

CHAPTER IV

THE FACTORS OF TURKEY CUT OFF THE DIPLOMATIC TIES TOWARD ISRAEL IN 2011

In this chapter will explain about the factors that affect the termination of diplomatic relations between Turkey and Israel also contains about proving the hypothesis that has been explain briefly in the first chapter.

A. Domestic Factors

Several changes in domestic policy have influenced Turkey to achieve the interests of its regime abroad. The change of values becomes more Islamist, and it has influenced Turkish foreign policy behavior. The regime of the AKP government has changed the focus of its foreign policy area towards the Middle East (Davutoglu, 2008, p.77). Can not be denied that foreign policy Turkey applied AKP increasing debate in the context of identity. This debate was considered could explain the dynamics of foreign policy which took place in various eras of leadership. Turkey's foreign political debate is an extension of the debate over national identity in the past and continues to this day. A clash between a group of Islamism and the Kemalist in respect of the interests of national security and creating tension in Turkey's foreign politics.

This is considered important factors in explaining the domestic conditions that effect directly against the formulation of foreign policy Turkey. This factor also sparked concern in taking action against AKP strategy how to defuse tensions between the two groups of thought. An analysis of these factors can be seen in the

Köselababan entitled *Torn Identities and Foreign Policy: The Case of Turkey and Japan*, Bozdağlıoğlu, entitled *Modernity, Identity, and Turkey's Foreign Policy*, and Robins called *Turkish Foreign Policy Since 2002: Between a ' Post-' an Islamist Government and a Kemalist State*. This article describes the third identity debate in the formulation of foreign policy Turkey, but with a different focus. Köselababan examines the theoretical debate in national identity in the case of Turkey and Japan, two countries which have Eastern roots but defines itself as part of the West. Bozdağlıoğlu review Chronology of Turkey's national identity debate and consider the argument as a process that has not yet ended. While Robins examine how duality of identity is reflected in the first period of the reign of AKP (2002-2005).

Foreign policy emerged from the contestation between sub-national identity that has different views about national identity. National identity needs to be in question because of conflict between groups of domestic identity takes place on an ongoing basis. Therefore, according to Köselababan, national identity is not considered as a single entity which represents understanding ideational factors. National identity not a monopolitik entity, but is characterized by the intensive conflict between perception regarding the definition of "self" and "the other" as an identity component. In this context, national identity is not a concept that is taken for granted, but it requires a consensus at the national level. The problem is this consensus never really materialized so that the conflict thought continues to effect the immediate political preference toward foreign policy. In the case of Turkey, the Köselababan suggests two things related to how foreign policy Turkey formulated. 41 first, the foreign policy Turkey drafted by not neglected their ideational factors such as identity and history. Second, foreign policy

emerged as the product of kontestasi between different groups of identity on the domestic level, which these groups have different views regarding the national identity of Turkey.

The other factors that are considered influential in explaining why there is a change in Turkey's foreign political era of the AKP is a conceptual thinking. Can not be denied that any regime has a different vision and strategy. In foreign policy, one which many observers considered the most influential in the leadership of the AKP is Ahmet Davutoğlu, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey at this time. Richard Falk revealed that Davutoğlu was the source of thought are important in foreign policy, AKP. It is also visible from the writings of the various academics who consider that an analysis of the causes of the change of political orientation abroad would not be complete if it did not examine the thinking of key figure Davutoğlu which is behind the formulation of external politics country Turkey.

The point of no return between Israel and Turkey was the *Mavi Marmara* incident. In May 2010, the "Gaza Freedom Flotilla" sailed toward the Gaza Strip to break the embargo imposed by Israel and bring humanitarian assistance to the Gazans. In total, there were eight ships, but one had mechanical difficulties and another was late. Therefore, six were approaching the Gaza Strip when one of them, the *Mavi Marmara*, owned and operated by an Islamist humanitarian organization, the Foundation for Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief (IHH), was attacked by Israeli commandos. Nine Turks died and numerous activists and Israeli soldiers were injured. The Human Rights Council of the United Nations called the interception of the flotilla "unlawful," labeling its actions crimes, including willful

killing and torture, and charging Israel with the use of excessive, unnecessary and disproportionate force.

Besides Turks, there were Germans, Americans, Arabs and British activists in the flotilla. In fact, there were five Israeli citizens, including member of the Knesset Haneen Zouabi and Sheikh Raed Saleh from the Islamist movement in Israel, who were also interrogated by the Israeli authorities. Needless to say, IHH was an Islamist organization motivated by ideological convictions to "save" the Palestinians from oppression and possibly seek confrontation with the Israelis if they were prevented from reaching the Gaza Strip.

