Dissertations and Theses   City College of New York

2012

Does Democratic Peace Theory Apply to Small Powers? A Case Study of Turkey and Israel

Robert Lattin
CUNY City College

Does Democratic Peace Theory Apply to Small Powers?
A Case Study of Turkey and Israel

Robert Lattin

May 2012

Master's Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of International Affairs at the City
College of New York

Advisor: Professor Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner

Abstract

This thesis hypothesizes that shared democratic values and institutional constraints, proposed as explanations by Democratic Peace Theory (DPT), should in theory prevent small powers from engaging in physical conflict. However, because these democracies are small and developing, these constraints may not influence outcomes in the same way as they do in larger and more developed powers. To test this hypothesis, a dyadic case study was conducted of the relationship between Turkey and Israel. Specific focus was given to two related events, both of which could have resulted in a physical conflict between the two countries: the May 2010 Flotilla incident and the release of the United Nations Palmer Report. The study concluded that DPT can be said to have limited applicability to small democratic powers, as issues such as balance of power, self-interest and country size appear to play a larger role in determining outcomes even when two states share some democratic norms.

Chapter 1- Case Study Design and Theoretical Frameworks

Introduction

One of the most debated subjects within the international relations community is the effect democracy has on a country's decision to go to war. Understanding how democracy contributes to peace or war is a particularly important topic given recent US history of building foreign policies around what is called the "Democratic Peace Theory" (DPT). In his 2004 State of the Union address, President George W. Bush stated: "America is a nation with a mission - and that mission comes from our most basic

beliefs…Our aim is a democratic peace..."[1] This quote suggests that if all countries are

democracies, then war will cease to exist, because democracies do not fight one another.

Most of the literature on DPT is focused on relations between larger powers such

as the United States and the major European nations. There has been limited research on

small powers. Yet, today the United States, the dominant superpower over the last 20

years, is seeing a decline in its relative power. States such as Brazil, India, and China are

on the rise. With the world in transition, and with the rise of social movements around

the world, the importance of having a deeper understanding of how DPT relates to small

powers is apparent. General theories of DPT should be re-considered and re-tested with

small powers as a focus.

This thesis will explore whether DPT provides an adequate explanation for the

behavior of small democratic powers during times of potential physical conflict. It will

use the relationship between Turkey and Israel as its context, giving specific focus to two

events which brought the two into conflict, though not war. The study will begin with an

elaboration of DPT, and my research design. This will be followed by a brief history of

Turkish-Israeli relations, and an analysis of the two pertinent events.

Design

My hypothesis is that shared democratic values and institutional constraints,

proposed as explanations by DPT, should in theory prevent small powers from engaging

in physical conflict. However, because these democracies are small and developing,

these constraints may not influence outcomes in the same way as they do in larger and

---

[1] "Text of President Bush's 2004 State of the Union Address."*Washington Post*. Jan. 20, 2004.
        http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/transcripts/bushtext_012004.html

more developed powers. I will test the hypothesis by conducting a dyadic case study of the Turkish-Israeli relationship. This relationship was chosen because both countries are dynamic democracies with capable armies and legitimate security concerns. These criteria are the basic elements of DPT. Countries with pressing military security concerns are more conflict prone, both militarily and politically. Thus, they are ideal for such a case study.

The case study will explore two related events between Turkey and Israel which could have potentially led to physical conflict. The first is the Gaza Flotilla incident. In May 2010 a flotilla of ships led by Turkish citizens attempted to breach the Israeli blockade of the Gaza Strip, but was met by the Israeli navy. Eight Turkish nationals were killed during the conflict that ensued following the boarding by Israeli commandos of one of the ships. The second event that will be explored is the release of the United Nations (UN) Palmer Report, which was an international investigation into the circumstances surrounding the Flotilla incident. In both situations war seemed a possibility between Turkey and Israel. This study will explore whether DPT played a role not just in averting war between the two states, but also in reducing the level of hostility and escalation during the crisis.

