Political Islam and Turkish Foreign Policy in the AKP Era[1]

Umut Yukaruc

University of East Anglia

Contact: U.Yukaruc@uea.ac.uk

Conference: CEEISA-ISA Joint International Conference, 23-25 June 2016, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Panel: Foreign Policy in the Middle East

Introduction

In the last decade, political Islam established its hegemony in Turkey under the leadership of Justice and Development Party (AKP) and it reduces the role of Kemalist hegemony in Turkish politics. The party has become a hegemonic political force and its political Islamist identity influences the political (domestic and international) and social spheres (culture, media, religion, or education). This hegemony is also reflected in the Turkish Foreign Policy (TFP). Rise of political Islam under the AKP rule has changed the perception of national interest and Turkey started to be more proactive in the regions where previously the Ottoman Empire ruled for centuries.

According to Social Constructivism in IR, state identities are an important part of state behaviours. They define behaviours and foreign policies emerge out of these identities. Identities can be divided into two in terms of how they are constituted. Firstly, they can be constituted by interaction with the other states. Secondly, they can be the results of domestic developments such as a revolution or a hegemony change. As a result of the hegemony change in Turkey in the last decade, there are new identities. These identities are a part of the security imaginary of Political Islamist ideology. According to Jutta Weldes, a security imaginary is "a structure of well-established meanings and social relations out of which representations of the world of international relations are created" (Weldes, 1999: 10). She states that these representations are constructed by state officials who are responsible for

---

[1] This paper is a part of PhD research and it is still a work in progress, so please do not cite without contacting the author.

foreign policy decision makers. Weldes (1999) explains that state officials have ideas about foreign affairs, and their ideas are represented by intersubjective and culturally established meanings through discursive practices.

Moreover, articulation of the meaning is an important process. Constructivist thinkers such as Ted Hopf (2002) or Weldes (1996; 1999) explain that state officials articulate particular meanings, identities to construct difference between the 'self' and 'other' or 'us' and 'them' into which they interpellate or hail individuals to provide legitimacy for their own actions (Klotz and Lynch, 2007: 75). Then discursive practices become important since they are a part of the articulation process which aims to make foreign policies more intelligible for the individuals.

As the architect of the TFP in the AKP era, Ahmet Davutoglu is accepted as one of the most important state officials related to the TFP and he has been a part of political Islam movement. He was a prominent thinker of IR within political Islam ideology and wrote articles for Islamist journals and newspapers such as *Aksiyon* and *Yeni Safak*. According to Ozkan (2014), Davutoglu is the first intellectual to devise an Islamist foreign policy based on rational and pragmatic features. His contribution to the Islamic journals and newspapers can describe him as "an Islamist 'organic intellectual' (to use Antonio Gramsci's term)" (Ozkan, 2014: 120). Davutoglu's book '*Strategic Depth*' which was first published in 2001 and sold more than 100.000 copies, formulises a foreign policy strategy compatible with political Islam in the 1990s despite some differences. Then, when discourses of the AKP elites, mostly Davutoglu, are examined, one can define these identities there.

Therefore, this paper aims to find out the identities that influence foreign policies of Turkey and that are aimed to be more intelligible for the individuals in the last decade. For this aim, the paper examines and analyses the discourse in the speeches and writings of the AKP politicians. The paper first gives a brief overview of the history of Political Islam in Turkish politics to understand intersubjective and culturally established meanings related to international politics in political Islam. This will also help us to understand the security imaginary of political Islam. Then, the paper goes on with the security imaginary of the AKP and focus on the politicians from the political Islam ideology, mostly Ahmet Davutoglu. Finally, the paper presents three identities: the leader of the Middle East, the defender of the

oppressed and self-confident Turkey, and argues how they are constructed by the discourses of state officials.

1. Political Islam in Turkish Politics

Political Islam has become a part of the Turkish politics since 1970s when the first Islamist party, National Order Party (*Milli Nizam Partisi*, MNP) was established in 1970 by Necmettin Erbakan. Islamist parties have become a problem for the Kemalist hegemony since then and they have been closed and had to be open again under different names. After the 1971 military intervention, for instance, the MNP was banned by the Constitutional Court and the leader, Erbakan, had to escape to Switzerland (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 131). Another Islamist party, National Salvation Party (*Milli Selamet Partisi*, MSP) was formed in 1972 and Erbakan becomes the leader of this party in 1973, however, it was dissolved again after the 1980 military coup with the other political parties.

The 1980s was a turning point for the political Islam in Turkey as a result of the military coup. The 1980s witnessed increasing re-Islamisation of Turkish politics because the military encouraged the religious revival, saw Islam as a cement against the Communism threat (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 131; Yavuz, 2003: 71; Tugal, 2009: 40). Hoping to create more homogenous society, the military opened new Quranic schools and made religious courses compulsory in primary and high schools. Moreover, this era witnessed the Islamisation of Turkish nationalism. The army wanted to protect Turkish 'soul' from the other cultures and Turkish-Islamic Synthesis was created out of Ottoman, Islamic and Turkish popular culture (Yavuz, 2003: 71). In 1983, the Welfare Party (*Refah Partisi*, RP) was established under the leadership of Erbakan again and according to Hakan Yavuz (2003: 238) "As a vocal and well-organized Islamic movement began to crystallize, the RP took advantage of the new state-led ethnoreligious nationalism to mobilize the masses, using the issues of identity and social justice".

The influence of Political Islam was increased in foreign politics in the beginning of the 1990s when Turkey took an active interest in the Balkans, the Caucasus, the Central Asia and the Middle East. Other conservative politicians such as Turgut Ozal from the Motherland Party (*Anavatan Partisi*, ANAP) or Suleyman Demirel from True Path Party (*Dogru Yol Partisi*, DYP) saw Islam as an opportunity to influence neighbouring regions after the dissolution of the

Soviet Union. For instance, in 1995, then President Demirel said that "Islam is one of the most important bases of our solidarity" to describe Turkey's relations with these regions (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 132). Ozal who was a member of the Islamist MSP, and the leader of the ANAP until he became the president of Turkey in 1989, followed a more active foreign policy in those regions which was interpreted as Neo-Ottomanism by journalists and scholars such as Cengiz Candar.

However, conservative politicians in Turkey still saw the West as an important ally and Islam cannot be an alternative in the first half of the 1990s. The Welfare Party (RP), on the other hand, transformed political Islam to an ideology that could challenge the Kemalist ideology which sees the West as a target to reach in the civilizational level (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 132). The RP won 29 cities including Istanbul and Ankara in the 1994 local elections and was the first party with 21% in 1995 general elections. As a result of this success the RP became a part of the coalition government and for the first time in Turkish politics, an Islamist leader, Necmettin Erbakan became the Prime Minister of Turkey.

During this coalition, the TFP showed characteristics of political Islam. For instance, Erbakan's first meeting was with the leader of Muslim Brotherhood, the son of the founder of the organisation, Hasan al-Banna (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 135; Yavuz, 2003: 243). The first official visit of Erbakan was to Iran to make a $23 million gas and oil deal (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 135; Yavuz, 2003: 243). During his term, Erbakan visited Muslim countries such as Libya, Malaysia, Iran and Indonesia to raise Turkish profile with the Islamic countries; initiated D-8 (Developing Eight) project between Turkey, Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia, Nigeria and Pakistan aiming cooperation between member states in economic terms; and the Turkish delegation was asked to vote against a UN resolution which would condemn Iran for its human rights violations along with North Korea, China, Cuba and Libya (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 135-136). These developments can be interpreted as the continuation of the Neo-Ottomanist policies of the previous conservative governments. Moreover, since there were policies such as Islamic unity, it can also be said that the TFP of the RP era shows characteristics of Pan-Islamism.

