

Bu tezin ana amacı, 2000'li yıllarda Türkiye'nin İsrail'le ilişkilerini, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliği perspektifinden incelemektir. Bu kapsamda oluşturulan araştırma sorusu, "devlet kimliği" kavramının Türk-İsrail ilişkileriyle ilgili olup olmadığı, ilgili ise, ilişkileri hangi dereceye kadar açıklayıcı olduğudur. Sözkonusu tez, 2000'li yıllarda Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinde süreklilik veya değişim olup olmadığını da ele almaktadır. Bu doğrultuda, sözkonusu tez, teorik bir çerçevede nihai bir analize varmak amacıyla, Türkiye'de Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (AK Parti) iktidarı öncesi ve sonrasını kıyaslamaktadır.

Bu tez, Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerinin, 1990'lı yıllarda "stratejik ilişkiler" tanımlamasından 2000'li yıllarda "krizler dönemine" dönüşmesine yönelik değişiminin, Türkiye'nin Batılı devlet kimliğinin *Ortadoğululaşmış Merkez Ülke / Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Mirasçısı* kimliğine dönüşmesiyle açıklanabileceğini ileri sürmektedir. 1948 yılında İsrail Devleti'nin kurulmasını müteakip, önce 1949 yılında Türkiye'nin İsrail'i tanıması, sonrasında da 1950 yılında diplomatik ilişkilerin kurulmasıyla oluşan devletlerarası ilişkilerin farklı teorik yaklaşımlarla ele alınması mümkün olmakla birlikte, devlet kimliği kavramının, AK Parti döneminde Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerinin kapsamlı bir şekilde analiz edilmesi bakımından önemli bir açıklama sunduğunu değerlendirmektedir. İkili ilişkileri bu kavram çerçevesinde inceleyen çalışmaların sınırlı sayıda olduğu görülmektedir. Yapılan kaynak taramasından, Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerinin farklı açılardan incelendiği gözlenmekte, ancak özellikle devlet kimliği kavramını temel alarak

273

1948-2011 yılları arasında Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerini inceleyen sınırlı sayıda çalışmanın olduğu anlaşılmaktadır.

İnşacı teori, bu tezin teorik çerçevesini teşkil etmektedir. Sosyal olguların devlet kimliğini, çıkarları ve dış politikayı nasıl oluşturduğunu ve değiştirdiğini anlamak, inşacı yaklaşımın başlıca meselesini oluşturmaktadır. Bu kapsamda, devlet kimliğinin nasıl inşa edildiği sorucu, inşacı teorisyenlerin ana araştırma konularından birini oluşturmaktadır. Devlet kimliği bağlamında, Alexander Wendt, "öz" algılayışın ve "öteki" algısının devlet kimliğinin inşa edilmesindeki öncelikli yerini vurgulamaktadır. Bu noktada, devletler ana analiz birimi olarak ele alınmaktadır. Devletler, yerel ve uluslararası politikanın sosyal çevresinde inşa edilmektedirler. Kimlik, çıkar ve dış politika kavramları arasındaki ilişki çerçevesinde, devletlerin kimlikleri sabit veya önceden verilmiş kimlikler değildir. Aksine, uluslararası sistemi oluşturan aktörlerin, yani devletlerin, sürekli olarak birbirleriyle etkileşim halinde olması neticesinde devletlerin kimlikleri değişkendir ve sürekli olarak yeniden tanımlanmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, kimlikler, çıkarların temelini oluşturmaktadır ve kimliklerin değişmesine bağlı olarak çıkarlar yeniden tanımlanmaktadır. Aynı şekilde, dış politika da bir inşa sürecidir. Bir devletin dış dünyayı nasıl algıladığı ve kimliğini nasıl oluşturduğu, bu devletin, uluslararası sistemde diğer devletler tarafından nasıl algılandığı kadar önemlidir. Sonuç olarak, dış politika, etkileşim halindeki devletlerin karşılıklı inşa sürecidir.

İnşacı teori çerçevesinde, özellikle Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde, devlet kimliği kavramına dayalı analizlerden daha fazla yararlanılmaya başlandığı görülmektedir. Devletler, dünya politikasının sosyal yapısını oluşturmakta, bu sosyal yapılar da devletlerin uluslararası sistemdeki rollerini, konumlarını ve nihayetinde kimliklerini belirlemektedir. İnşacı teorisyenlere göre, kimlik kavramı

bir devletin uluslararası sistemdeki davranışlarını tayin etmektedir. Öte yandan, devlet kimliği kavramının tanımına yönelik birçok çalışma bulunmaktadır. Yapılan çalışmaların genellikle yerel veya uluslararası etmenleri temel alması nedeniyle, bu tez, mevcut tanımlar yerine, kendi devlet kimliği tanımını yapma çabası içerisindedir. Buna göre, devlet kimliği, sürekli etkileşim halinde bulunan siyasi liderler ve devlet aygıtı / kurumları gibi yerel faktörler ile uluslararası sistem / dinamiklerden oluşmaktadır. Bu kapsamda, sözkonusu iki faktörden birinin değişmesi halinde, devlet kimliğindeki değişim sınırlı olacaktır. Tümden bir değişim olması için iki faktörün de aynı anda değişmesi gerekmektedir. Siyasi liderler, partiler ve ideolojilerin yanısıra, Türkiye örneğinde parti kapatmaları ve askeri darbeler gibi yerel unsurlar da devlet kimliğinin oluşumuna etkide bulunabilirler. Benzer bir şekilde, Soğuk Savaş'ın bitmesiyle birlikte iki kutuplu sistemin tek kutuplu sisteme doğru değişmesi gibi uluslararası sistemde değişiklik yaşandığı hallerde de devlet kimliğinde kısmi değişiklik yaşanmaktadır. Bu çerçevede, iki faktörden sadece birinin değişmesiyle devlet kimliği için alternatif önerilerde bulunulabilir, ancak iki faktörün aynı anda değişmesi sonucunda devlet kimliğinde köklü bir değişim yaşamaktadır.

Bu çerçevede, Şaban Çalış'a göre, Türk dış politikasını ve kimliğini belirleyen faktör Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğidir. Benzer bir şekilde, Mustafa Aydın, William Hale ve Oral Sander'in çalışmalarına atıfta bulunan Baskın Oran da tarihi, stratejik ve iç yapısal boyutların Türk dış politikası üzerinde olumlu ve olumsuz etkileri olduğunu ifadeyle Türk devletinin, başka bir değişle, devlet kimliğinin unsurları üzerine yoğunlaşmaktadır. Mevcut kaynakların ışında, bu tez, 29 Ekim 1923 tarihinde Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kuruluşundan başlamak üzere, devlet kimliğinin oluşumunu ve zaman içerisindeki evrimini incelemektedir. Bunun,

teorik bir yaklaşım temelinde, Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerini daha iyi anlayamaya yardımcı olacağı düşünülmektedir.

Bu kapsamda, sözkonusu tez, giriş bölümünün dışında yedi bölümden daha oluşmaktadır. İkinci bölümde, tezin teorik çerçevesini teşkil eden inşacı teorinin temel tartışmaları ele alınarak, özellikle kimlik, çıkar ve dış politika kavramları arasındaki etkileşim analiz edilmekte, kimliğin dış politika (dolayısıyla bu tezde Türkiye-İsrail ilişkileri) üzerindeki etkisi anlaşılmaya çalışılmaktadır.