Contextual Theories and Clarifications

Power

In discussing DPT in the context of "small powers," it is relevant to explain what power is. Realists tend to characterize power in terms of control of material resources with a major emphasis on military might. Liberals and constructivists, however, include

factors beyond military capacity, including economic and cultural "power." Great powers, which have more military, economic, political, and perhaps cultural, resources, are understood to be able to influence the global political environment far more than small powers like Turkey and Israel, which can be characterized as regional powers. These have the ability to affect their respective regions, but their global influence is limited.

Small powers may not be capable on all dimensions of power. However, they can stay influential in their respective regions by relying more heavily on one defining characteristic. For example, North Korea's military capabilities are relatively strong, but its economy is very weak. On the other hand, the United Arab Emirates has a strong oil-based economy, but it only has a standing army of 64,000 people.[2] These countries are important for one reason or another in their regions, but they lack the ability to influence the international system.

Democracy

For a full understanding of this case study, an examination of democratic theory is necessary. I will briefly review ancient Greek democracy, Jean-Jacques Rousseau's participatory democracy, Robert Dahl's pluralist democracy, Milton Friedman's protectionist democracy, and Joseph Schumpeter's performance democracy.

Democracy's roots stem from ancient Greece, where the Athenians set up a system of representation under which the state was subject to "the rule of the people." Athenian society, however, was not a democracy by today's standards. There were over

---

[2] "Background Note: United Arab Emirates," *U.S. Department of Defense*, Dec. 29, 2011, Accessed, May 10, 2012, http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5444.htm.

10,000 resident foreigners and 150,000 slaves who were not entitled to representation. Only men 18 years of age whose parents were Athenians could participate in the democratic process.[3] Today's systems of democracy have since been altered to include certain defining characteristics such as universal suffrage and choosing representatives through free and fair elections.[4]

Shifting to more modern forms of democracy, participatory theory proposes that "participation produces popular control of the issue-agenda, decision making, and implementation" of policies in a democracy.[5] According to the theory, not only does participation lead to public control but it also has an educative influence that develops and sustains public participation. The theory's origins can be found in the works of Rousseau and J.S. Mill.

For Rousseau, participation leads to popular control of the main political bodies, because participation involves each member in the equal sharing of benefits and burdens. Participation is crucial to a just society because it involves every member in deciding his or her own best interest, and because it connects that interest to wider public interest.[6] Justice results because free men force themselves to follow the self-prescribed laws, which affect everyone equally. This process merges the public and private interests as well as educates citizens and provides them with the personal resources and inspiration to continually participate. For Mill, participation fulfills a protective and educative function that leads to the development of involved, other-regarding citizens. Similar to Rousseau,

---

[3] "Ancient Greek Democracy," *The History Channel*, Accessed April 16, 2012,
        http://www.history.com/topics/ancient-greece-democracy
[4] "Ancient Greek Democracy."
[5] Joel D. Wolfe, "A Defense of Participatory Democracy," *The Review of Politics*, 47.3 (Jul. 1985): 371.
[6] Ibid, 371.

Mill concludes that other-regarding behavior is formed by political institutions that facilitate participation, and, in turn, that participatory institutions are self-sustaining.[7]

Pluralist democracy focuses on the location of power within society. Robert Dahl has led the way in pluralism theory. He focused mostly on the American political system, most notably in his book Who Governs?, in which he provides a case study of the power structures of the city of New Haven, Connecticut. He determines that power is spread out through various groups in society and that no one ruling elite can control everything. Industrialization has advanced democracy and produced "a pattern of dispersed rather than cumulative inequalities" and every group "has access to some resources that it can exploit to gain influence," wrote Dahl.[8]

While Dahl was a proponent of pluralism democracy, he did not believe that it was the ideal form of democracy. His ideal form, he stated, was not conceivable in the real world. He wrote that the ideal objectives of democracy were popular sovereignty, political equality, and majority rule.[9] He specified eight institutional guarantees within the three dimensions of competition, participation, and civil liberties that would be necessary to maximize attainment of the three objectives.