In this era, the other coalition partner was Tansu Ciller, the leader of the DYP who was the Minister of Foreign Affairs and believed that Turkey should be in the Western camp rather than the Middle East. This identity crisis between the coalition powers prevents to say that

political Islam was the main identity in the TFP at that era. Ultimately, while Erbakan was opening Turkey to the East, Ciller was visiting European leaders and countries to confirm Turkey's Western identity and leading to identity crisis in the TFP (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 135). The founder members of the AKP such as Recep Tayyip Erdogan and Abdullah Gul were among the RP cadres in the 1980s and 1990s. After the military intervention in 1997, The RP was banned and the leader Erbakan had to put his political career behind. After the intervention, while the "traditionalist" cadres established the Felicity Party (*Saadet Partisi*, SP), the 'moderate' cadres who questioning the leadership of traditionalist and political style founded the AKP. Ahmet Davutoglu was an intellectual and academic of IR during all this developments and was very popular among Islamist camp due to his articles. For instance, after academic article that criticising the End of History thesis of Fukuyama and the Clash of Civilisations thesis of Huntington was published in 1994, he was invited to a program at *Kanal 7*, an Islamic channel, presented by Nabi Avci, Minister of National Education between 2013 and 2016. Davutoglu also contributed debates on the TFP throughout the 1990s with the articles in Islamist journals and newspapers. After the AKP came into power, he served as the Chief Advisor to the Prime Minister and stayed at this position until he became the Minister of Foreign Affairs in 2009. Then, it is possible to argue that Davutoglu was an 'organic intellectual' of Political Islam during the 1990s and his ideas shaped and were shaped by the political Islam ideology. Since his book *Strategic Depth* is a guidance for the TFP of the AKP era, his ideas are crucial for this research. However, since Constructivism believe that in foreign policy analysis intersubjective understandings are more important than the individuals while I analyse Davutoglu's ideas I will also investigate the speeches of the cadres of the Welfare Party (RP) to show that Davutoglu is a part of the social-cognitive structure of political Islam ideology. Thus, security imaginary of the AKP will emerge and provide us identities of the TFP.

2. Security Imaginary of the AKP

In this part, firstly I will describe Davutoglu's ideas and give examples of other political Islamist officials to show the security imaginary of the AKP. According to Davutoglu, the end of the Cold War improves Turkey's ability to become more active in the neighbouring regions and once again appear as an actor on the stage of history. He believes that Turkey is the "product of a historical [Ottoman] heritage which had been formed as the result of an intensive and

centuries-long struggle against the prevailing [Western] civilisation, which constituted the international system" (Davutoglu, 2001: 66 in Ozkan, 2014: 123). Turkey is not an ordinary nation-state in the periphery of the Western civilisation because "it is the centre of [Ottoman] civilisation, which had established on original and long-lasting political order" (Ozkan, 2014: 123). Therefore, according to Davutoglu, Turkey needs to find its potential.

Geopolitics constitutes an important part of Davutoglu's ideas. According to him, geography is one of the constant parameters along with history, culture and population that determines power of one country (Davutoglu, 2001: 17; Murinson, 2006: 951; Walker, 2007: 32; Davutoglu, 2008: 79; Davutoglu, 2009: 12; Kardas, 2010: 124; Yanik, 2011: 1; Yalvac, 2012: 169; Ozkan, 2014). He states in his book *Strategic Depth* that in the Cold War era Turkey's geopolitical position has been used by Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) to keep the *status-quo*. However, in the post-Cold War era, geopolitical position of Turkey should be seen as a dynamic tool to open Turkey to the world gradually and to transform Turkey's regional activity into global activity by using political, economic and security ties with the neighbouring regions. He claims that if Turkey continues to use status-quo politics, it not only fails to become a global player, but also it will protect its current borders (Davutoglu, 2001: 117). This new approach to the geopolitics that targets to strengthen the economic, political, and cultural ties with the neighbouring regions would affect Turkey's international parameters in the long term (Davutoglu, 2001: 118). Moreover, he suggest that Turkey should gradually expand its activity in these regions with this line: 1. The Balkans, the Middle East and the Caucasus 2. The Black Sea, the Adriatic Sea, the Eastern Mediterranean, the Gulf and the Red Sea 3. Europe, North Africa, South Asia, and Central and Eastern Asia.

This approach, in fact, is not new for the TFP. Since the beginning of the 1990s, political figures had used similar discourses. Right wing politicians Turgut Ozal and Suleyman Demirel, for instance, used the phrase 'From the Adriatic to the Chinese Wall' to describe Turkey as a new regional actor that intends to increase her influence from the Balkans to the Caucasus and the Central Asia (Kohen, 1993: 39). Another example is that, after Turkey was not accepted as a member of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1989, Ismail Cem, a member of the Kemalist CHP and the Minister of Foreign Affairs between 1997 and 2002, said in 1990 that "What should Turkey do? Turkey can be an important power in the Middle East. There are 1 billion people in the world who share the same customs and religion with us. But Turkey

has one more unique aspect: it is secular and democratic. We should defend this model and use it as a foreign policy weapon" (Bozdaglioglu, 2005:99) and in 1998, he also said: "Turkey can undertake a different mission in the changing world. Instead of being in the periphery country, it can gain a position in the core" (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 105). In 1998, former Minister of Foreign Affairs Mumtaz Soysal from the CHP stated that

"This is the most opportune time to rid ourselves of the complex of being considered Europeans…We are Turks from Turkey. Turkey is a country with one bank in Europe and the other in Asia. The same thing can be said of our geography and culture. We must realize and accept this as such and we must turn this embarrassment into a sense of superiority" (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 104).

However, although the secularists see Turkey's potential to become a regional power from a secularist-nationalist perspective, political Islamists approach this from a different perspective connoting the Ottoman era. When we look at the conservative and political Islamist parties the religion, Islam, becomes prominent. For instance, Turgut Ozal states that

"When we look at this geopolitical space from the Adriatic Sea to Central Asia under the leadership of Turkey, we realize that this space is molded and dominated by Ottoman-Muslim and Turkic population . . . The Ottoman-Muslim population shares the same historical legacy and fate as the Turks of Anatolia and they still regard themselves as "Turk" in the religio-cultural sense. These groups live in Bosnia, Albania, Kosovo, Macedonia and Western Trace" (Yavuz, 1998: 24)

Abdullah Gul who formulated the Welfare Party's foreign policy strategies in the 1990s said:

Turkey is neither Luxembourg nor Bangladesh. History, geography and reality require Turkey to carry and fulfill a mission regardless of our desires. This mission or role may be the role of the Ottoman Empire. We therefore cannot remain indifferent to the developments in Palestine, Yugoslavia, and Albania due to our national interest… [Turkey is] the cultural center of Islamic civilization in Europe. We [Turkey] therefore have to involve ourselves in the developments in the Balkans. (Yavuz, 2003: 236).