Üçüncü bölümde, uzun bir süreyi içeren tarihsel mirasın ikili ilişkiler üzerindeki etkisi incelenmektedir. Türkler ve Yahudiler, devletlerarası ilişkilerden çok uzun bir süre önce toplumsal etkileşimde bulunmuşlar ve zaman zaman yakın ilişkiler geliştirmişlerdir. İnşacı teorinin "tarihsel mirasın", "hafızanın" ve "anlatımın" bir devletin kimliğinin oluşumunda oynadığı role dikkat çekmesi çerçevesinde, bu bölümde sözkonusu unsurların Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğine etkisi üzerinde durulmaktadır. Bu bölüm, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu dönemiyle başlamakta ve sırasıyla 19. yüzyılda Siyonist ideolojinin doğuşu ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu üzerindeki etkisi, Birinci Dünya Savaşı (1914-1918), iki dünya savaşı arasındaki dönem (1919-1939) ve İkinci Dünya Savaşı'yla (1939-1945) devam etmektedir. İki dünya savaşı arasındaki dönemde Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kuruluşuyla oluşturulan devlet kimliği süreci üzerinde de durulmaktadır. Türkiye'nin bu dönemdeki devlet kimliğinin, ülkenin, 1948 yılında İsrail Devleti'nin kuruluşunun ilan edilmesine yönelik tutumunda belirleyici olduğu tartışılmaktadır.

Bu bölümde, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun düşüşü ve Siyonizm'in yükselişi, Sultan II. Abdülhamit ve Siyonizm'in kurucusu olarak kabul edilen Theodor Herzl arasındaki diyalog ve bu kapsamda Sultan'ın, Herzl'in önerisini kabul etmemesinin ardından İmparatorluğun daha önce başlayan çöküşünün dağılmayla sona ermesi,

dolayısıyla Filistin'in kaybedilmesi ve bu bölgeye yönelik Yahudi göçü bağlamında, özellikle siyasal İslamcı çevrelerde komplo teorilerinin dile getirildiği ve bu konunun bugün de gündeme getirilmekte olduğu görülmektedir. Osmanlı dönemi sonrasında üç ana faktörün toplumlararası ilişkileri şekillendirdiği gözlenmektedir: Kurtuluş Savaşı sonrasında Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kuruluşu, Filistin'e Yahudi göçü ve İkinci Dünya Savaşı gibi uluslararası gelişmeler. İlk olarak, yeni kurulan devlet, laik bir devlet yapısı temelinde Türk ulus inşası sürecine yoğunlaşmış, ancak bu süreçte Yahudi toplumuna, Müslümanlara tanınan siyasi ve medeni hakları tanımıştır. Öte yandan, Türk modernleşme süreci Batılı, laik ve modern bir devlet kimliği yaratılmasına olanak sağlamıştır. Bu durum, Türkiye'nin İsrail'in bağımsızlığı ve sonrasında Ortadoğu'da yaşanan gelişmelere yönelik tutumunu belirlemede yardımcı olmuştur. İkinci olarak, Yahudi toplumunun Filistin'e göçü bu bölgede bağımsız bir devlet kurma fikrini güçlendirmiştir. Bu süreçte, Türkiye, 1936-1939 Arap isyanı gibi bölgesel gerilimlerden kendini uzak tutmaya çalışmış ve Filistin'i Türk dış politikasının önceliklerinden birisi olarak görmemiştir. Üçüncü olarak, İkinci Dünya Savaşı, Türkiye için de ciddi güvenlik kaygılarına neden olmuştur. Nazi Almanyası'ndan kaçan Yahudilere Türkiye üzerinden göç etme ve Türkiye'de çalışma imkânı sunulmakla birlikte, bu dönemde "Struma" faciası gibi olaylar yaşanmış ve Trakya olayları ve Varlık Vergisi gibi gelişmeler Türkiye'den Yahudi göçünü artırmıştır.

Dördüncü bölümde, 1948 yılında İsrail Devleti'nin kuruluşundan 1991 yılında Soğuk Savaş'ın sona ermesine kadarki dönemde Türkiye-İsrail ilişkileri ele alınmaktadır. Türkiye'nin yeni kurulan İsrail Devleti'yle ilişkileri Soğuk Savaş dinamikleri çerçevesinde incelenmektedir. Ayrıca, bu dönemde yaşanan Süveyş Savaşı (1956), Altı Gün Savaşı (1967), 1967-1973 Savaşları ve Kudüs Kanunu

(1980) gibi önemli gelişmelerin ikili ilişkilere etkileri de analiz edilmektedir. Tez, anılan dönemde Türk dış politikasının, ülkenin Ortadoğu'da cereyan eden çatışma ve anlaşmazlıklara taraf olmasından imtina etmek ve Soğuk Savaş dönemi şartları altında ulusal güvenliğin korunmasını ve statükonun sürdürülmesini sağlamak yönünde kurulu olduğunu tartışmaktadır.

Bu bölümde tez, İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında Türkiye'nin büyüyen Sovyet tehdidi nedeniyle Batı güvenlik yapısında yer almaya çaba gösterdiğini, bu sürecin, Kore Savaşı'nı müteakip, Türkiye'nin NATO'ya üyelikle sonuçlandığını ve İsmet İnönü ve Adnan Menderes gibi önemli siyasi figürler ile Batı yanlısı askeri-sivil bürokratların, ülkenin Batılılaşma / modernleşme sürecine paralel olarak Soğuk Savaş döneminde Batılı kurumlarına üye olmasına çaba gösterdiklerini ortaya koymaktadır. Böylelikle, Türkiye'nin Batı bloğundaki yerini sağlamlaştırmak ve Batı'nın ortağı olmak yönündeki rolünü güçlendirmek için çaba sarf ettiği ileri sürülmektedir. Bu kapsamda, Türkiye, önce 12 Mart 1949 tarihinde İsrail Devleti'ni fiili olarak tanımış, 11 Mayıs 1949 tarihinde İsrail'in BM'ye kabulü için yapılan oylamada çekimser oy kullanmış, sonrasında 28 Mayıs 1949 tarihinde İsrail'i resmen tanımış ve böylelikle İsrail'i resmen tanıyan ilk Müslüman ülke olmuştur.