Claude Burtenshaw states that pluralist democracies give particular attention and consideration to four specific things. First, that there should be no significant concentration of power anywhere. Second, that there are slack resources everywhere, which means no one is necessarily at a disadvantage: the opportunity to assume a position

---

[7] Ibid, 371-372.
[8] Robert Dahl, "Equality and Power in American Society," in William V. D'Antonio and Howard J. Ehrlich (eds.), *Power and Democracy in America* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961): 89.
[9] Richard W. Krouse, "Polyarchy & Participation: The Changing Democratic Theory of Robert Dahl," *Polity*, 14.2., (Spring 1982): 442-443.

of leadership is accessible to anyone. Third, leaders have an incentive to do the bidding

of their constituents causing them to reflect on popular consensus. And fourth, that a

group of people who may feel persecuted will be stimulated to take advantage of

resources, and thus system tends to be "self-correcting."[10]

Protectionist democracy puts an emphasis on the government's role as a protector

of law. In his book Capitalism and Freedom, Milton Friedman analogizes the role of

government in society to that of an umpire in a game.   Like an umpire, the government's

basic roles in a free society are "to provide a means whereby we can modify the rules, to

mediate differences among us on the meaning of the rules, and to enforce compliance

with the rules on the part of those few who would otherwise not play the game."[11] For

Friedman, democratic governments are there for the purpose of creating and enforcing

law, specifically laws which affect a person's individual rights in the economic, property,

and goods and services spheres.

Freidrich Hayek, another protectionist democracy theorist, further emphasized the

government's duty to legally protect public goods and services. As noted by Radnitzky,

Hayek theorizes that the government should be expected "to enforce the rules of 'just'

conduct such as protection, security of property, etc….to render additional 'highly

desirable' services. Hayek considered such government service to be compatible with

'liberal' principles so long as the 'wants satisfied are collective wants of the community

as a whole."[12] In this definition of the role of the state, Radnitzky adds, Hayek assumes

---

[10] Claude J. Burtenshaw, "The Political Theory of Pluralist Democracy," *The Western Political Quarterly*, 21.4 (Dec. 1968): 585.

[11] Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962) http://books.cat-v.org/economics/capitalism-and-freedom/chapter_02.

[12] Gerard Radnitzky, "Hayek on the Role of the State: A Radical Libertarian Critique," *Policy*, (Autumn 2000): 18.

that there will be some sort of agreed upon legal method or procedure through which the public can express and communicate their interests and preferences. With that, the widely agreed upon manner to find out what the public wants is through the democratic method of one-man, one-vote, majority rule.[13]

Performance democracy emphasizes how democracies actually operate, specifically the relationship between competing leaders and the public. Joseph Schumpeter, the leading performance democracy theorist, states that democracy is actually about "competitive leadership" and "the rule of the politician," rather than mass participation and popular rule. This "elite" focused form of democracy is driven by what he termed the "democratic method." "The democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people's vote," wrote Schumpeter.[14]

He challenges what is referred to as "classic" democracy, or the idea that democracy is a process by which the electorate identifies common goods, as decided by the public, and is then carried out by politicians on their behalf. Instead, Schumpeter states that the public has low levels of political knowledge, interest, and participation. As a result the public is taken advantage of through the elites' use of the democratic method. Schumpeter stated that "elite groups and parties may be able to preside over a formally democratic institutional arrangement, providing some measure of political competition, but certainly not fulfilling the values of equality, participation, or human development."[15]

---

[13]Ibid. 18.

[14] Joseph Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1976) 3rd ed., 269.

[15] John Medearis, "Schumpeter, the New Deal, and Democracy," *The American Political Science Review*, 91.4 (Dec. 1997): 819-820.