Thus, the idea of becoming a regional power has started in the post-Cold War era and all ideologies in Turkey either the Kemalists, the conservatives or political Islamists grab and formulise it from different perspectives. In this era, two developments are important to understand the emergence of this idea: the first one is the rejection of Turkey's submission for EEC and the second one is the collapse of the Soviet Union. While the former forces Turkey

to decide new aims, the latter gives Turkey opportunity to increase its influence in neighbouring regions. Then, what does differentiate the ideas of Davutoglu and political Islam from the political atmosphere of the 1990s? This can be explained in two: first, he is ideologically against the Western civilisation. Second, he emphasises on the domestic sphere if Turkey aims to be a regional power.

Then first, the ideology of Davutoglu and political Islam should be examined. In his writings, Davutoglu criticises Kemalist hegemony by saying that it was an utopian project which aims a civilisation change and ignores its history, cultural, political and social forces in the society and stating that "the Turkish experience in this century proved that an imposed civilizational refusal, adaptation, and change… cannot be successful" (Cornell, 2012: 20). He thinks the Western civilisation is in a deep crisis and he argues in his book, *Civilizational Transformation*, that in the end of the Cold War, capitalism did not win; it will be collapsed as communism did since they had the same philosophical background (Cornell, 2012: 20). Therefore, Western civilisation should be an undesirable system for Turkey.

In the article of Behlul Ozkan (2014: 134), Davutoglu's ideas about Western models are stated as this:

> "Davutoglu argues that unity among the peoples and governments of the Middle East can only be achieved if political regimes derive their legitimacy from Islam. He believes that the Western model, whose legitimacy comes from elections, parliament and other representative institutions and mechanisms, is inadequate for the Islamic world. Indeed, according to Davutoglu, 'the West has turned into a civilisation with a merely mechanical supremacy'. He argues that 'humanism, which is claimed to be the source of Western civilisation, is nothing but a delusion', and that Western democracies are dangerous because they lack religious values to keep them in check".

In addition to this, Davutoglu makes some assumption in the 1990s about the Western leaders during the Bosnian War. He states that not only the regional contradictions will spread the Bosnian crisis to the entire Balkans, but also "inhuman understanding pervaded into the heads and souls of the Western leaders who have claims to establish a world order. Until the Western mentality which sees some people more superior and more equal than the others is not be reformed and overcomes this moral crisis, there would be no end for this tragedies

[Bosnian crisis]"[2]. As it is seen in this example, the language of Davutoglu against the West is very firm. In his other articles, he uses a language such as "Catholic Spanish barbarians"[3], "Christian terrorism and fundamentalism"[4] and "European fascism"[5] (in Bosnian War). On the other hand, he defines Muslim combatants in the Bosnian War as "the leader[s] of the jihad" and the combatants in Chechnya fought against "the attacks coming from the barbaric Russian steppes" (Ozkan, 2014: 127). Thus, in the West-East conflicts it can be said that while the West is described in derogatory language, Muslims as their counterparts, has been described in elevated language since he is also a member of the school of political Islam.

When we investigate the political Islam movement in the 1990s, it can be seen that the cadres of the Welfare Party also made statements about the West and the Western institutions. The leader of the party, Erbakan for instance, stated: "Turkey should cooperate with Muslim countries through which she can realize the goal of being a leader, instead of being a servant in the EU… To become a member in the EU by leaving the Community of Muslim countries means to lose the very essence of our identity and to accept a 'Second Sevres.'" (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 135). He also argued that "the reason for the lack of solidarity among Muslim nations is the Western mentality of Turkish administrators. They [Muslim countries] need Turkey's leadership. Turkish leaders, instead of trying to assume such a leadership role and thus serving the 'Just Order,' choose to serve imperialism and Zionism" (Bozdaglioglu, 2003: 135).

In his writings, Davutoglu compares the politics of the Sultan Abdulhamid II and the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) in the late 19th century. During this era while the CUP members believed that the best interests of the Empire lies in the West, the Sultan Abdulhamid II sought to unify Muslim communities internally and externally by using Caliphate as a tool (Deringil, 1991; Ahmad, 1993; Mardin, 2005). According to Davutoglu when the politics of the CUP and Abdulhamid II are compared, the Sultan's politics is more superior in terms of seeking alliances in the neighbouring regions than the CUP's strategies which caused the Empire to lose the Rumelia with the Balkan Wars and the Middle East with the First World War[6]. He believes that

---

[2] http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/yazarlar/bati-dunyasindaki-deger-taktik-celiskileri-ve-balkanlar_500835
[3] http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/yazarlar/sabit-ve-ufuk-cografyalan-acisindan-turkiye_501689
[4] http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/yazarlar/nato-mudahalesinin-arka-plani-ve-bosnanin-gelecegi_500991
[5] http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/yazarlar/islam-dunyasindaki-yapici-siyasa-eksikligi-ve-sonuclari_501346
[6] http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/yazarlar/daralan-bolgesel-kiskac-ve-turk-dis-politikasi_501590

> "Islamist politics of Abdulhamid II gives the Ottoman Empire possibility to exercise power more than its potential within its borders. One of the best example of this politics is the effort to balance the pressure of the British Empire over the Ottoman Empire by creating Caliphate-centred influence areas in Islamic countries such as India and Sudan colonised by the British Empire. In this way, on the one hand, the borders of the Ottoman Empire are protected by the cross-border influence areas, on the other hand, radius of action is procured by increasing diplomatic means that will be used by foreign policy maker."[7]

In the same article, Davutoglu states that with the end of the Cold War, a dynamic conjuncture emerges and Turkey should follow a not only stable but also a flexible strategy in the region. For instance, while Turkey was following a strategy as Abdulhamid II in the Ozal era, it should not have made an agreement with Israel which caused Turkish-Arab tension. Then, it can be said that as a political Islamist Davutoglu puts emphasis on Islam as a unifying strategy of the Ottoman Empire against the Western powers, and he believes the post-Cold War international system gives Turkey an opportunity to follow a similar politics as in the late 19th century. This politics, however, can only be implemented if there is a stable and flexible foreign policy strategies.

Moreover, in Ozkan's article Davutoglu is dubbed as a Pan-Islamist. Ozkan states:

> "Bosnia and Albania should be regarded as 'natural allies of Turkey', and the Muslim population of the Balkans are the 'most important elements of Turkey's Balkan policy'. Characterising Bosnia-Herzegovina as a 'political, economic, and cultural outpost of Turkey in Central Europe', Davutoglu boldly defines the societies of Bosnia and Albania as 'the remnants of the Ottoman Empire whose fates are tied to Turkey's regional power and hegemony'. But his pan- Islamism particularly focuses on the Middle East, which he claims has a geopolitical potential that can only be realised by ending the separation of its nation-states" (Ozkan, 2014: 127).

