

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### A. Background

In 1918, the once mighty Ottoman Empire lost the war to the Allies. Afterwards, the regions that belonged to the Ottoman were divided between Britain, France, Greece and Russia. (History.com Editor, 2017) During years of struggle, Kemal Ataturk emerged as a leading figure for Turkish-nationalism which later was honored as the ‘Father of The Turks’. After years of war that was called as ‘Turkish War of Independence’, the Ottoman Empire was abolished by Turkey’s Grand National Assembly in 1922 and Turkey was declared a republic in 1923 with Kemal Ataturk as its first President.

When the new Turkey was founded, its political affairs including foreign policy were mainly guided by Kemal Ataturk who introduced the ‘modern Turkey’. During its early years, the leader of Turkey focused on introducing nationalist values that would replace the Islam-oriented values of the Ottoman Empire. In terms of foreign policy, Kemal Ataturk introduced “*Peace at Home, Peace in the World*” as the foundation of Turkish foreign policy. In fact, this non-adventurist foreign policy still became the general principle of Turkey foreign policy until early 2000s. (Gol, 1993)

Further, one of the main goals of Ataturk was also to establish modernization of Turkey. According to Ayla Gol, “*Ataturk identified modernization with westernization and used both words synonymously. Turkey's western-inclined foreign policy began in Atatürk's time in conjunction with efforts at modernization in the cultural sphere.*” (Gol, 1993) In order

to support modernization in Turkey, Kemal Ataturk also introduced secularism in Turkey which separated religion and state in Turkey.

An important outcome of this new focus was that Turkey distanced itself from the Muslim world and chose to remain outside of the Middle Eastern affairs. (Ozkececi-Taner, 2013) On the other hand, as modernization and Westernization became the main goal of Turkey, its foreign policy was changed to western-oriented. The signing of Lausanne Peace Treaty in 1923 which maintained Turkey's international recognition as independent and sovereign state among Western nations had become the sign of its western-oriented foreign policy. The other example of the Western-oriented foreign policy of Turkey was its decision to become the first Muslim majority country that recognized the state of Israel in 1949. In fact, Turkey also made several attempts to apply membership in the European Union even though all attempts were rejected. The only problematic issue of Turkey with the West that allegedly became the obstacle of Turkey's membership application to EU was the Cyprus conflict.

During the Cold War, Turkey's foreign policy maintained its Western-orientation by siding with the Western Bloc. The Cold War era was the first time Turkey started to play role in the Middle East after its foundation in 1923. In the Middle East, Turkey signed the British-led Baghdad Pact in 1955 which its goal was to restrain Soviet influence in the Middle East and on the other hand supported U.S containment policy. But its plan faced major opposition from the Arab states and failed soon after.

Since the end of 1900s, Turkey started to re-reengaged with the Middle East especially since the era of former President Turgut Ozal. He was very active in seeking economic opportunities with the Middle Eastern countries. By the 1990s, Turkey export to the Muslim countries has reached to 40 percent of Turkey's export, higher than its trade with

traditional Western markets. (Dinc & Yetim, 2012) But in fact, Ozal's era of foreign policy still maintain Turkey's western orientation as under his leadership, Turkey became a staunch supporter of U.S policies and sought full incorporation into the European Union. (Ozkececi-Taner, 2013)

In 2002, the AKP party won election and took power in Turkey. Since then, Ahmet Davutoglu was the architect of Turkey foreign policy with its '*Strategic Depth*' doctrine. The main principle of Turkey that was promoted by Davutoglu was the '*Zero Problems with Neighbors*' philosophy. As a matter of the fact, this principle is actually still based on Kemal's principle of foreign policy of maintaining peace with the world. The example of this foreign policy outcome was Turkey effort and progress toward normalizing its relations with Iran and Syria which was Turkey rival previously. (Davutoglu, 2010) (Ozkececi-Taner, 2013) At the time, Turkey rapprochement with the Middle Eastern states was guided by the '*zero problems with neighbors*' principle.