Having said that, however, the fact that there were no firearms on the ship and no threat to the Israeli soldiers makes the Israeli reactions to the *Mavi Marmara* unreasonable. In retrospect, both governments mishandled the crisis: the Turkish government for allowing — maybe encouraging — the flotilla to sail towards Israel; and the Israeli government for killing citizens of a friendly country. Both countries have lost from this fiasco.

Israeli leaders claimed that they perceived the activists on the *Mavi Marmara* to be government-supported, violent, armed Islamist militants. This was all the more reason to handle the situation carefully, as if it were true that the Turkish government was supporting the flotilla a violent clash would jeopardize relations with Turkey for a long time to come. On the other hand, labeling and perceiving them to be terrorists made the defense of Israel essential hence the harsh reaction.

B. International Factors

The Encouragement Of International Factors That Make Turkey Breaks Off Diplomatic Relations With

Israel. The OIC is one factor in the termination of the Turkish international relations with Israel. Organization Islamic Cooperation (OIC) is the second largest inter-governmental organization after the United Nations. This organization has membership of 57 states spread over four continents. Besides, the Organization Islamic Cooperation is formerly Organization of the Islamic Conference. The establishment of this organization was in 25 September 1969. OIC states that it is the collective voice of the Muslim World and ensuring to safeguard and protect the interests of the Muslim World in the spirit of the promoting international peace and harmony.

For the conflict between Palestine and Israel, the world has witnessed Palestinian suffering from Israel military occupation since the end of the war and the declaration of Israel Independence. So, as an international organization that concern about Muslim World problems, OIC does not just sit down and see it happen without doing anything. Since the establishment of this organization is in responding to one of the roots of Palestine conflict, OIC take action to penetrating Palestinian issues into other international organization and actors to take care of this issues. One of the action that has already taken by OIC was they are fully supportive in Palestine's bid for full membership in UNESCO and calls upon UNESCO's General Conference to adopt it. This is to foster the Palestinians legitimate aspirations for statehood. Besides, it was to increase the possibilities for a lasting peace based on the vision of the two-state solution.

Furthermore, OIC play a role as the meeting point of cooperation among Islamic states. So that, in 1981 OIC summit calls for broad struggle for the liberation of Jerusalem and occupied territories. OIC has choose to boycott the Israel economic which is the general agreement for economic, technical and commercial

cooperation comes into force. In addition, after a year OIC foreign ministers resolve to create Islamic offices specially for boycotting Israel. The Islamic offices also was established for military cooperation with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). This action has been taken to give pressure into the state of Israel for ending the Israel occupation and oppression towards Palestinian. Furthermore, OIC not only take action to seek for support from Muslim majority countries but also from Western countries as well in order to support the establishment of Palestinian state. Besides, OIC also have already urged the United Nation Security Council to take the Palestine-Israel conflicts seriously and put it an end within a specific time frame and in line with the established international agreements.

The emergence of the OIC could not be released from the presence of the spirit of Pan-Islamism. Pan-Islamism is a political theory developed by Jamal al-Afghani and his disciples. This theory emphasizes the solidarity of Muslims, in the face of economic and political dominance of the West. Despite the rallying the cry of Islamic unity or Pan-Islamism has been echoed in these years, but the House of secularists, Socialist, and nationalist regional not ready to overcome differences and forge unity on the basis of the same faith. In 1960-70s, appears new efforts in building ties between muslim countries. The Saudi Crown Prince, who later became King Faisal is leading the new effort. He sought to stem the Arab nationalism.

There are four main goals of the OIC:

1. Raising of Islamic solidarity among its members.
2. Consolidation and cooperation among its members in the fields of economic, social, cultural, science

and technology, and other areas that are considered important.

3. Consultation and cooperation among member countries in various international organizations.
4. Eliminate racial discrimination and colonialism in all its forms.

In addition to the purpose of the formation of this organization, the OIC also has principles of membership as follows:

1. Equality of the position, rights, and obligations among Member States.
2. Respect the right to determine its own and does not interfere in the domestic issues that occur in the Member States.
3. Respect for the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of each of the Member States.
4. Resolve any conflicts that arise with the use of peaceful means such as negotiation, mediation, reconciliation or arbitration.
5. Not to threaten or use force against the territorial integrity, national unity or political independence of Member States.