Yet, this paper believes that Davutoglu is not a Pan-Islamist. During his term in the MFA, he had many references to the Ottoman Empire. For instance, in his speech at the Dicle University in Diyarbakir[8], he said "…look at the the Malabadi Bridge [in Diyarbakir] and the Mostar Bridge [in Bosnia], only then you can feel the shared values beyond our borders. And at that time you will understand the necessity of integration of the Middle East and the

---

[7] http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/yazarlar/turk-dis-politikasinda-alternatif-modeller_501628
[8] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-ahmet-davutoglu_nun-diyarbakir-dicle-universitesinde-verdigi-_buyuk-restorasyon_-kadim_den-kuresellesmeye-yeni.tr.mfa

Balkans, the Caucasia and the North Africa after a period of separation". These references is not only about Muslim communities in the Ottoman Empire, he also mentions on non-Muslim communities which were under the rule of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, if Davutoglu is dubbed as only a Pan-Islamist, the current relations with the non-Muslim countries in the Balkans cannot be explained. According to the Ministry of Economy data, the volume of trade with the Balkan countries was USD 2.9 billion in 2000, and it reached USD 18.4 billion in 2011. The Free Trade Areas with Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia led to ascendancy in the volume of trade and investments between Turkey and those Balkan countries (Bechev, 2012: 143). Turkish companies have invested not only in Muslim countries but also in non-Muslim countries as a part of economic interdependence strategy of Turkey. For instance three Turkish companies have invested in Serbia to build a part of the highway that connects Belgrade to Montenegrin port of Bar (Bugajski, 2012: 4). Tepe-Akfen-Vie (TAV) Airports have a twenty year concession for operating Skopje and Ohrid airports and also have a contract for a new terminal to Zagreb (Bugajski, 2012: 4). Thus, this paper believes that Davutoglu follows policies in accordance with Neo-Ottomanism rather than Pan-Islamism, however, the paper believes Islam, the Middle East and Muslim countries are prioritised.

The second feature that differentiate the AKP's approach from the 1990s political atmosphere in terms of foreign policy is that, Davutoglu believes that there should be a concert between domestic and international politics which differentiates his ideas from the ones in the 1990s. He criticises, for instance, the Neo-Ottomanist policies of Ozal era and the Islamist RP era by saying that they could not be successful because while they had the claim to redefine the relationship between domestic political culture and international position, lack of knowledge, inexperience and theoretically extemporaneousness caused them to fail[9]. Then according to Davutoglu, there should be cooperation between domestic and international politics, in other words, domestic and international identities of Turkey should be in harmony.

Davutoglu also believes that domestic politics constitutes one of the pillars of the Turkish Foreign Policy. In his speech at the 3rd Ambassadors Conference in 2011, he emphasises on public opinion, people of Turkey as the sources of the MFA along with three other sources: the MFA officials, structure of the MFA and coordination between the state institutions. He

---

[9] http://www.yenisafak.com/yazarlar/ahmetdavutoglu/yakin-tarihimizin-ana-akimlari-ve-secim-sonuclari-41555?mobil=true

explains that "people of Turkey expect an assertive, high-scaled state because Turkish nation embraced an assertive country in history and this nation has felt and lived what making a big contribution to the history is throughout different historical eras"[10]. In the same speech he said "…the state on the minds of this nation is powerful and mighty; while it is compassionate, at the same time it is a phenomenon that is never be harmed… For that reason we must integrate with this public. If we cannot tell our feelings and diplomatic goals to Turkish public, we cannot tell to the world. If we cannot have the power of Turkish public, we cannot feel powerful in the world. This public needs this message"[11].

In addition, in Davutoglu's speeches there is also emphasis on a restoration of the public. In his speech in Diyarbakir in 2013 for example he explains this restoration as: "a matter of construction of a new mentality". In this speech he speaks of two levels of restoration. First one is the domestic restoration, "…the restoration of our country in itself. This restoration is very important. First, mentalities, psychologies has to be built again. Over these psychologies, past fears, past drives, past anomies, past provocations must be overcome and a new moral, modesty, mutual respect and, yes, love and conversation must be prevailed. In the last decade, what we totally wanted to do was the rediscovery of this"[12].

Second kind of restoration, according to Davutoglu, is directly related to the identity. He says "about the construction of our identity and the civilizational belonging, we should meet in common grounds without hesitation"[13]. The concept of common history is very crucial at this point. Davutoglu believes that Kemalist governments cut off the ties between the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey. He believes that it was a result of nationalism and it broke off the ties between the peoples of the Balkans, the Caucasia, the Middle East and the Central Asia. In the same speech he says that "No matter what they say, wherever there is someone who has the common history with us, he/she is our kin, is someone with the same fate, at the same time, he/she is a core element of our foreign policy. Describing this, we never distinguish a Turk from a Kurd, an Albanian from and Bosnian"[14]. Davutoglu believes if Turkey can success

---

[10] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-sayin-ahmet-davutoglu_nun-3_-buyukelciler-konferansi_nin-acilisinda-yaptigi-konusma_-03-ocak-2011.tr.mfa
[11] Ibid.
[12] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-ahmet-davutoglu_nun-diyarbakir-dicle-universitesinde-verdigi-_buyuk-restorasyon_-kadim_den-kuresellesmeye-yeni.tr.mfa
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.

in this restoration, it will cause a domino effect and lead to restorations in the other regions. Consequently, with this common history, "peoples in other regions will find a place under the plane tree[15] which has been formed by identities of Turks, Kurds, and the other Anatolian peoples"[16]. In the speech, Davutoglu does not say how to do this identity construction. Yet, it is important to think that there is a project that aims to create a new identity based on common history, in other words Neo-Ottomanist policies.

Then, affected by the Neo-Ottomanist ideas of the 1990s and the Islamist ideology, Davutoglu uses geography, history and culture in defining the security imaginary of Turkey. His ideas shows that Turkey should follow an active foreign policy embracing the neighbouring countries. Turkey is in the leader position in this imaginary and she has responsibilities and duties for peoples in the neighbouring regions because of the common history dated back to the Ottoman era. This imaginary shows similarities between the Neo-Ottomanist understandings in the 1990s and the TFP during the AKP era. For instance, zero-problem policy and economic interdependence with the neighbour countries can be evaluated by this concept. However, in the AKP era, this imaginary becomes more prominent than the 1990s because while in the 1990s, there was not a political environment to implement this kind of policy because of political instabilities and economic reasons, since 2002, the AKP has the control of the government and this gives opportunity to establish new identities in under the name of 'restoration'. These identities related to international politics will be examined in the next section.

3. The identities created by the AKP

In this section I will explain which identities are brought by the AKP for international politics of Turkey. I examine in three headings: the leader of the Middle East, the defender of the oppressed in the Middle East and self-confident Turkey. These identities are the products of the security imaginary of the AKP which is explained in the previous section. In order to understand these identities I address to the speeches of Davutoglu and Erdogan.

a. The leader of the Middle East

---

[15] Plane Tree, here, is representing the Ottoman Empire. According to a narrative, the founder of the Ottoman Empire, Osman Bey who had a dream a long-lived and glorious plane tree that grows in his chest, representing the Ottoman Empire.
[16] Ibid.

Being a leadership gives warrants for action in many situations. In her book, *Constructing National Interests: The United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Jutta Weldes (1999: 199-201) claims that the leadership position of the US and attendant responsibilities and obligations have been taken for granted by US foreign policy officials such as president Harry S. Truman. She suggests that the representation of the US as a world leader leads consequences for US identity. First, she states that this representation provides the US a warrant for action because a leader is expected to act, not to remain passive or hesitate. Second, leadership position grants a leader "the right to moral leadership, the right to set the standards against which threats and appropriate policy responses are measured" because a leader is capable of determining when action is required and suggesting the right action (Weldes, 1999: 200). Third, according to Weldes, a leader is obligated to do so. That is, it is not only about rights, it is also about obligations and duties. She explains this as follows: "Just as the 'white man's burden had imposed upon the British the obligation to bring Anglo-Saxon civilization to the backward and often barbaric 'natives' residing within its empire, so global leadership conferred upon the U.S. the burden of preserving and promoting freedom, democracy, and order" (Weldes, 1999: 200). Fourth, decisions and actions of a leader are in part altruistically rather than for its own gain. There is a cost of being a leader.