There are those who would argue that both Turkey and Israel do not constitute true democracies. This notion, however, is contested. Western schools of thought (which have for the most part dominated the study of international relations) tend to structure their perceptions of democracy around the larger western powers such as the United States, France, and Germany. However, their versions of democracy were built around their own unique histories and set of societal experiences. While it is tempting to discuss democracy in a general and global way, to do so would be insufficient.

Each region of the world has its own unique constraints, characteristics, and histories; as a result democracy comes in all forms. Turkey and Israel may not be traditional Western democracies, but they are democracies in their own right. Furthermore, both Turkey and Israel reflect a combination of the traditional theories of democracy as theorized by Robert Dahl, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Milton Friedman, and Joseph Schumpeter. In both countries there is law for the protection of public goods and services, power is spread out through various groups of society with no one ruling elite controlling everything, and there is a process of elections in which all citizens have a say in the rotation of ruling elites. It is important, however, to review some of the controversies surrounding their democracies.

Israel has long been criticized for discriminatory practices against its domestic Arab populations. Much of it is a result of distrust by the Israeli government because of its 40 year conflict with the Palestinians. At the heart of the discrimination is unequal allocation of resources. Housing, education, and income for Arab Israelis substantially lag behind that of the Jewish majority. In March 2012, Arab Israeli attorney Keis Nasser of the Arab Center for Law and Policy issued a report stating that based on research and

official Interior Ministry reports, the government creates obstacles preventing the development of Arab towns and villages in Israel. These obstacles then drive the Arab communities to develop and expand illegally and without permits, resulting in their inevitable destruction. The report also stated that only three of the 71 plans proposed in Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's housing reform are located in Arab communities, and only three percent of the planned housing units are in Arab towns.[16]

On the issue of educational resource allocation, the 2007 Sikkuy equality index reported that Israeli Arabs were only receiving around "71% of the education resources due to them, based on their relative share in the population…"[17] In 2009 a study published by Professor Sorel Cahan of Hebrew University's School of Education found that the Education Ministry's budget for special assistance to students from low socioeconomic backgrounds gave only 20 percent the amount of assistance per student to Arabs as it did to Jews.[18]

Israel also faces attacks on its democracy based on its occupation of the West Bank. Israel, along with the United States, however, takes credit for ensuring democracy in West Bank Palestinian politics. However, due to heavy involvement by the Israeli military in day-to-day operations, this claim has been highly contested. Freedom of travel inside the West Bank is severely restricted and there are serious issues over the invasion of privacy.

---

[16] Jack Khoury, "Netanyahu's housing reform ignores Israeli Arab communities, says new research," *Haaretz*, Mar. 29, 2012, Accessed Apr. 15, 2012, http://www.haaretz.com/news/national/netanyahu-s-housing-reform-ignores-israeli-arab-communities-says-new-research-1.421357.

[17] "Israeli Arab Citizens: Submitted by the Commission on Social Action to the Union for Reform Judaism's 70th General Assembly," *Union for Reform Judaism*, Nov. 3, 2009, Accessed Apr. 15, 2012, http://urj.org/about/union/governance/reso/?syspage=article&item_id=27440.

[18] Or Kashti, "Israel aids its needy Jewish students more than Arab counterparts," *Haaretz*, Dec. 8, 2012, Accessed Apr. 15, 2012, http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-aids-its-needy-jewish-students-more-than-arab-counterparts-1.281830.