Tezde, Alexander Wendt'in uluslararası politikanın temel yapıları sosyaldir ve aktörlerin kimliklerini ve çıkarlarını şekillendirir tartışması temelinde, ABD-SSCB iki kutuplu dünya düzenine dayalı uluslararası sistemin Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinde ve İsrail'le olan ilişkilerinde etkili olduğu sonucuna varılmaktadır. Tezin devlet kimliği tanımı çerçevesinde, Türkiye'nin "öz" algısının kapsamı, Ortadoğu'daki "diğerlerine" karşı Batı kampında yer alan İsrail'i de içermektedir. İki ülkenin yöneticileri, diğer bir deyişle iç faktörler, devletlerinin kimliklerini

demokratik ve laik olarak tanımlamaktadır. Her iki ülkenin güvenlik kültürlerini Batı ile özdeşleştirmeye çalışması, iki ülkenin Soğuk Savaş döneminde yakın ilişkiler geliştirmesine katkı sağlamıştır. Bununla birlikte, bu dönemde iki ülke ilişkilerinin iniş-çıkışlar yaşadığı da görülmüştür. Esasen bu durum, inşacı teorinin, kimliklerin statik olmadığını ve aktörlerin birbirleriyle sürekli olarak etkileşimi nedeniyle yeniden tanımlandığını / üretildiğini tartışmasıyla tutarlı görülmektedir. Benzer bir şekilde, Türkiye, İsrail'in yanısıra, uluslararası sistemin diğer aktörleri ile etkileşimde bulunmuş ve bölgesel ve uluslararası gelişmeler doğrultusunda kendi devlet kimliğini sürekli bir biçimde yeniden oluşturmuştur. Ancak, Türkiye, devlet kimliğinin Batı yanlısı özelliklerini özellikle Soğuk Savaş koşullarının da etkisiyle korumuştur.

Beşinci bölümde, Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde Türkiye-İsrail ilişkileri incelenmektedir. İlk olarak, Soğuk Savaş'ın bitmesiyle oluşan yeni uluslararası düzenin dinamikleri açıklanmaya çalışılmaktadır. Ayrıca, Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerine etkileri bakımından Körfez Savaşı (1990-1991), Madrid Barış Konferansı (1991) ve Oslo Anlaşmaları (1993 ve 1995) gibi gelişmeler ele alınmaktadır. Uluslararası sistemdeki/dinamiklerdeki gelişmelerin yanısıra, 1990'lı yıllarda Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğine ilişkin tartışmalar da incelenmektedir. Özellikle Batı ve İsrail karşıtı söylem ve ideolojisiyle bilinen Milli Görüş hareketinin lideri Necmettin Erbakan'ın, Doğru Yol Partisi lideri Tansu Çiller'le koalisyon hükümeti kurması, "ikili devlet kimliği" tartışmalarına yol açmıştır. Kimilerine göre, "post-modern darbe" olarak tanımlanan 28 Şubat Süreci gibi Türkiye'de yaşanan, ancak diğer taraftan İsrail'le ilişkilere de doğrudan yansıdığı görülen iç gelişmeler de bu bölümde ele alınmaktadır. Tez, bu dönemde siyasal İslam'ın yükselişinin devlet kimliğine ilişkin alternatif yaklaşımların daha gözle görülür bir hal aldığını, ancak

iç faktörlerin bir diğer unsuru olan Batı yanlısı askeri-sivil elitlerin, devletin mevcut kimliğini koruma hususunda RP ve ideolojisine karşı çok daha güçlü bir konumda olduğunu ileri sürmektedir.

Bu tez, Soğuk Savaş'ın bitmesi sonrasında, Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerini iki döneme ayırmaktadır. İlk dönem, Soğuk Savaş'ın son yıllarında yaşanan Körfez Savaşı'yla başlamakta ve Ortadoğu barış sürecine ilişkin gelişmelerle devam etmektedir. İkinci dönem ise, 3 Kasım 2002 tarihinde yapılan genel seçimleri neticesinde Türkiye'de başlayan AK Parti yönetimidir. Bu bölüm, ilk döneme yoğunlaşmakta ve Aleksander Wendt'in "Kimlikler, çıkarların temelini teşkil etmektedir" varsayımından hareket etmektedir. Bu kapsamda, Körfez Savaşı, Türkiye ve İsrail'in yeni uluslararası dinamikler sırasında kendilerini yeniden tanımladıkları bir dönemin başlangıcını oluşturmaktadır. Tez tarafından yapılan devlet kimliği tanımı çerçevesinde, uluslararası sistemde / dinamiklerde yaşanan değişimler Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinde sınırlı bir değişimin yaşanmasını da beraberinde getirmiştir. Öte yandan, Sosyalist bloğun çözülmesiyle ortaya çıkan belirsizlik ortamında yaşanan bölgesel çatışmalar Türkiye'yi güvenlik sorunlarıyla mücadele etme ihtiyacına yöneltmiştir. Bu durum, Türkiye'nin Batılı kimliğinin devamına katkıda bulunmaktadır. Ali Balcı ve Tuncay Kardaş'a göre, Türkiye'nin güvenlik kaygıları sadece toprak bütünlüğü açısından değil, Türk devletinin en önemli prensiplerinden birinin, laikliğin, korunması bakımından da ele alınmalıdır. Bu temelde, askeri-bürokratik elitlere göre, İsrail, laik Türk devletinin ideolojik aynasını temsil etmektedir. Bu duruma paralel olarak, Hakan Yavuz da İsrail'le geliştirilecek stratejik ilişkilerle Türkiye'nin Batıya yöneliminin teyit edileceğini, "laik" özelliğinin ispatlanacağını ve yerel İslamcı gruplara sağlanan bölgesel desteğin dengeleneceğini tartışmaktadır.

Bununla birlikte, Türkiye'nin İsrail'le ilişkileri Türk siyasetindeki eleştirilerden bağımsız değildi. İsrail'i ve Türkiye'nin bu ülkeyle ilişkilerini sert bir şekilde eleştiren Erbakan'ın Başbakan olması, yapılan eleştirilerin sadece söylemde sınırlı kalmamasına yol açmıştır. Bu noktada, kimliğin yaratılmasında önemli bir yeri bulunan "söylem" faktörü üzerinde durulmasında yarar görülmektedir. Erbakan ve lideri olduğu Refah Partisi, "Lider Türkiye" ve "Şahsiyetli Dış Politika" gibi söylemlerde bulunarak kendi dış politika algısını ortaya koymaya çalışmıştır. Dış politika "çerçevesi" olarak da Batı (ve dolayısıyla İsrail) karşıtlığını sunmuştur. "Kurumlar" faktörüne gelince, Umut Uzer'in Türkiye'de dış politika yapımında Başbakan, Dışişleri Bakanlığı ve Ordu'nun rolüne dikkat çekmesi ışığında, RP-DYP Hükümeti sırasında Başbakanlık görevini Erbakan, Dışişleri Bakanlığı görevini ise DYP lideri Çiller üstlenmiştir. Ancak, Başbakan Erbakan RP'li Devlet Bakanları Abdullah Gül, Rıza Güneri ve Ahmet Cemil Tunç gibi isimlere de dış ilişkilerle ilgili görevler vererek Dışişleri Bakanlığı görevini yürüten Çiller'e karşı bir nevi kendi dış politika ekibini oluşturmuştur. Örneğin, Devlet Bakanı Tunç, Irak ve diğer Ortadoğu ülkeleriyle ilişkilerden sorumlu olmuştur. Erbakan ve ekibinin farklı bir devlet kimliği ve dış politika yaklaşımına rağmen, Ordu'nun yanısıra, Batı yanlısı bürokratik elitler geleneksel Batılı devlet kimliği ve dış politikasından bir sapma olmasına izin vermemişlerdir. Bundan dolayı, RP'nin büyük ortak olduğu koalisyon hükümeti, Türkiye ve İsrail arasında yakın ilişkiler geliştirilmesini engelleyememiştir. Sonuç olarak, 1990'lı yıllarda alternatif devlet kimliği yaklaşımları geliştirilmesine rağmen, Türkiye'nin Batı yanlısı kimliği ve dış politikası önemli bir değişim yaşamamıştır, nitekim RP-DYP Hükümeti'nin sona ermesini müteakip kurulan koalisyon hükümetleri de bu durumu teyit etmiştir.