These representations can also be found in Turkish state identity in the AKP era. Turkey and Recep Tayyip Erdogan are introduced as the leader of the Middle East and one of the leaders of the world by the state officials or the others such as academics and columnists. For instance, Ahmed Davutoglu stated in one of his speech in the parliament "There is a new Middle East and we will be its owner, leader and servant…Irrespective what others say, the new order's leader and spokesperson will be Turkey." (Barkey, 2012: 4). After Erdogan returned from the World Economic Forum in Davos which is held in 2009 and where Erdogan stormed out a debate about Gaza, thousands of people greeted him at the airport holding 'a new world leader' signs[17]. In his victory speech after the parliamentary elections in 2011 (known as 'balcony speech'), then PM Erdogan said "…today, Sarajevo won inasmuch as Istanbul; Beirut won inasmuch as Izmir; Damascus won inasmuch as Ankara; Ramallah, Nablus, Jenin, West Bank, Jerusalem and Gaza won inasmuch as Diyarbakir" (Oran, 2013: 197). This speech can be interpreted as he believes he is not only the leader of Turkey but

---

[17] http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/davos/7859815.stm

also he is the leader of the neighbouring regions. Then, it can be argued that there is a leadership identity within the AKP officials.

Moreover, the leadership identity is in accordance with the foreign policy imaginary of Davutoglu. As stated in the previous section, he believes Turkey should follow a pro-active diplomacy in the neighbouring regions where historically and geographically the Ottoman Empire had his hegemony. When we apply the representations of the leadership to the TFP and the security imaginary of Davutoglu, it can be seen that the leadership identity of Turkey is constituting a very important part of the TFP. I explain this with the same four points of Weldes I mentioned above.

Firstly, according to this identity it should give Turkey a warrant for action for the issues related to the neighbouring regions. When we look at the TFP during the AKP era, we see that Turkey takes part in the conflicts of the Middle East. For instance, after the Arab Spring, Turkey supported the Muslim Brotherhood Parties in Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Syria, Iraq; and that is interpreted as intervening to internal affairs of these countries. Ziya Onis (2012: 54) states that while Turkey sought to play a leadership role indirectly by supporting the Muslim Brotherhood parties, she played that role directly in Syria by using confrontational attitude towards the Assad regime. Moreover, Turkey actively supports Sunni opposition groups against the Assad regime by providing a safe passage to material support -arms and funds- of Saudi Arabia[18]. Also, Turkey provides help to the Free Syrian Army which explicitly use a Turkish address and Turkish GSM number in their contact section of the website[19]. Then, Turkey's leadership identity gives Turkey warrants for action, intervention to the politics of the Middle East after the Arab Spring.

Secondly, it can be seen that the AKP acts as a moral leader in the Middle East, especially in the cases of Egypt coup and Syrian civil war. For instance, after the coup in 2013 against the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, Erdogan condemns then General and later President Abdel Fattah al-Sisi for state terrorism by saying that "The Al-Fath Mosque is under siege. People's place of worship is innocent. They have burned, destroyed our mosques in Syria and in Egypt.

---

[18] http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/syria-crisis-turkey-and-saudi-arabia-shock-western-countries-by-supporting-anti-assad-jihadists-10242747.html
[19] http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/main-base-in-turkey-says-rebel-free-syrian-army.aspx?pageID=238&nID=28967&NewsCatID=338

Either Bashar or Sisi, there is no difference between them. There is no salvation with oppression"[20] and called Sisi tyrant and illegitimate leader because he came to power with force rather than democratic ways. Davutoglu states that "As a universal principle, we have supported the democracy demands based upon protection of the honour of humanity, principles of the state of law and open and transparent elections of fellow peoples in the Middle East. These demands are supported by our countries and we will continue to support whoever demands us to do" and added peace will come to the Middle East with regimes reconciled with their people.[21] These examples can be multiplied with the Syrian case. Then, as the moral leader of the Middle East, Turkey, or Erdogan, believes that democracy, or elections, should be an important part of the Middle East.

Thirdly, Turkey feels that she has to interfere the politics of the neighbouring regions since she is the leader of these regions where are dominated by the Ottoman Empire. As stated above, Turkey has common history, culture and geography with these regions, for this reason, she cannot remain unresponsive to the issues especially related to people, or 'our brothers and sisters'. Turkey has an obligation, duty and responsibility for these people. Davutoglu explains that

> "…Turkey is in the centre of a geography where all cultural crisis emerge. We as a country which is in the influence area of all these crisis; in the centre of Afro-Eurasia, has lands in Asia and as well as in Europe, is neighbour to Africa, has direct connections with the Balkans, the Middle East, the Caucasia, the Black Sea, the Mediterranean, the Caspian Sea, the Gulf, we have a responsibility to be a main actor who produce right answers to all these crisis. We have a position that produce vision to global crisis, not only produce answers. Again in all geography we are in a situation that take historical responsibility."[22]

Lastly, the decisions of Turkey in the region, not all but in part, are altruistically rather than for her gain. For the Syria case, Davutoglu explains this altruism as "…we place importance on a stable transformation. Of course, our hope, aim is that our Syrian brothers would live together in peace, in tranquillity in their villages and cities, and would be hopeful for the

---

[20] http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/egypt-committing-state-terrorism-al-sisi-and-al-assad-are-same-turkish-pm.aspx?pageID=238&nID=52723&NewsCatID=338
[21] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-davutoglu-misirda-yasanan-son-gelismeleri-degerlendirdi.tr.mfa
[22] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/sayin-bakanimizin-2009-degerlendirme-toplantisi_-31-aralik-2009_-ankara.tr.mfa

future. Turkey will spare no sacrifice for this"[23]. In this sense, the refugee crisis can be evaluated within this altruistic leadership identity. Turkey is the leader in the Middle East and she has to open her borders to the refugee brothers who are escaping a dangerous undemocratic regime. Turkey has to provide shelter for those needed not because of her own gain bur for the needs of her brothers, her 'kin'. Erdogan also said in his speech in the parliament: "Are we to close our doors on our brothers and say 'You can die in Syria'? Can we say this? I ask you, do we have a right to do this?"[24]. Turkey, then, has to open her borders to the refugees as a leader of the region without any gain for herself. When the cost of the refugees is investigated, Deputy Prime Minister Numan Kurtulmus announces that Turkey has spent $7.6 billion caring for 2.2 million Syrians so far[25].