There is also the matter of Palestinian house demolitions by the Israel Defense

Forces (IDF) inside the West Bank. Punitive demolitions, which are those conducted as a

response to persons suspected of taking part in, or directly supporting, terrorist or guerilla

activities are particularly controversial. They are meant to be a direct punishment for

terrorism, as well as a deterrent against future attacks. Punitive demolitions constitute 8.5

percent or 1,523, of defined demolitions between 1967 and 2010.[19] Human rights groups

often argue that Israel is in breach of The Hague and Fourth Geneva Conventions, which

it is party to, by allowing punitive demolitions.[20] More importantly, many of the

demolitions occur without a fair trial or right to a hearing for the home owner.[21]

Many also argue that the occupation of the West Bank erodes democracy inside

Israel proper as a result of settlement activity. The most recent development was the

passing of the controversial West Bank Settlement Boycott Law. Under the law, any

sponsor of a "geographically based boycott" of goods, including in Israel or its

settlements, could be sued for damages in civil court by the party injured in the boycott

proclamation. Several rights groups and international law experts have stated that the

legislation is a breach of freedom of speech.[22]

Turkey is also criticized for some of its democratic failures. The most discussed

issue revolves around Turkey's sizable Kurdish minority, which makes up around 18

---

[19] "Statistics on House Demolitions (1967-2010)," *The Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions*,
2010, Accessed, Dec. 12, 2011, http://www.icahd.org/?page_id=5508.

[20] The Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, also referred to as
"The Fourth Geneva Convention," was adopted in 1949 and defines humanitarian protections for civilians
in a war zone.

[21] "Through No Fault of Their Own: Punitive House Demolitions during the al-Aqsa Intifada," *B'Tselem*,
Nov. 2004, 45.

[22] "Israeli lawmakers pass West Bank settlement boycott law," *BBC News*, July 11, 2011. Accessed Mar.
21, 2012, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-14111925.

percent of the total population.[23] Turkey has been fighting a war with the Kurdish

separatist party the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) since 1984. Turkish resentment

stemming from the conflict has found its way into discriminatory treatment of the

domestic Kurdish minority. Restrictive laws limit free speech, prevent the teaching of

minority languages, such as Kurdish, in school, and require political parties to secure an

insurmountable 10 percent of the nationwide vote to gain a seat in parliament. This has

led to a significant inability of Kurdish parties to achieve any meaningful status in the

Turkish parliament. Instead, many Kurds in parliament were forced to run as

independent candidates, who can then form a minimum 20-seat party grouping once in

office.[24]

Over the last three years, the Turkish government has been accused of misusing

anti-terrorism laws to bring criminal charges against ordinary civilians who engage in

legitimate and nonviolent pro-Kurdish political activity. Thousands are on trial for their

affiliation with the Turkey Assembly of the Union of Kurdistan Communities, accused of

being the PKK's urban wing. Many of the defendants are activist members, officials and

serving elected mayors of the legal Peace and Democracy Party, which formed a group in

parliament after winning 36 seats as independents in the recent June 2011 election.[25]

Turkey is also the target of continued international condemnation for its

burgeoning hostility towards the media. In January 2012, the New York Times reported

that there were 97 members of the news media in Turkish prison.[26] This includes

---

[23] Central Intelligence Agency. *The World Factbook: Turkey*, Updated Apr. 12, 2012, Accessed Apr., 15,
2012, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tu.html.

[24] Emma Sinclair-Webb, "Turkey's human rights challenges," *Los Angeles Times* in *Human Rights Watch*,
Dec. 19, 2011, Accessed Apr. 15, 2012, http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/12/19/turkeys-human-
rights-challenges.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Dan Bilefsky and Sebnem Arsu, "Charges Against Journalists Dim the Democratic Glow in Turkey," *The*

journalists, publishers, and distributers. Turkish authorities have also given Internet

service providers and website hosts a list of 138 keywords that are forbidden.[27]

Over the last year, the arrest of German-born journalist Nedim Sener has garnered

substantial attention from the international media. In 2010 Sener won the International

Press Institute's World Press Freedom Hero award for his reporting on the murder of

Hrant Dink, a well-known Turkish-Armenian journalist who was assassinated in Istanbul

in 2007.[28] Sener stands accused of being part of the group Eregenekon, which the ruling

party believes was plotting to overthrow the government. Prime Minister Recep Tayyip

Erdogan's opponents state that he is using the foiled plot to round up and eliminate his

critics and opposition.