Altıncı bölümde, AK Parti'nin dış politika kimliğinin temelleri üzerinde durulmaktadır. Bu kapsamda, 2001 yılında AK Parti'nin kuruluşundan önce kurucu kadronun ve siyasi söyleminin Milli Görüş geleneğiyle bağları, bu bağlamda, Milli Görüş ideolojisi, 28 Şubat Süreci ve Türkiye'nin AB üyelik süreci gibi Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinin şekillenmesinde önemli rol oynadığı düşünülen faktörler ele alınmaktadır. 3 Kasım 2002 genel seçimlerini kazanan ve İslamcı bir gelenekten gelen AK Parti'nin, geleneksel Milli Görüş partilerinden farklı olarak AB üyelik sürecine önem atfettiği görülmektedir. Bu bölümde tez, sözkonusu değişimin nedenlerini irdelemeye çalışmaktadır. Bu dönüşümü anlamak amacıyla, AK Parti'nin Türk dış politika anlayışı üzerinde önemli bir ağırlığı bulunan ve "Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu" adlı kitabıyla gerek Türkiye'de gerekse uluslararası platformda adından sıkça söz ettiren Başbakan Recep Tayyip Erdoğan'ın Dış Politika Danışmanı ve daha sonra Dışişleri Bakanı olan Ahmet Davutoğlu'nun çalışmalarına ve söylemlerine ağırlık verilmektedir. Davutoğlu, ideolojik olarak medeni, tarihi ve coğrafi anlamda öz anlayışına önem atfetmektedir. Buna göre, sözkonusu kavramlar birbirleriyle ilişkili kavramlardır. İslam dininin medeni öz algılayışı, diğer medeniyetlerle barışçı yollardan işbirliği yapmaya uygundur. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, İslam geleneğinden gelen iyi bir örnektir. Davutoğlu, "Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu" adlı kitabında Türkiye'nin jeopolitik ve tarihi derinliğine vurguda bulunmaktadır.

Davutoğlu'nun Dışişleri Bakanlığı (2009-2014) görevi öncesinde 2008 yılının başlarında yayımlanan "Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007" başlıklı makalesi, AK Parti'nin dış politika anlayışı hakkında önemli bilgiler vermektedir. Makalede, Davutoğlu, Türkiye'nin uluslararası sistemdeki yerini analiz etmektedir. Davutoğlu'na göre, Soğuk Savaş döneminde Türkiye, bir NATO

üyesi olarak, SSCB ve dolayısıyla Sosyalist bloğa karşı Güneydoğu Avrupa'nın müdafaa edilmesini sağlamakla görevli bir "cephe ülkesi" olarak görülmüştür. Soğuk Savaş'ın sona erdiği 1990'lı yılların başında, Türkiye'ye "köprü ülke" rolü atfeden yeni bir fikir ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu dönemde, Türkiye'nin öncelikli hedefi, Körfez Savaşı ve Balkanlarda yaşanan çatışmalar nedeniyle ortaya çıkan güvenlik sorunlarının üstesinden gelmek ve kendi istikrarını muhafaza etmekti. 11 Eylül 2001 tarihinde ABD'ye düzenlenen saldırılar sonrasında Türkiye'nin uluslararası politikadaki konumu ise yeniden tasarlanmıştır. Tarih ve coğrafya unsurlarının dikkate alındığı, bölge ülkeleriyle kültürel bağların da göz önünde bulundurulduğu bu yeniden tanımlama sürecinde, Türkiye'nin Balkanlar, Kafkaslar ve Ortadoğu bölgelerindeki "merkez ülke" konumuna yoğunlaşılmıştır.

Makalede devamla, Türk dış politikasında beş prensip benimsendiği belirtilmektedir. Bu kapsamda, birinci prensip, özgürlük ve güvenlik arasında denge kurulmasıdır. Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde özgürlük öne çıkarken, 11 Eylül saldırıları sonrasında güvenlik öncelik kazanmıştır. Davutoğlu'na göre, diğer ülkelerden farklı olarak Türkiye, 11 Eylül sonrası dönemde AB üyelik süreci çerçevesinde yapılan reformlarla (Kopenhag kriterleri) özgürlüklerin alanını genişletmeye devam etmiştir. İkinci prensip, "Türkiye'nin Komşularıyla Sıfır Sorun Politikası"dır. 1990'lı yılların başlarına kadar, Türkiye'nin Rusya ve Bulgaristan'la, 1990'lı yılların sonlarına kadar ise, Yunanistan, Suriye, Irak ve İran'la ilişkileri sorunluydu. Ancak, AK Parti'nin iktidara gelmesiyle bu ülkelerle ilişkiler önemli ölçüde iyiye gitmiştir. Üçüncü prensip, komşu bölgeler ve ötesiyle ilişkilerin geliştirilmesidir. Türkiye'nin etkinlik sahası Balkanlardan Ortadoğu, Kafkaslar ve Orta Asya'ya kadar uzanmaktadır. 2002 yılında başlayan AK Parti iktidarında 2007 yılı sonuna kadar geçen beş yıllık sürede, Türkiye, bu bölgelerde

önde gelen aktörlerden birisi olmuştur. Dördüncü prensip, çok boyutlu ve yönlü diplomasidir. Davutoğlu'na göre, Türkiye Soğuk Savaş yıllarında Batı'ya dönük tek boyutlu ve yönlü bir diplomasi takip etmiştir. Bu dönemde Türk dış politikasının önceliği güvenliğin sağlanmasıydı. Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde ise, çok boyutlu dış politikanın temel hedefi, komşu bölgelerde ülkenin etki sahasını genişletmektir. Beşinci prensip ise, ritmik diplomasidir. Uluslararası sistemin dinamikleştiği bir dönemde statik kalmaya çalışmak yeni şartlara uyum sağlamayı zorlaştırmaktadır. Bu nedenle, Türkiye'nin akışkan ve esnek bir diplomasiye ihtiyacı bulunmaktadır.

Makalede ayrıca, AK Parti döneminde AB ile ilişkiler ve Irak konularında edinilen kazanımlardan bahsedilmekte ve Türkiye'nin uluslararası planda pro-aktif bir konum kazanabilmesi için demokrasi ve bölgesel istikrarın kalıcı kılınması hususlarına yoğunlaşılması gerektiği vurgulanmaktadır.