These components of leadership identity makes Turkey interfere more into the regional affairs. Since it is a part of new Neo-Ottoman imaginary of Davutoglu and other AKP officials, this identity has become a constitutive part of the TFP during the AKP era and legitimise the policies of the AKP for the politicians sharing the values of political Islam ideology. According to a research conducted by TESEV, in 2011, %71 of the participants from Egypt, Syria, Libya and the Gulf countries believe that Turkey should play a larger role. However, this percentage drops to %66 in 2012 and %60 in 2013 (Akgun and Gundogar, 2013: 21). According to another research conducted by TESEV in 2011, almost %75 of the participants believes that Turkey can be a model for the Middle East. Again %75 of the participants believe that Turkey should play an intermediary role in Israel-Palestine conflict (Seufert, 2011: 4). Consequently, with these results, it can be argued that the leadership identity becomes intelligible for Turkish and the Middle Eastern peoples.

b. The Defender of the Oppressed in the Middle East

In the discourse of the AKP cadres, it can be seen that Turkey takes always side with the weaker and oppressed (*mazlum* in Turkish and Arabic). This identity makes Turkey right in her policies on Israel and the authoritarian regimes in the Middle East. When the speeches of the AKP leaders are investigated it can be seen that these policies are constructed as Turkey is

---

[23] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/sayin-bakanimizin-hatay_da-gerceklestirdigi-basin-toplantisi_-15-haziran-2011.tr.mfa

[24] http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/en/originals/2014/04/syrian-refugees-hurt-turkish-economy.html#

[25] http://beta.trtworld.com/turkey/deputy-pm-announces-turkey-spent-76-bln-on-syrian-refugees-8095

supporting 'our' oppressed brothers and sisters against the oppressors (*zalim*). This oppressor/oppressed approach has been used many times. For instance, Davutoglu said in 2014: "We never asked the Syrian refugees that 'are you Sunni or Shia or Nusayri [Alawi]? Are you Arab, Turkish or Kurdish?' we did not ask. Since he/she came to our border, it is a divine duty to protect him/her and as long as we are on this land, on this responsibilities, on this weak shoulders, Allah is the witness, we never abandon the oppressed [*mazlum*] to the oppressor [*zalim*]"[26]. In another speech, he said: "We have always been with the same side with the *oppressed* and against the *oppressor*, and we will continue to do that. No matter how they give us a hard time, no matter what conspiracies they make, Syrian Turkmens, Syrian Arabs, Syrian Kurds, Syrian Muslims, Syrian Christians, Syrian Sunnis, Nusayris, all Syrians should know that we will continue to be in their side with all our capabilities"[27].

Erdogan is using this discourse more frequently than Davutoglu. In 2012, for instance, he legitimise the Egypt policy of Turkey and at the same time, criticise the opposition party by using oppressor/oppressed discourse:

> "Today, the ones who tell us 'do not interfere in Egypt', they do not abstain from supporting to bloody-handed illegitimate regime and from taking a souvenir photo with the leader of this regime. If we had backed the bloody-handed regime in Syria, they would have asked us 'what is your business in Syria? They talk differently in the morning and another in the evening. They are uncomfortable since we are taking side with the *oppressed*, the rightful'. Because they have always taken side with the *oppressors* throughout their history. This main opposition [CHP] took side with Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin. Throughout their history, they have always taken side with blood shedders, the ones who oppress their people. Today they are doing the same. They are backing the *oppressor*, they overlook the *oppressed* against the *oppressor*"[28].

As it can be seen the ubiquitous usage of the oppressed/oppressor and us/them discourse articulate the historical role of Turkey. While Erdogan articulates the opposition party with the oppressors in the Middle East and in the historical context, he creates this identity for the AKP and for Turkey. He criticises Sisi, Assad and the other oppressors in the current context of the Middle East and gathers them with the Kemalist opposition party, Mussolini, Hitler and

---

[26] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-sayin-ahmet-davutoglu_nun-dunya-islam-bilginleri-baris_-itidal-ve-sagduyu-inisiyatifi-toplantisinda-yaptiklari.tr.mfa
[27] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-sayin-ahmet-davutoglu_nun-suriye-turkmen-meclisi-genel-kurul-toplantisinda-yaptiklari-konusma_-9-mayis-2014.tr.mfa
[28] http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/erdogan-zafer-havalimanini-acti-22010262

Stalin at the same group. He says that while *the CHP* was on the same side with dictators, *the AKP* are with the oppressed. Then, he creates the meaning that the Kemalist foreign policies was wrong and we need to be on the same side with the oppressed, the rightful.

There are also other examples of this oppressed/oppressor discourse. In another speech in 2013, he said:

"We will always be in the same side with the *oppressed*. You have seen Baniyas [Syria], you have seen how these children was massacred. Every day, tens of women are massacred and raped in Syria. The ones who say 'Syrian refugees should go back', I wonder how they can look at their neighbour's face... We are not a racist nation, we are not selfish. What makes us a great nation is being at the same side with the *oppressed* in the hard times"[29].

This discourse was used also policies on Turkish-Israeli relations. Erdogan said:

"We have always felt the sorrow of Palestinians and we are a nation that has never stayed silent about injustices and inhuman conducts against them. The situation of Palestine, for us, has always been a symbol of agony of the entire *oppressed* communities. Every bad news coming from Palestine tore our hearts out, every good news relieve us"[30].

Then, it is clear that the discourse of oppressed/oppressor is relevant in many foreign issues within the frame of the TFP. Moreover, it is important to say that this discourse is used with historical references from Turkish history. This leads this identity to articulate with Neo-Ottomanist identity. For example, Erdogan said:

Turkey is a great country which is unable to comprehend by some people. With its history, ancestry and civilisation, Turkey is a great country which will never be silenced. Since 1071, we have defended the rightness [*hakk*] on these lands where our voice and word could reach. We have only defended peace, friendship, brotherhood and solidarity. For a thousand years, we have never allowed one brother to massacre another, one Muslim to massacre another, and we have never let sectarian conflicts to happen. We have always been a negotiator, and have taken side with the *oppressed*. We have always been in a comprehension that promotes peace, reconciles brothers... You see that the Seljuk sultans are against the *oppression* and in the same side with the *oppressed*. Look at the Ottoman world state. You see a comprehension which is integrative, unifying, side with

---

[29] http://www.ntv.com.tr/turkiye/erdogan-altinda-kalmaz-misliyle-odetiriz,Ppr8nPXDT0-rjmVG7Dtdng
[30] http://www.trtturk.com/haber/erdogan-israil-yonetimi-baris-istiyorsa-yasanan-tarihi-degisimi-iyi-degerlendirmeli-19425.html

union of forces and fate partnership; not pillaging, exploiting, blood shedding. You see fleets sent to the *oppression* in Indian peninsula and Aceh, Indonesia…"[31].

In this speech, Erdogan uses many references to the Turkish history and Islam. For instance, the date 1071 is a reference to Battle of Manzikert which is one of the most important battles in Turkish history. After this battle between the Byzantium Empire and the Seljuk Turks, Turkification of the Anatolia region has begun. This knowledge is taught to all people in Turkey and everybody knows it with the explanation of 'The doors of the Anatolia was opened to Turks'. Erdogan articulates this with some Islamic features such as defending rightness, justice (*Hakk*) which also has a religious meaning in Turkey because it is also one of the 99 names of *Allah* or not allowing to sectarian conflicts. According to Erdogan *we*, the Seljuk Turks, the Ottomans and now Turkey under the AKP rule, as Muslim Turks have always promoted peace in these regions and even in the far Muslim lands such as India and Indonesia. However, he does not mention about the Christians or the Jews as others or any non-Turkish and non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire as selves. This approach articulates Turkishness to Islam and creates a Neo-Ottoman identity which gives Turks a duty to stand for oppressed neighbours in the Middle East.