Regarding Turkey's diplomatic relations with Egypt, the only conflict that occurred between the two states before the period of Arab Spring started was Egypt's opposition to Baghdad Pact that was also signed by Turkey. The conflict almost reached direct confrontation when Egypt sent campaign troops near the Syrian – Turkish border in order to help the Syrian forces as a response to Turkey army deployment along the Turkish – Syrian border. But in the end, both sides were withdrawing their troops and the possible confrontation ended. (Ozkececi-Taner, 2013)

The relations of Turkey with Egypt started to improve since 1970s when Egypt's Nasser era was ended, replaced by the pro-US Anwar Saddat. When Saddat signed Camp David Accords with Israel in 1979, Turkey supported the Egyptian side while most other Arab states did not. Trelations developed further particularly when former Turkish Prime

Minister Necmettin Erbakan visited Egypt in 1996. The visit resulted in the formation of the Group of Eight countries which its first summit was in Istanbul in June 1997.

When the AKP took power in Turkey in 2002 and changed Turkey foreign policy direction to the Middle East, Turkey's trade with Egypt increased significantly. Both sides signed Free Trade Agreement in 2005 and agreed on natural gas deal in 2006 which end up resulting in an increasing amount of trade between the two countries from \$301 million to \$5 billion only between 2002 and 2013. (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Trade, 2018) (Cagaptay & Sievers, 2015) (Alexander's Gas & Oil Connections, 2006) However, Turkey never criticized Egyptian government for its undemocratic regime.

In the end of 2010, the Arab Spring revolution started in Tunisia. Before the mass revolution occurred, nobody expected that its impact would inspire revolutionary movements in countries throughout the Arab World. However the anti-government protest spread very quickly that in 14 January 2011, Ben Ali was overthrown as a Tunisian president. And on the same month, a major protest was already started in Egypt demanding the resignation of its President Hosni Mubarak.

When the tragedy of Bouazizi suicide occurred in Tunisia (an event that triggered Arab Spring revolution in Tunisia), Turkey reaction was extremely cautious and it did not release any official statement or response regarding the tragedy even until the then-Tunisia President Zein Al Abidine Ben Ali resigned on 14 January 2011. (Başkan, 2016) However, Turkey responded differently when the revolution spread to Egypt. Only one week after the protest started throughout Egypt, Turkey made Turkey Prime Minister Erdogan made an official statement that Turkey supported democratic transition in Egypt and demanded Hosni Mubarak to listen to people's demand. (Vilhelbeitia & Aydinli, 2011) And only one month after Hosni Mubarak's resignation on February 2011, Turkey showed clear supports to the

democratic transition in Egypt by several top official visits by Turkey president and prime minister only within months after Morsi's resignation. (VOA, 2011 ; Khalifa, 2017)

Muslim Brotherhood played an important role during the Arab Spring in Egypt. They even endorsed the Arab Spring movement officially on 28 January 2011. After the resignation of Hosni Mubarak from Egyptian presidency, the Muslim Brotherhood announced that it would form a political party, which later was officially created on May 2011. After a series of elections in Egypt, Muslim Brotherhood won the presidential election in June 2012 and its candidate Mohamed Morsi took power as the first democratic president of Egypt. (Nada & Rowan, 2019)

Turkey enjoyed good relations with Egypt under Morsi government, which was backed by the Muslim Brotherhood. Both Morsi and Erdogan even visited each other in 2012, talking numerous of issues and potential cooperation, including the issues of Syria and Gaza, and also trade. (Seibert, 2012) However, it did not last long as Morsi regime was forced to step down by a military coalition led by Egyptian army chief General Abdel Fattah el-Sisi in 2013. Morsi was also kidnapped along by a dozen members of Muslim Brotherhood by the Egyptian armed forces. (Carlstrom, 2013)