Finally, it has been common place over the last 40 years for the military to

overthrow a ruling party or coalition that is believed to threaten the secular nature of the

country. However, this has not happened since 1997.

Democratic Peace Theory

Democratic Peace Theory is one of the principal paradigms of the Liberal school

of thought within international relations. The theory states that democracies are unlikely

to fight each other due to their shared democratic norms, which they externalize

internationally, and institutional constraints that democracies create. Various theorists

have placed different levels of emphasis on which reason is more predominant, shared

---

New York Times, Jan. 4, 2012, Accessed Mar. 21, 2012,
     http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/05/world/europe/turkeys-glow-dims-as-government-limits-free-
     speech.html?pagewanted=all.
[27] Richard Pollak, "In Turkey, Media Censorship is Rampant and the Internet Isn't Free," *The Nation*, May
     24, 2011, Accessed Mar. 21, 2012, http://www.thenation.com/article/160897/turkey-media-
     censorship-rampant-and-internet-isnt-free.
[28] Dan Bilefsky and Sebnem Arsu, "Charges Against Journalists Dim the Democratic Glow in Turkey."

democratic norms or institutional constraints. In general, history suggests that DPT does in fact hold up; democracies are unlikely to fight each other. However, it is the causal logic behind it that is debated.

There are two ways of conducting research on DPT, through dyadic or monadic studies. Dyadic research on DPT explores only the likelihood of whether democracies will fight one another. The research matches up individual democracies and explores their individual relationships. Comparatively, monadic research studies a democracy's relationship with all regime types, and explores whether democracies are a more peaceful as a whole. This study will be conducted on the claims of dyadic studies, though brief insight into the competing frameworks is appropriate.

Dyadic vs. Monadic Studies

Monadic studies of DPT explore whether democracies are less prone to physical conflict in general, regardless of the opposition's regime type. On the other hand, those who study DPT dyadically suggest that while democracies are less prone to fight each other, this has little to no bearing on their willingness to go to war with other regime types. David Rousseau, Christopher Gelpi, Dan Reiter, and Paul Huth conducted a study in which they assessed whether DPT is purely dyadic, monadic, or a mixture of the two. The model directly compared the dyadic and monadic explanations by using the state as the unit of analysis, rather than a dyad. It also controlled for an important, but what they claim is overlooked variable, satisfaction with the status quo.

What the study found was that in general, there was ample support for the argument that DPT is primarily a dyadic process, specifically when addressing the

escalation of international crisis. They claimed that "once a democracy is involved in an international crisis, it carefully distinguishes the type of state with which is bargaining and adjusts its bargaining behavior accordingly. When faced with a democratic opponent, a democracy believes that its opponent shares its desire to avoid the use of force."[29] However, their examination of the satisfaction with the status quo variable does indicate that there may be significant monadic effects for the initiation of crises. Their results suggest that democracies are unlikely to initiate crises with all other types of states, but once involved in a crisis, "democracies are clearly less likely to initiate violence only against other democracies."[30] They do state that the theoretical groundwork for such a study is limited and needs more development.

Kenneth Benoit states in "Reexamining Democracy and War Involvement: Democracies Really Are More Pacific," that democracies are less likely to go to war in general than other regime types. In his study, Benoit systematically reviews a series of empirical works, specifically Small and Singer (1976), Rummel (1983), Chan (1984), and Weede (1984), exploring conflicts between 1960 and 1980, and argues that democracies fight no fewer wars than non-democratic regime types. Benoit created his own quantitative model, combining models previously created by Butterworth, Small-Singer, Bollen, and Freedom House to test whether the aforementioned theorists' evidence, was correct.[31]

What Benoit concluded was that regime type does explain variation in international conflict, and that previous conventional wisdom, which was absent of