Davutoğlu, 1 Mayıs 2010 tarihinde Oxford Üniversitesi'nde ana konuşmacı olarak verdiği ve "Political Reflection" adlı dergide yayımlanan konuşmasında, küresel düzenin tarihsel dönüşümü hakkındaki düşüncelerini açıklamış ve jeopolitiği merkez alarak, dönüşümü, geleneksel dünya düzeni, kolonyal dünya düzeni, Soğuk Savaş düzeni ve Soğuk Savaş sonrası dünya düzeni şeklinde sınıflandırmıştır. Bu çerçevede, Davutoğlu, önce Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na sonra da Türkiye'ye değinmektedir. Davutoğlu devamla, Türkiye'nin Soğuk Savaş sonrası dünya düzenindeki konumu, tarih, coğrafya ve diplomasi perspektiflerini ele almaktadır. Davutoğlu, pro-aktif diplomasiye vurguda bulunmaktadır. Son olarak, Türkiye'nin bölgesel politikaları hakkında bilgi veren Davutoğlu, Gazze'nin mevcut durumu başta olmak üzere Filistin meselesinin Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerinde oynadığı rolden de bahsetmektedir. Davutoğlu'nun ifadelerinden,

İsrail'in Filistin'e yönelik politikalarının Türkiye'nin İsrail'e bakış açısını ve ikili ilişkilerini doğrudan etkileyeceği anlaşılmaktadır.

Bu bölümde ayrıca, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinin oluşumunda, dış politikanın belirlenmesinde ve İsrail'le ilişkilerin analiz edilmesindeki etkileri bakımından iç faktörlerdeki değişimi açıklamak amacıyla, AK Parti Hükümeti'nin ideolojik arka planı da irdelenmektedir. AK Parti ideolojisinin belirlenmesinde, 28 Şubat Süreci'nin etkileri, Refah Partisi'nin Anayasa Mahkemesi'nin kararıyla kapatılması sonrasında kurulan Fazilet Partisi'nin (FP) bölünmesinde önemli bir rol oynamıştır. FP'nin "Yenilikçi" kanadından gelen AK Parti kadroları, RP-DYP koalisyon hükümeti tecrübesinden de görüldüğü üzere, Batı yanlısı askeri-bürokratik elitlerin, Türkiye'nin Batılılaşma sürecinden uzaklaşmasına izin vermeyeceğini fark etmiştir. Buna uygun olarak, 2002 yılında iktidara gelindiğinde, AK Parti yönetimi, dış politikada Türkiye'nin AB üyelik sürecine öncelik vermiştir. Esasen, AB üyeliği için yapılan reformlar AK Parti'nin kendi gündemini uygulamaya koyma ve iç politikada geniş bir manevra alanı kazanma imkânı vermiştir. Bu süreçte Ordu'nun iç gündemi belirleme gücü azalırken, AK Parti iç politikada ve devlet aygıtını oluşturan kurum ve kuruluşlarda gücünü artırmıştır. Bu kapsamda, devlet kimliğini oluşturan iç faktörlerin önemli bir değişim sürecinden geçtiğini söylemek mümkündür. Bu durum, bölgesel ve uluslararası dinamiklerdeki değişimler göz önüne alındığında, başka bir deyişle iç ve dış faktörlerde yaşanan değişimlerin etkisiyle, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğindeki değişime işaret etmektedir. Türkiye'de iç faktörlerin değişimi ile bölgesel ve uluslararası dinamiklerde yaşanan değişmeler bir sonraki bölümde analiz edilmektedir.

Yedinci Bölümde, siyasal İslam geleneğinden gelen AK Parti'nin seçimleri kazanması sonrasında Türkiye'de başlayan Erdoğan dönemi ve bu süreçte Türkiye-İsrail ilişkileri ele alınmaktadır. Bu noktada, Filistin meselesi, ABD, Iran ve özellikle Arap Baharı döneminde Arap dünyası gibi üçüncü aktörlerin ikili ilişkilere yansımaları da incelenmektedir. 2002 yılından bu yana geçen zaman içerisinde, Türkiye-İsrail işbirliğinin güçlü destekçisi olan Batı yanlısı Ordu'nun iç siyasette gündemi, dış politikada ise, İsrail'le ilişkiler gibi öncelikleri belirleme gücünün azaldığı görülmektedir. 550 milletvekilinin bulunduğu Meclis'te 363 sandalyesi bulunan AK Parti Hükümeti, tek muhalefet partisi konumunda bulunan CHP'nin ve bağımsız milletvekillerinin desteğine ihtiyaç duymadan kendi iç ve dış politikalarını üretebilecek ve uygulayabilecek bir konuma gelmiştir. Bu durumun sağladığı avantajı kullanan hükümet, AB üyeliğinin gerektirdiği reformları uygulamaya koymuştur. Önce 17 Aralık 2004 tarihinde üyelik görüşmelerinin başlamasına yönelik AB Konseyi kararı, daha sonra 3 Ekim 2005 tarihinde üyelik müzakerelerinin başlaması Türkiye'deki iç siyasi yapının değişmesinde önemli bir rol oynamıştır. Bu dönemde, artan sayıda sivil toplum kuruluşunun da iç ve dış politika konularında daha fazla yer aldığı görülmektedir. Örneğin, Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği, Türkiye, İsrail ve Filistin'den işadamlarını biraraya getirmek ve Filistin'de sanayi bölgeleri oluşturmak amacıyla Ankara forumları düzenlemiştir. Bu durum, Davutoğlu'nun "Türkiye'nin dış politikadaki başarısı sadece devlet politikalarının başarısı üzerine temellendirilemez" iddiasıyla örtüşmektedir. Bu bağlamda, Türkiye'de siyasal İslam geleneğinden gelen aktörlerin, Ortadoğu'daki muadillerine göre, daha pragmatik ve demokratik oldukları ve bu doğrultuda Batılı kurumlarla işbirliğine açık oldukları sonucuna varılması mümkün gözükmektedir.

Dış politikaya gelince, AK Parti iktidarı dinamik, pro-aktif ve çok yönlü bir dış politika yürütmeye çaba göstermiştir. Bu noktada, AK Parti'nin dış politika mimarı olarak görülen Davutoğlu, yeni bir jeopolitik yaklaşım önermektedir. Davutoğlu'na göre, Afro-Avrasya bölgesinin ortasında yer alan Türkiye eşsiz bir jeopolitik konuma sahiptir. Bundan dolayı, Türkiye, coğrafi ve kültürel bakımdan sadece bir bölgeyle açıklanamaz. Buna göre, Türkiye birden fazla bölgesel kimliğe sahiptir. Bu nedenle, Batı ve Doğu'daki bölgesel sorunlar ele alınırken, Türkiye, hem Batılı hem de Doğulu kimliğinden faydalanmalıdır. Bu temelde, AB üyelik sürecinin yanısıra, Türkiye, Ortadoğu bölgesine de yoğunlaşmıştır. Özellikle 11 Eylül sonrası dönemde yaşanan gelişmeler ve 2003 ABD-Irak Savaşı gibi bölgesel ve uluslararası dinamikleri etkileyen gelişmeler de bu dönemde yaşanmıştır. PKK terörünün arttığı bir zamanda, 2003 yılındaki savaş sonrasında Irak'ın kuzeyinde Kürdistan Bölgesel Yönetimi'nin kurulması ve bu durumun Türkiye'deki Kürtleri etkileyerek bağımsızlık mücadelesine daha fazla yöneltebileceği endişesi, dikkatlerin bu bölgeye yöneltilmesine neden olmuştur. Böylelikle, Türkiye için Ortadoğu'daki gelişmeler Avrupa'yla ilişkiler kadar önem arz etmiştir. Başka bir deyişle, bu süreçte Türkiye'nin dış politikası, Batı'yla ilişkileri/bağları koparmadan Ortadoğululaşmıştır.