In another speech he said

"When you go to the martyr's cemetery in here [Canakkale], you see all of them in each other's arms. You see people from Skopje, from Bosnia, from Kars, from everywhere. They came and became martyr in this land… these martyr's graveyards tell us our history. They tell us that why we are interested in Palestine so much. Because here, in Canakkale, there are martyrs from Jerusalem. They say to us why we are interested in Syria that much. Because there are martyrs from Damascus, Aleppo in Canakkale. Go to the Syria, there are martyrs of *Mehmetcik* (Turkish soldiers). If they succoured 98 years ago, we will be on the same side with them in their hard times… We have not been in the same photograph frame [with Assad]. We have always been in the same side with the *oppressed*, and we will. Because the Battle of Gallipoli commands us to do so"[32].

Again, here, Erdogan seeks to articulate the Battle of Gallipoli which has a historical importance for Turkish nationalists and gives it an Islamic mission beside a nationalist one. Then, the historical events in Turkish history are articulated with this oppressed/oppressor

---

[31] http://www.milliyet.com.tr/basbakan-erdogan-in-rize-konusmasi/siyaset/detay/1754156/default.htm
[32] http://t24.com.tr/haber/erdogan-guzel-gelismeler-var,225881

discourse for both nationalist and Islamist people in Turkey. His narrative about the important events in Turkish history articulates their meaning to Islamic features and creates a naturalising effect for individuals. Then this identity becomes intelligible for these people.

c. Self-confident Turkey

This identity brought by the AKP represents Turkey as a great, powerful country, not as 'weak' as before and as a player of her own 'game', not of others. As a nation that has self-confidence, this identity creates a representation of Turkey in which Turkey can do anything she wants without hesitation. Therefore, this identity also legitimise Turkey's recent foreign policies in the Middle East. To start with, it is important to state that Davutoglu has a special emphasis on this self-confidence building. In his speeches at the 4th, 5th and 6th Ambassadors Conferences, he speaks about this. At the 4th Ambassadors Conference, in 2011 he said:

> "As diplomats of a country which is in the route of becoming a global power, what should we pay attention to? First, in this route, in this flow of history, the psychological principle that we will never leave is self-confidence. We will trust ourselves, our nation and our state. We will not think whether our power would be sufficient enough. If it is not sufficient, we will create means. For years, decades, our people are humiliated by a feeling of complexness… On their minds there is a perception of an imperialist power that they would not compete. This is sometimes America, and sometimes is Israel… Others set the game, Turkey, at the most, takes its portion from this game. We created the game, dream, imagination, future ideal, vision; we create and we conduct"[33].

In 2013, Davutoglu also says in a speech to university students in Diyarbakir that "we should construct a new self-confidence culture with the pace we get from the history and by using that accumulation" as a part of internal restoration[34]. At the 6th Ambassadors Conference in 2014, he explains that Turkey has been shot by a self-confidence vaccination since 2002[35]. He mentions about this as their biggest success and says "We will not think what the other states would think if we decide to do this or that. Other states will think on what Turkey would make a decision next"[36].

---

[33] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-sn_-ahmet-davutoglu_nun-iv_-buyukelciler-konferansi-acis-konusmasi_-23-aralik-2011.tr.mfa

[34] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-ahmet-davutoglu_nun-diyarbakir-dicle-universitesinde-verdigi-_buyuk-restorasyon_-kadim_den-kuresellesmeye-yeni.tr.mfa

[35] http://www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-sayin-ahmet-davutoglu_nun-altinci-buyukelciler-konferansi-kapsaminda-adana_da-yaptiklari-konusma.tr.mfa

[36] http://www.ntv.com.tr/turkiye/davutoglu-en-buyugu-ozguven-devrimidir,v9G05korBk6uzwy5_4Wckw

Davutoglu also states the necessary of a new self-confident identity for Turkey in his book, *Strategic Depth*. He says:

> "…Turkey is in need of a multilateral strategical regeneration. This strategic regeneration, in the first place, makes essential a new strategical interpretation frame and a new stance of this new frame. In this interpretation process, the primary origin is constructing social psychology with self-confidence. In an era where the world interacts reciprocally, the societies which sustain their self-confidence will constitute the cores of new power centres. On the other hand, the ones that loses their self-confidence and accept of being periphery of the societies will be faced with the danger of strategic disintegration after a psychological downfall" (Davutoglu, 2001: 559).

Thus, it is clear that self-confident Turkey in 21st century is crucial of Davutoglu. According to him, Turkey with a self-confident identity is more independent about her policies in the neighbouring regions. This representation makes Turkey not a 'tongs' of international powers. Rather, Turkey is a self-confident, independent country which can conduct her own policies in neighbouring regions and she is not a part of any game, she is the playmaker.

This representation also creates a self-confident Turkey which 'spoils the games played over Turkey and neighbouring regions'. Erdogan also uses this discourse in many cases. For instance, he said:

> "The ones who intend to play off brothers against each other as Sunni and Shia in the Middle East also wanted to play this game in Turkey. They want to warm up this game from time to time and serve it in Turkey. Thank *Allah* for endless time, Turkey has not been fallen in to this trap of discord despite all these set traps. *Allah* willing, it will never be. Alawis and Sunnis are their sole protectors"[37].

Erdogan also use this discourse for domestic politics. If there is a development against the AKP government this discourse becomes useful. For example, in the corruption scandal which is called 17-25 December process, he explains that: "This dirty game is a game played against great Turkey. This plot is organised against new Turkey. This dirty game is a game against Turkish nation, national will and national sovereignty rather than us, the AK Party"[38].

---

[37] http://t24.com.tr/haber/ortadoguda-kardesleri-sii-ve-sunni-diye-ayirip-bu-kirli-oyunu-turkiyede-de-oynamak-istediler,265146

[38] http://www.aljazeera.com.tr/haber/ininize-girecegiz-didik-didik-edecegiz

This discourse is important because it might be intelligible for different groups in Turkey. Here, 'Sevres syndrome' should be mentioned because it is an important feature for different kind of ideologies. It can be explained as follows:

> "The Sèvres Syndrome is an expression used in international relations to describe the paranoia of the Turkish secular bureaucracy and its politicians. This takes the form of an irrational fear that Western powers are bent on dismantling Turkey visà- vis the abortive Treaty of Sèvres in 1920. This "insecurity complex" has been reinforced by other threats and dangers to Turkey's national security in the intervening years, ranging from Stalin's expansionist statements in the mid-1940s, to Armenian and Syrian irredentism, to the bilateral military cooperation of Greece and Syria, to the invasion of Iraq, and finally, to Turkey's ostracism from the European Union. Going hand-in-hand with this enduring perception of threats from without are threats from within, most notably the Islamists who plot to demolish the secular state, but also the hardline secularists who plot to prevent Islamists from gaining power and popularity. There are also fears that Christian, Kurdish, or Armenian minorities are colluding with foreign powers to divide and destroy the country" (Guida, 2008: 38).

Thus, it is important to indicate that the idea of 'external powers that plan to separate Turkey' has historical roots in Turkish politics. It has roots among the Kemalists, the nationalists, the leftists and the Islamists. Politicians from all ideologies used this discourse from time to time. What the AKP brings as a new approach is that Turkey is self-confident now and Turkey has capability to overcome any plots although there are still 'dirty games' organised by external and internal powers. This identity makes Turkey as an actor that can challenge to plots in her region as well as within her borders. By articulating the domestic threats with international ones, the AKP legitimise its foreign policies in the Middle East. Erdogan, for instance, said: "Today, the game played in Egypt, will be organised in another Muslim county tomorrow. Today, the atrocity displayed in Egypt will be displayed in another country tomorrow. *They* may want to mix up another country, or Turkey. Because *they* do not want a powerful Turkey in this region"[39].