The majority of the Middle Eastern countries responded cautiously toward the coup, including UAE, Jordan, Iran, Iraq, and Qatar who made very cautious official statements. Saudi and Syria both turned out clearly supporting the military coup toward Morsi government. However, Turkey made an antagonistic respond toward the coup, blaming it as anti-democratic. Turkey then led an international campaign against Egypt and demanded the UN Security Council to impose sanction on the Egypt new government under el-Sisi. (Khalifa, 2017) At the same time, as Muslim Brotherhood members were arrested and killed by the armed forces in Egypt, Turkey did not only blame the events as 'massacre', but also

welcome the Brotherhood's members who seek asylum in Turkey. (Kotan, 2017) The bilateral relations between Egypt and Turkey downgraded when Egypt decided to expelled Turkish ambassador in Cairo which Turkey responded by declaring Egyptian ambassador in Ankara as *persona non grata*. (BBC, 2013)

The writer believed that Turkey's aggressive rejection toward the Egyptian military coup in 2013 is unprecedented on its modern republic history and can be seen as an act of leaving its principle of '*zero problems with neighbors*'. It is also interesting because Turkey did not respond similarly to the Arab Springs movements that occurred in other Middle Eastern states. Even Turkey also criticized the other Arab States such as Saudi Arabia for refusing to support former Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak. (Zaleswki, 2013) Therefore, the writer will analyze the phenomenon of Turkey foreign policy towards Egypt in rejection of Egyptian military coup in 2013 as it moved from '*zero problems*' foreign policy philosophy into more a confrontation policy, in this case, with Egypt.

## **B. Research Question**

From the case explained above, the research question of this thesis is, "**why Turkey did not accept military coup toward Egypt former democratic government under Mohamed Morsi?**"

## **C. Theoretical Framework**

An international relations theory is needed to explain why a phenomenon occurred in the international system, or why a state decided a foreign policy decision, or predicting the upcoming phenomenon in the future. In order to analyze and answer the research question above, the writer believe that neoclassical realism is the best theory that can answer the reason behind Turkey's rejection of Egyptian military coup in 2013.

The neo-classical realism theory was developed by Gideon Rose in 1998. Unlike neo-realism that focuses solely on international system, neo-classical realism added the domestic

factor that also can affect the states behavior. In other words, neo-classical realists study both international structure or systemic pressure and domestic factor, and their complex interaction with each other that influence foreign policy behavior of a state. (Firoozabadi & Ashkezari, Neo-classical Realism in International Relations, 2016)

For neo-realist, states don't just seek power and states don't just fear other states. There are reasons states seek power and there are reasons states fear other states. (Newmann) A historical event that was taken as example by neo-realist was "The History of the Peloposennian War" written by Thucydides, which Gideon Rose believed that the cause of war was the feeling of fear among Spartans because of increasing power of Athena. The Spartans saw Athens as excessively arrogant and expansionistic in nature due to Athenians elevated view of themselves. Rose stated that this was "*how systemic incentives were translated through unit-level variables into foreign policies of the various Greek-city states.*" (Rose, 1998) (Wallin, 2014)

From the statement above, it can be understood that international system or systemic pressure is also important in neoclassical theory. However, Gideon Rose also stated that the decision's maker understanding from systemic relative power that makes them decide a foreign policy is also very important. Therefore, studying the effect of '*relative power*' is the core subject in neoclassical realism theory. Taliaferro also explained, "*the underlying causal logic of neoclassical realism is that state's relative power distributions are effected by domestic constraints and elite perceptions, which in turn influence foreign policy decision.*" (Firoozabadi & Ashkezari, Neo-classical Realism in International Relations, 2016)

Based on Taliaferro argument, neo-classical realists believed that foreign policy choices are made by political leaders and elite, so it is their perceptions of relative power that matter, not simply relative quantities of physical resources or forces. (Rose, 1998) The

understanding of the leaders toward international threats and opportunities also shape the states foreign policy differently. As decision maker's perceptions matter, the analysis such as historical background, ideology, identity, belief and/or values of the policy makers, leaders or political leaders are also important for neo-realist. Further, there is also dependence of state from civil society, political coalitions and/or organizational politics that might influence the perception of the policy makers. (Firoozabadi & Ashkezari, Neo-classical Realism in International Relations, 2016)

Neo-classical realists still maintain the argument that 'demands for security' is the main cause for state to seek power because self-help is determining factor for providing its own security. However, neo-classical realists believe that power is an instrument to reach security. But, neo-classical realists rejected the assumption of neo-realism that argues security is the sole goal of any state in international system. Instead, neo-classical realists believe that states attempt to change international system on their own preferences through increasing their own power. Therefore, the states that possess more power follow more ambitious foreign policy. Based on these assumptions, the policy makers within states would calculate threats in international system to its security and also opportunities that would enhance its ambitions foreign policy. (Firoozabadi & Ashkezari, Neo-classical Realism in International Relations, 2016) On the other hand, the arguments also meant that neo-classical realist still maintain realism's argument that security is the national interest of state. But it further also argued that changing international system on state's own preferences is also a national interest of state.