Öte yandan, Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu ülkeleriyle yakınlaşması, İsrail'le ilişkiler bakımından önemli yansımaları olmuştur. Daha önce de belirtildiği üzere, 1990'lı yıllarda Türkiye-İsrail ilişkileri "stratejik ilişki" olarak tanımlanmıştır. Bu dönemde, güvenlik sorunu ikili ilişkilerin şekillenmesinde kritik bir öneme sahiptir. Ancak, Türkiye ve PKK lideri Abdullah Öcalan'a ev sahipliği yapan Suriye arasında 1998 yılında Adana Anlaşması'nın imzalanması ve Öcalan'ın 1999 yılında yakalanması Türkiye-Suriye ilişkilerinin güçlenmesine zemin hazırlamış ve

Türkiye'nin İsrail'e duyduğu güvenlik ve istihbarat alanındaki ihtiyacı azalmıştır. Bu çerçevede, özellikle 2002'den sonraki dönemde, "Komşularla Sıfır Sorun" politikası doğrultusunda, Türkiye, Suriye ve İran gibi komşu ülkeleri bir tehditten ziyade, iyi ilişkiler kurulması gereken komşu ülkeler olarak görmeye başlamıştır. Bu meyanda, Türkiye Ortadoğu'da faal bir oyuncu olmayı ve bölgesel sorunların çözümünde kolaylaştırıcı bir rol oynamayı seçmiştir. Ancak, İsrail'in 2008-2009 Gazze saldırısı, Davos'ta düzenlenen Dünya Ekonomi Zirvesi sırasında Başbakan Erdoğan'ın İsrail Cumhurbaşkanı Shimon Peres'le yaşadığı diyalog ve İsrail askeri güçlerinin, Gazze'ye yardım taşıyan Mavi Marmara adlı Türk gemisine düzenlediği saldırı neticesinde Türk vatandaşlarının hayatlarını kaybetmesi gibi olaylarla da görüldüğü üzere, Türkiye'nin bu vizyonu ve Ortadoğu'ya yönelik politikaları, iki ülke arasında krizlerin yaşanmasını engelleyememiştir.

Bu kapsamda, sözkonusu tez tarafından yapılan devlet kimliği çerçevesinde, AK Parti iktidarı iki önemli noktaya işaret etmektedir: İlki, AB üyelik sürecine önem atfedilmesine karşın, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinin nasıl Ortadoğululaştığı, ikincisi ise, bunun Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerini nasıl etkilediğidir. AK Parti'nin iktidara gelmesi ve sonrasında yaşanan gelişmeler Türkiye'deki farklı aktörlerin rollerinin değiştiğini göstermektedir. Bu da Türkiye'nin devlet kimliği, çıkar ve nihayetinde dış politika tanımlamalarını değiştiren bir süreci tetiklemektedir. Türkiye-İsrail ilişkileri, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğini tanımlama / yeniden tanımlama sürecinden bağımsız olmadığına işaret etmektedir.

Sonuç bölümünde ise, Türkiye'nin İsrail'le ilişkilerinin devlet kimliği kavramıyla açıklanabileceği ileri sürülmektedir. Bu noktada, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinin AK Parti döneminde radikal bir değişime gittiği görülmekte ve bu

değişim, Batılı devlet kimliğinden *Ortadoğululaşmış Merkez Ülke / Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Mirasçısı* devlet kimliğine şeklinde tanımlanmaktadır.

1948-1991 yılları arasındaki dönemde, büyüyen Sovyet tehdidinin etkisiyle, Türkiye, Batı bloğunda yer almayı tercih etmiştir. Bu süreçte ülkenin Batı yanlısı yönetici elitleri, Türkiye'nin Batılılaşma sürecine paralel olarak, ülkenin, NATO, Avrupa Konseyi, OECD ve AET gibi Batılı kuruluşlarda yer almasına çaba göstermişlerdir. Soğu Savaş dinamikleri altında, Türkiye ve İsrail, Ortadoğu'nun iki demokratik ülkesi, Batı kampında yer almayı tercih etmiş, birbirlerini "kendi" algısı içerisinde barındırırken, bölgedeki diğer aktörleri "öteki" olarak görmüş ve bu doğrultuda oluşturdukları çıkarlar temelinde yakın ilişkiler gerçekleştirmiştir.

Öte yandan, bu dönemde ilişkilerde iniş ve çıkışların olduğu da görülmektedir. Ancak, ilişkilerdeki inişler sadece kısa bir zaman diliminde yaşanmış, esasen ilişkilerde radikal bir değişiklik yaşanmamıştır. İlişkilerin Türk tarafı ele alındığında, birçoğu Sovyetler Birliği tarafından desteklenen Arap/İslam ülkeleriyle daha iyi ilişkilerin kurulduğu dönemlerde dahi askeri-sivil yönetici elitler, Batılı değerlerle tanımlanan Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğine sıkı sıkıya bağlı kalmışlardır. Bu durum ilişkilerdeki kriz dönemlerinde de devam etmiştir.

Diğer taraftan, 1980'lerin sonunda Sosyalist bloğun düşüşü ve nihayetinde 1991 yılında Sovyetler Birliği'nin dağılması iki kutuplu dünya düzenine son vermiş ve uluslararası sistem ve dinamikler derin bir değişime uğramıştır. Bu tez tarafından tanımlanan devlet kimliği kavramı çerçevesinde, uluslararası sistemde / dinamiklerde yaşanan değişim Türkiye'nin devlet kimliği bakımından da kısmi bir değişim ifade etmektedir.

Öte yandan, bu dönemde ilişkilerde iniş ve çıkışların olduğu da görülmektedir. Ancak, ilişkilerdeki inişler sadece kısa bir zaman diliminde

yaşanmış, esasen ilişkilerde radikal bir değişiklik yaşanmamıştır. İlişkilerin Türk tarafı ele alındığında, birçoğu Sovyetler Birliği tarafından desteklenen Arap/İslam ülkeleriyle daha iyi ilişkilerin kurulduğu dönemlerde dahi askeri-sivil yönetici elitler, Batılı değerlerle tanımlanan Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğine sıkı sıkıya bağlı kalmışlardır. Bu durum ilişkilerdeki kriz dönemlerinde de devam etmiştir.

Diğer taraftan, 1980'lerin sonunda Sosyalist bloğun düşüşü ve nihayetinde 1991 yılında Sovyetler Birliği'nin dağılması iki kutuplu dünya düzenine son vermiş ve uluslararası sistem ve dinamikler derin bir değişime uğramıştır. Bu tez tarafından tanımlanan devlet kimliği kavramı çerçevesinde, uluslararası sistemde / dinamiklerde yaşanan değişim Türkiye'nin devlet kimliği bakımından da kısmi bir değişim ifade etmektedir.