When the polls related Turkey's perceptions about foreign countries are examined, it is seen that Turks do not trust or like no one but themselves. According to a research conducted by

---

[39] http://www.radikal.com.tr/politika/erdogan-yarin-belki-turkiyeyi-karistirmak-isteyecekler-1146605/

Pew Research Center in 2014, Turkey does not have a favourable view for any country or organisation. The research says:

> "But Turkish distaste for foreign powers does not begin and end with the U.S. On balance, around two-thirds or more Turks express unfavorable views of the European Union, China, Brazil, Russia, Iran and Israel. Turks even dislike Saudi Arabia (53% unfavorable and, notably, the highest favorability percentage (26%) among all countries we asked about). The people of Turkey also hold negative views toward NATO specifically (70% dislike the organization). In fact, it is hard to find any country or organization the Turkish people really like, except, of course, Turkey itself. According to our spring 2012 poll, 78% of Turks said they had a favorable view of their country"[40].

Then, it can be said that this identity is also intelligible for the Turks and while it is a part of the common sense it also has the potential to affect the common sense. Moreover, it is important to mention that recently 'New Turkey' discourse helps to construct this identity. The New Turkey discourse is used by the AKP elites to differentiate the AKP era from the previous eras and to create new representations under the name of 'New Turkey'. According to these representations, self-confidence constitutes the psychological basis of 'New Turkey'. In 2014, Davutoglu explains this as the biggest success of the AKP in the last 12 years[41]. Also, after Davutoglu became the prime minister, he started to do a short program in the concept of address to the nation on television under the name of 'On the Way for New Turkey'. By using this discourse, the AKP era is compared with the previous eras in which Turkey was not 'self-confident' enough. By the articulation of self-confident Turkey to the 'New Turkey' this identity becomes the identity of the New Turkey under the AKP rule.

Conclusion

After the AKP established its hegemony in Turkey in the 21st century it is seen that the Turkish Foreign Policy has transformed and Turkey became a country that aims to be a regional power with ambitions of being a leader country. It becomes more responsive to the regional issues, especially in the Middle East. This can be explained by the new identities in the TFP according to Constructivist approach in IR.

---

[40] http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/10/31/the-turkish-people-dont-look-favorably-upon-the-u-s-or-any-other-country-really/

[41] https://www.akparti.org.tr/site/haberler/sayin-davutoglunun-ak-parti-1.-olagustu-buyuk-kurultayinda-yaptigi-konusman/66351#1

Security imaginary of Turkey has also transformed in the 21st century as a part of new ideology. The security imaginary of the political Islamist party, the AKP and especially Ahmet Davutoglu as the architect of the TFP in the AKP era, their ideas and approaches constitute great importance for this transformation. Since the 1990s, the ideas and representations about international politics of conservative and Islamist politicians are very important for the identities that the AKP brought. These identities are products of these intersubjective understandings that constitutes the security imaginary. As a political Islamist, Davutoglu's ideas, representations and imaginary affected by these intersubjective understandings make Turkey more susceptible to the events in the Middle East and Islamic countries.

Out of this imaginary, three identities become important in the AKP era. The elites of the AKP believe that Turkey is the leader and defender of the oppressed in the Middle East. They also believe that Turkey can also prevent 'dirty strategies' of the external actors in the region if she becomes self-confident, because Turkey has sufficient power to do this. These are the identities that legitimise the foreign policies according to the AKP elites and by articulating it successfully to features of the Turkish-Islamic Synthesis, these identities become more intelligible for the individuals in Turkey.

Bibliography

Ahmad, F. (1993), *The Making of Modern Turkey*, Routledge: London

Akgün, M., and Gündoğar, S. S. (2013), 'Ortadoğu'da Türkiye Algısı 2013', *TESEV Dış Politika Programı, TESEV Yayınları*

Barkey, H. (2012), 'The Evolution of Turkish Foreign Policy in the Middle East', *TESEV Foreign Policy Programme*, (July), pp. 1-8

Bechev, D. (2012), 'Turkey in the Balkans: Taking a Broader View', *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14 No.1, pp.131-146

Bozdaglioglu, Y. (2003), *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: a Constructivist Approach*, New York; London: Routledge

Bugajski, J. (2012), 'Turkey's Impact in the Western Balkans', *Atlantic Council*, (February)

Cornell, S. E. (2012), 'What drives Turkish foreign policy?', *Middle East Quarterly*, (Winter), pp. 13-24

Davutoğlu, A. (2001), *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*, 1st Ed., Istanbul: Küre Yayınları

Davutoglu, A. (2008), 'Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007', *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10 No.1, pp.77-96

Davutoğlu, A. (2009), 'Turkish Foreign Policy and the EU in 2010', *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 8 No.3, pp. 11-17

Deringil, S. (1991), 'Legitimacy Structures in the Ottoman State: The Reign of Abdülhamid II (1876–1909)', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 23 No. 03, pp. 345-359

Hopf, T. (2002), *Social construction of international politics: identities & foreign policies*, Moscow, 1955 and 1999, Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Kardas, S. (2010), 'Turkey: redrawing the Middle East map or building sandcastles?', *Middle East Policy*, Vol. 17 No.1, pp. 115-136

Klotz, A., and Lynch, C. (2007), *Strategies for Research in Constructivist International Relations*, Armonk N.Y.: ME Sharpe

Mardin, S. (2005), 'Turkish Islamic exceptionalism yesterday and today: Continuity, rupture and reconstruction in operational codes', *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 145-165

Murinson, A. (2006), 'The strategic depth doctrine of Turkish foreign policy', *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.42 No.6, pp. 945-964

Onis, Z. (2012), 'Turkey and the Arab Spring: between ethics and self-interest', *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 14 No.3, pp. 45-63

Oran, B. (2013), *Turk Dis Politikasi: Kurtulus Savasindan Bugune Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar Cilt III 2001-2012*, Eds., Istanbul: Iletisim

Ozkan, B. (2014), 'Turkey, Davutoglu and the Idea of Pan-Islamism', *Survival*, Vol. 56 No.4, pp. 119-140

Seufert, G. (2011) 'TESEV'in Kamuoyu Arastirmasi Uzerine: Turkiye'de Dis Politika Algisi', *TESEV*, (July)

Tugal, C. (2009), *Passive Revolution: Absorbing the Islamic Challenge to Capitalism*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press

Walker, J. (2007), 'Learning Strategic Depth: Implications of Turkey's New Foreign Policy Doctrine' *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 9 No.3, pp. 32-47

Weldes, J. (1999), *Constructing National Interests: the United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Minneapolis; London: University of Minnesota Press

Yalvac, F. (2012), 'Strategic depth or hegemonic depth? A critical realist analysis of Turkey's position in the world system', *International Relations*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 165-180

Yanik, L. K. (2011), 'Constructing Turkish "exceptionalism": Discourses of liminality and hybridity in post-Cold War Turkish foreign policy', *Political Geography*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 80-89

Yavuz, M. H. (1998), 'Turkish identity and foreign policy in flux: The rise of Neo-Ottomanism' *Critique: Journal for Critical Studies of the Middle East*, Vol. 7 No. 12, pp. 19-41

Yavuz, M. H. (2003), *Islamic Political Identity in Turkey*, New York: Oxford University Press