The first application of neoclassical realism theory that will be analyzed in this research is Turkey's policy makers' perception, ideology, and identity. In this case, the identity and ideological background of the AKP party, which was the dominant party that hold power in Turkey since 2002, will be analyzed. Since AKP took power in 2002, it



attempted to change Turkey state's identity into its own party identity. Despite its founders and members have a strong background of Islamists, Erdogan refused to admit that the AKP is an Islamic political party. He emphasized that the AKP party are 'Muslim Democrats' or in other words the Muslim party that strongly holds the democratic ideas. (Rabasa & Larrabee, 2008) However, the Islamism ideology hold by the AKP party has a strong ambition in the Middle East, which many often refer it as the neo-Ottoman ideology. The existence of neo-Ottomanist idea among Turkey policy makers means that there are strong supports for Turkey to play proactive roles and policies in the regions that belonged to the Ottoman Empire. (Ozkececi-Taner, 2013)

On the other hand, neoclassical realist also believed that "*states attempt to change international system on their own preferences through increasing their own power*". (Firoozabadi & Ashkezari, Neo-classical Realism in International Relations, 2016) In this case, the AKP relations with Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt will also be analyzed. Turkey's support for Muslim Brotherhood's key man Mohamed Morsi during his presidency and the rejection of military coup toward Morsi is also means for Turkey to hold its accomplice in Egypt, which is Muslim Brotherhood. Besides el-Sisi oppression toward the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, Turkey also viewed Egypt's new government under el-Sisi as did not coherent with their Islamic democrat ideas as they hold militarism rule and undermine democratic values.

#### **D. Hypotheses**

Based on the background and theoretical framework explained above, the writer's hypotheses on the reasons behind Turkey's foreign policy behavior that rejected military coup toward Mohamed Morsi in Egypt and its new government under el-Sisi are:

1. Because of the Islamism and neo-Ottoman ideology hold by the AKP party are in contrast with the ideology of el-Sisi government.
2. Turkey views el-Sisi government as a threat to Turkey ambition to have bigger political influences in Egypt and because of their oppression toward Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt that notably has strong political connection and has similar ideology with the AKP party.

### **E. Research Methodology**

This research will be created using qualitative method which explains an international relations phenomenon using international relations theories. Therefore, depth data collection is needed in order to provide deep analysis to the phenomenon.

The data collection is taken from historical research in order to provide systematic and objective examination. Literatures, books, journals, reports, news from either offline or online resources are essential for collecting data in this research.

### **F. Scope of Research**

In order to make the research clearer, the writer limits the scope of research to avoid irrelevant analysis to the research. The writer noted that the scope of research started from 2002 when the AKP party took power in Turkey until the military coup that occurred in Turkey in 2013. However, the writer does not close any possibility if there are data outside of the research scope in order to support the analysis.

### **G. Research Outline**

The outline of this research consists of 5 chapters:

**Chapter I** contains introduction which explains problem's background, research question, theoretical framework, scope of research, hypotheses, research methodology, and research's outline.

**Chapter II** contains description about the Turkey's foreign policy orientation which was Europe minded, heavily influenced by Western values and democracy before the era of 2000s.

**Chapter III** contains detailed historical description about Turkey's foreign policy toward Egypt before the military coup that did not focus on how democracy is implemented in Egypt

**Chapter IV** contains explain and analyze the factors that influences Turkey's foreign policy decision toward Egyptian military coup in 2013.

**Chapter V** contains conclusion from this research. The conclusion is drawn by analyzing hypotheses and the theoretical framework from valid data.