The existence of a rational and flexible impression if it can be dikorelasi with the view of Morgenthau, politics abroad brought by Attaturk and reszim AKP equally rational and flexible nature. But that sets it apart just a secular worldview brought by Attaturk did not manage to meet the needs of the community, while the regime of AKP managed to answer the will of the people

against the face of the Turkey, and there is no impression of force and experience the pressure.

Be aware that up to now, foreign directions under Erdogan still investigation to build relationships as many other countries. This is in accordance with the terms in berdiplomasi that a thousand friends too few, and one foe is already too much. However, Turkey diplomatic relations with some countries currently experiencing difficulty, especially with the United States and also with the countries in the European Union. Turkey plays the role of diplomacy with little risk and can not understand a lot of parties. The difficulty coupled with the domestic issues that are a bit volatile because of the problems of the Kurdish separatists, as well as problems to the people of Gaza who are indirectly the responsibility of Turkey itself. Thus, Turkey has a desire to improve relations with his diplomatic segara multiple countries, including Israel, in resolving the diplomatic problems.

In 2005, Turkey became Secretary General of the Organization for Islamic Cooperation (OIC). The position has shown Turkish gait in the Middle East. More cooperation that built along with following Islamic countries also began to be firmed, such as military cooperation with Iran and improved relations with Syria (Davutoglu, 2008, p 80).

The system of interaction between Turkey and the Islamic world since 2007 has been reconstructed the understanding of 'friends' and 'enemies' in the international place. In the case of Israel-Palestine, the Islamic world considers Israel as the 'enemy' of Islam to be competed with. Based on such common understanding, it influences the construction of Turkey's understanding of Israel. So Turkey also considers Israel as the enemy, and Palestine as a 'friend'. It is proved by Turkey giving aid to the

Palestinians as the Palestinians are at odds with its ally, Israel, while Turkey continues to condemn Israel's actions at the Davos conference (Ulutaş, 2010, pp. 6-7)

The system of interaction between Israel and Palestine has also contributed to Turkish political behavior. Israel tends to keep attacking, that makes other Islamic countries angry including Turkey. The other Islamic countries and OIC decide to urge Israel to stop its attacks ((OIC), 2009). Regarding to current international political order, the state must consider about the world peace in its international political practice. So in that case, the Islamic countries could only do diplomatic intervention to Israel and send aid to Palestine. One of the hit crackdowns in international politics is the severance of diplomatic relations. Turkey voted the way for Israel for its crackdown on Palestine in 2010, especially when Israel sank the Mavi Marmara ship which carrying humanitarian aid to the Palestinians (Washingtonpost, 6/7/2010).

Turkey has undertaken a series of diplomatic maneuvers at the United Nations, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and NATO, where Israel was criticized. The Turkish ambassador in Tel Aviv, Oguz Celikkol, was recalled to Turkey; and Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu called this incident "our 9/11," pointing out that it was the first time Turkish citizens had been killed by the army of a foreign country. It was also striking that the order to attack was given by Minister of Defense Ehud Barak. He was the sympathetic prime minister during the devastating earthquake in Turkey in 1999 who personally visited Turkey to open the Israel-Turkey village built for the victims of the earthquake. On the other hand, there were Jewish voices such as Tikun Olam, which criticized the incident as an execution.

IHH, besides being a humanitarian organization, also calls for political demonstrations to bring the suffering of oppressed peoples onto the world agenda. It was established in 1994 and got involved in sending humanitarian aid to Yugoslavia, Kosovo and Chechnya. Interestingly, the leader of an influential Muslim politico-cultural movement, Fethullah Gulen, who resides in Pennsylvania, criticized the IHH for not asking prior approval from Israel before undertaking the trip. This was the first time that a civil-society organization has initiated a crisis that was not properly managed by the authorities. The bottom line is that IHH singlehandedly torpedoed Turkish-Israeli relations, despite the fact that there was criticism of Israel by Turkey over the Palestine issue. However, the IHH's dispatching of the ships and the subsequent killings have destroyed relations for a long time to come.

There was the characterization by Arutz Sheva (Channel 7, 18 May 2012) of IHH as a Turkey-based terror group, and by Barry Rubin as an "Islamist terrorist group" supported by the Turkish government. There has been a recent investigation by Turkish courts into the possible diversion by the chairman of IHH, Bulent Yildirim, of funds to al-Qaeda. The Israeli Commission Report (Turkel Report) characterized the IHH as a "humanitarian organization with a radical-Islamic orientation which provides support to Hamas." It also points out that activists attacked the Israeli soldiers with clubs, iron rods and knives, as a result of which nine soldiers were wounded including two by bullets.