Bununla birlikte, Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerinde güvenliğin devam eden önemi gibi kolaylaştırıcı faktörler Türkiye'nin Batı yanlısı kimliğinin korunmasında önemli bir rol oynamıştır. Yeni bölgesel ve uluslararası koşullar altında ülkenin ana önceliğinin güvenlik ve istikrarın korunması olması nedeniyle, Türkiye, bir kez daha Batı'yla ortak bir kimlik anlayışına yönelmiştir. Bu doğrultuda, "Türkiye, Batı'dan bağımsız politikalar izlemelidir" şeklinde iç politikada büyüyen eleştiri ve tartışmalara rağmen, 1990'lı yıllarda Türkiye, İsrail'le işbirliği yapmaya devam etmiştir.

Bu noktada, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliği bağlamında, Kürt, İslamcı ve yeni Osmanlıcı/pan-Türkist şeklinde sınıflandırılabilecek alternatif yaklaşımların, Soğuk Savaş'ın bitmesini müteakip, daha yoğun bir şekilde tartışılmaya başlandığı görülmektedir. Özellikle siyasi İslam'ın yükselişi, Milli Görüş geleneğinden gelen Refah Partisi'nin 1996 yılında iktidara gelmesiyle inkâr edilemeyen bir gerçek halini almıştır. Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, RP-DYP (1996-1997) koalisyon hükümeti

süresindeki devlet kimliğini, "Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinin ikililiği" şeklinde tanımlamaktadır. Ancak, askeri-bürokratik elitler, diğer bir değişle Batı yanlısı diğer iç faktörler, Türkiye'nin Batılı devlet kimliğinden ayrılmaya yönelik alternatif öneri ve çabalara, RP-DYP Hükümeti'ni sona erdiren 28 Şubat Süreci'yle son vermiştir.

RP-DYP Hükümeti sonrasında 1997-2002 yılları arasında kurulan koalisyon hükümetleri, Türkiye'nin Batı yanlısı devlet kimliğini sürdürmüşler ve dış politikayı da bu kimlik temelinde uygulamışlardır. Bu meyanda, sözkonusu tez, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğine yönelik alternatif yaklaşımların ülkenin geleneksel Batı yanlısı içyapısını ve Batı'ya dönük dış politikasını değiştirmek için yeterince güçlü olmadığını ileri sürmektedir. Türkiye ve Suriye arasında 1998 Ekim ayında Adana Anlaşması'nın imzalanması ve PKK lideri Abdullah Öcalan'ın 1999 Şubat ayında yakalanmasıyla Türkiye'nin güvenlik ve istihbarat alanında İsrail'e olan ihtiyacı azalmasına rağmen, bu durum değişmemiştir. 2000 Eylül ayında İsrail'e karşı ikinci Filistin direnişi başladığında ve dönemin Başbakanı Bülent Ecevit, 2002 Nisan ayında İsrail'in Cenin mülteci kampına saldırısını "soykırım" olarak nitelendirdiğinde dahi ilişkiler istikrarını korumuştur. Ecevit Hükümeti'nin Türk Ordusu'nun modernizasyonuna ilişkin projelerde İsrailli şirketlerin yer almasına yönelik kararı bu durumu doğrulamaktadır.

Zaman içerisinde Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinin evrimi ve

Bunun İsrail'le ilişkilere olan etkisi:

Dönem	Devlet Kimliği	Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri
1948-1991	Yerel devamlılık Uluslararası devamlılık Batı yanlısı	İyi: Sınır: Türkiye'nin Arap dünyasıyla olan ilişkileri
1991-2002	Yerel devamlılık Uluslararası değişim Batı yanlısı	Daha İyi: Stratejik ilişkiler / Sınır: Filistin direnişi
2002-2011	Yerel değişim Uluslararası değişim Batı yanlısından Ortadoğululaşmış Merkez Ülkeye / Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Mirasçısı	Kötüden Daha Kötüye: Stratejik ilişkilerden Krizler dönemine

AK Parti'nin 2002 Kasım ayında yapılan genel seçimler sonrasında işbaşına gelmesiyle birlikte, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliği dış politikada daha fazla rol oynamaya başlamıştır. 2002-2011 yılları arasındaki AK Parti tecrübesi, iç siyasetin dış politikayı etkileyebileceğini ve dış politikadaki gelişmelerin iç siyaset için sonuçları olabileceğini göstermiştir. AK Parti liderliği, iç politikada tarihsel mirasa, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na, atıfta bulunan güçlü mesajlar vermektedir. Filistin meselesinde de açıkça görüldüğü üzere, Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu ülkeleriyle olan ilişkilerinde ortak değerlere, özellikle İslam dinine, vurguda bulunulmaktadır. Bu

nedenle, Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu bölgesine ve spesifik olarak da İsrail'e yönelik dış politikasını daha iyi anlamak için AK Parti döneminde Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğini esas alan inşacı bir yaklaşıma ihtiyaç duyulduğu değerlendirilmektedir.

Tezin daha önceki bölümlerinde de açıklandığı üzere, Türkiye'nin AB'ye üyelik süreci, ülkenin iç faktörlerinin önemli bir değişime uğramasında etkili olmuştur. Batı karşıtı söylemlerde bulunan geleneksel siyasal İslamcı partilerden farklı olarak, AK Parti, 28 Şubat Süreci'nin etkisiyle "Batılı / modern siyasi değerler ve Batı" hakkında yeniden düşünme sürecini tecrübe etmiştir. Öte yandan, AB üyelik sürecinin getirdiği reformların yapılması Ordu'nun gündemi belirleme gücünü azaltırken, AK Parti Hükümeti'ne geniş bir manevra alanı kazandırmıştır. Bu süreçte birçok sivil toplum kuruluşunun iç ve dış politika oluşumuna daha fazla katkı yapmaya başladığı da gözlenmektedir. Sonuç olarak, Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerinin güçlü savunucusu konumunda bulunan Batı yanlısı askeri-sivil bürokrasi iç politikadaki ayrıcalıklı yerini ve dış politikayı belirleme kabiliyetini kaybetmiştir.

Uluslararası sisteme/dinamikler bakımından, bu tez, 11 Eylül saldırısı ve sonrasında yaşanan gelişmelerin, Soğuk Savaş'ın bitmesiyle başlayan değişim sürecinin devamı olduğu sonucuna varmaktadır. Bu süreçte, oluşan yeni dinamiklerde Türkiye'yi yeniden konumlandırmak amacıyla, örneğin bu ülkeyi *Ilımlı İslam*'ın temsilcisi olarak tanımlayan bazı çabaların sergilendiği görülmektedir. Erdoğan Hükümeti, Türkiye'nin *Ilımlı İslam*'ın temsilcisi olduğu iddialarını reddetmiştir. Esasen bu tartışmaların Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu bölgesindeki geleceğiyle ilgili olduğu düşünülmektedir.

Bu çerçevede, AK Parti Hükümeti, kendi ideolojik yaklaşımını hayata geçirmek ve dış politika ajandasını uygulamak için uygun bir zemin bulmuştur.

Daha önceki bölümlerde de kaydedildiği üzere, devlet kimliği, çıkar ve dış politika arasında yakın bir ilişki bulunmaktadır. *Ortadoğululaşmış Merkez Ülke / Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Mirasçısı* kimliği temelinde, Türkiye'de yeni bir dış politika vizyonu oluşmuştur. Kuşkusuz Türkiye'nin İsrail'le olan ilişkileri de bu süreçten etkilenmiştir. İlişkilerin düşüşe geçmesi, kötüleşmesi ve nihayetinde krizlere dönüşmesi Türkiye'nin değişen devlet kimliğiyle açıklanabilir.

Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinin evrimi ve bunun İsrail'le olan ilişkilere etkisi doğrultusunda, bu tez, yaşanan değişim sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu mirasının özel bir önemi/rolü olduğunu tartışmaktadır. AK Parti'nin Cüneyt Zapsu, Ahmet Davutoğlu ve Yasin Aktay gibi önde gelen isimleri AK Parti'nin stratejik düşünce yapısında bu Osmanlı rolüne dikkat çekmektedirler. Bu dönemde Türkiye'nin tarih, çıkar ve dış politika algısını açıklamak üzere, AK Parti'nin kurucuları arasında yer alan ve 2001-2008 yılları arasında Başbakan Erdoğan'a danışmanlık yapan Cüneyt Zapsu'nun ifadelere dikkat çekmekte yarar görülmektedir. Cüneyt Zapsu, dünya politikasında Türkiye'ye yeni, olumlu bir rol belirlemek için bu ülkenin tarihiyle barışması, toplumsal tabuların üstesinden gelinmesi ve yeni, olumlu bir Türk kimliği kavramı gerektiğini ifadeyle Osmanlı'nın devamı olduklarını ve bundan utanmadıklarını söylemiştir.

Benzer bir şekilde, Ahmet Davutoğlu da jeostratejik yaklaşımını daha önce Osmanlı İmparatorluğu tarafından yönetilen topraklar üzerine kurmuştur: Ortadoğu ve Kuzey Afrika, Balkanlar ve Kafkaslar. Bu noktada, her öz algısının kimliğe dönüştüğünü savunan Davutoğlu için kimlik yaratma sürecinde "öz algısı" önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Bu çerçevede, Davutoğlu, Türkiye için öz algının yeniden tanımlanmasından bahsetmekte ve Türkiye'nin Osmanlı geçmişiyle ortak bir noktada buluşması gerektiğini ileri sürmektedir.

Türkiye'nin Osmanlı mirasına atıfla, Davutoğlu, Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu bölgesinde "merkez ülke" olduğuna inanmaktadır. Davutoğlu'na göre, yüzyıllar boyunca Türkiye coğrafyasının harmanladığı farklı kültürel özellikler temelinde, bu ülke cazibe merkezidir. Bu nedenle, tarihinin ve coğrafi konumunun bir sonucu olarak Türkiye'nin "stratejik derinliği" bulunmaktadır. Türkiye ilgilenmese bile, Ortadoğu'daki her sorun onu ilgilendirecektir. Bu durum, Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu'ya yönelik dış politikasının, bölgedeki çatışma ve anlaşmazlıklardan kaçınmadan arabulucu rolü oynamaya şeklinde değişmesinin ana nedenlerini de göstermektedir. Tez, bu değişikliğin Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerine olumsuz yansımaları olduğunu ileri sürmektedir.

Sonuç olarak, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliği, 29 Ekim 1923 tarihinde Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kurulmasından bu yana Türk dış politikasının ayrılmaz bir parçası olmuştur. Son dönemde Türkiye'nin geleneksel Batı yanlısı devlet kimliği ve Batı yönlü dış politikasına alternatif olarak sunulan Osmanlı tarihsel mirasıyla ilişkilendirilen İslami yaklaşımı dış politikanın iç siyasileşmesi olarak görmek mümkün gözükmektedir. Bu tezin devlet kimliği kavramıyla uyumlu olarak, AK Parti döneminde Türkiye'deki iç faktörlerin yanısıra, uluslararası sistem / dinamikler de değişime uğramıştır. Sözkonusu iki faktörün değişime uğraması nedeniyle, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliği, çıkarları ve dış politikası da değişmiştir. Bu kapsamda, sözkonusu tez, yeni devlet kimliğini *Ortadoğululaşmış Merkez Ülke / Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Mirasçısı* olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Türkiye'nin yeni devlet kimliğinin bu ülkenin İsrail'le olan ilişkilerini analiz etmek için önemli bir çerçeve sunduğu düşünülmektedir. 1990'lı yıllarda iki ülke arasındaki ilişkiler zirve noktasına ulaşmış ve bu dönemde ilişkiler "stratejik ilişki" olarak nitelendirilmiştir. Bunun birlikte, Ortadoğu'da iki ülkenin yararına

fırsatlar sunmasına rağmen, bugün böyle bir ilişkinin varlığından söz etmek olası gözükmemektedir. Bu noktada, Türkiye'nin devlet kimliğinin kritik ve belirleyici bir rol oynadığı değerlendirilmektedir. Bu itibarla, Türk dış politikası da yeni devlet kimliğinin etkisi altında bulunmaktadır.

Özetle, devlet kimliği, 1950 yılının Ocak ayında tesis edilen devletlerarası ilişkileri açıklamada önemli bir faktör olarak öne çıkmaktadır. Bu tez tarafından ortaya konulan devlet kimliği tanımı doğrultusunda, sözkonusu tez, Türkiye'nin değişen devlet kimliğinin İsrail'le olan ikili ilişkileri de değiştirdiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu bağlamda, yapılan çalışmanın, Türkiye-İsrail ilişkilerinde gelecekte yaşanacak gelişmelerin, devlet kimliği perspektifinden daha kapsamlı ve iyi bir şekilde anlaşılmasına katkıda bulunacağına inanıyorum.

<div align="center">**C. CURRICULUM VITAE**</div>

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Ünal, Derviş Fikret

Nationality: Turkish

Date and Place of Birth: 21 August 1983 / İzmir, Turkey

Marital Status: Single

Phone: +90 541 313 19 12

E-mail: unaldervis@gmail.com

EDUCATION

2006-2007   Master of European Studies, Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI), Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universitaet Bonn, Germany Thesis Title: The Cyprus Issue within the Context of Turkey-EU Negotiations (Under the supervisory of Prof. Dr. Ludger Kühnhardt)

2001-2006   Bachelor of Science in International Relations, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Middle East Technical University, Turkey

1997-2001   Manisa Yabancı Dil Ağırlıklı Süper Lisesi (High School), Turkey

WORK EXPERIENCE

2009-   Career diplomat at the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs

2008-2009   Scientific Programmes Assistant Expert at the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK)

2007-2008   Assistant Rapporteurs at the General Secretariat for Istanbul Minerals and Metals Exporters' Association (IMMIB)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

English (advanced), German (upper intermediate), French (elementary), Italian (elementary), Hebrew (elementary), Greek (beginner)

PUBLICATIONS

1. Ünal, Derviş Fikret, "EU-Russian Relations: Evolution and Theoretical Assessment", *Discussion Paper C203*, Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI), 2011.

2. Erdoğan, Murat and Ünal, Derviş Fikret, "The Legacy of Hrant Dink and Turkey's EU Process", *ZEI EU-Turkey-Monitor*, Vol.3 No.1, March 2007, p.8.

HOBBIES

Football, Swimming, Reading, Movies, Music

D. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☐

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı : ....
Adı   : ....
Bölümü : ....

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : ....

....
....
....
....

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☐   Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın. ☐

2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullancılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) ☐

3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) ☐

Yazarın imzası ....   Tarih ....