---

[29] David L. Rousseau, Christopher Gelpi, Dan Reiter, and Paul Huth, "Assessing the Dyadic Nature of the Democratic Peace, 1918-1988." *American Political Science Review*, 90.3 (Sept. 1996): 526-527.
[30] Ibid, 527
[31] Kenneth Benoit, "Democracies Really Are More Pacific: Reexamining Democracy and War Involvement," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 40.4 (Dec. 1996): 636-642.

monadic-level studies, deserved to be reconsidered. He gives a word of caution, though, that all studies must carefully consider the testing spectrum as democracies only make up 20-30 percent of all regimes.[32]

Arguments in Favor of Democratic Peace Theory

In 1791 Thomas Paine wrote *The Rights of Man*, in which he states that the "war system' was contrived to preserve the power and the employment of princes, statesmen, soldiers, diplomats and armaments manufacturers, and to bind their tyranny ever more firmly upon the necks of the people."[33] In other words, wars allowed for increased government control over citizens.

Immanuel Kant's essay, *Perpetual Peace*, largely recognized as the foundation of DPT, offered a remedy to what Paine laid forth.   The essay suggests that an international system of interconnected republican constitutions would result in a world "perpetual peace." Generally, liberals believe that peace is the normal state of affairs, contrary to their realist counterparts. But as Bruce Russett and John Oneal point out, Kant was realistic. He acknowledged that war was inherent in the anarchic international system. He simply cautioned nations to act wisely until a league of interdependent republics was established.   He also knew that power politics only produced temporary respite from conflict, not permanent solutions.[34] Kant's belief was that the construction of republican governments, ones in which leaders were accountable and individual rights were guaranteed, would result in peaceful international relations.

---

[32]Ibid, 654-655.

[33] Michael Howard, *War and the Liberal Conscience*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978): 31.

[34] John R. Oneal and Bruce Russett, "The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992," *World Politics*, 52.1 (Oct., 1999): 1.

There was a resurgence of interest and discussion in Kant's essay in the mid

1980s, spearheaded by Michael Doyle. *Liberalism and World Politics*, Doyle's most

acknowledged work, reviews three different forms of liberalism using Machiavelli,

Schumpeter, and Kant as his prime figures. He concludes that Kant's proposal of liberal

republicanism, as well as his views on politics, should be the standard for how regimes

strive to be. The basis of his argument revolves around Kant's three "definitive articles"

as laid out in *Perpetual Peace*. The first article requires a state to be a republic.

According to Doyle's interpretation of Kant, a republic should be a:

> …political society that has solved the problem of
> combining moral autonomy, individualism, and social
> order. A private property and market-oriented economy
> partially addressed that dilemma in the private sphere. The
> public, or political, sphere was more troubling. [Kant's]
> answer was a republic that preserved juridical freedom…on
> the basis of a representative government with a separation
> of powers.[35]

The second article calls for some form of a union of republics, what Kant calls the

"pacific federation," or *foedus pacificum*. This pacific federation would establish a zone

of peace amongst already existing republics, with the goal of ultimately converting and

bringing in new republics. The zone of peace would facilitate certain levels of

interdependence, both political and economic, resulting in serious constraints and

incentives for republics not to go to war with each other.[36] The third article deals with

universal hospitality. He states that foreigners should be welcomed and unharmed, and

---

[35] Michael Doyle, "Liberalism and World Politics," *The American Political Science Review*, 80.4 (Dec.
        1986): 1157-1158.
[36] Ibid. 1986, 1158

allowed to do business assuming it is within the law of the country.[37] Doyle interprets
this third article to mean adherence to civil rights.[38]

In *Liberalism and World Politics,* Doyle provides empirical evidence to
corroborate Kant's theory. The article has a three page appendix where all the liberal
regimes which have existed from 1700-1982 are listed and all the international wars since
1817 onwards are given chronologically. Based on his data he claims that "liberal states
are different. Liberal states have created a separate peace, as Kant argued they would."[39]
Doyle coined the term "separate peace," differentiating the peace between allies who are
fighting an enemy from a liberal peace.

Bruce Russett and Zeev Maoz's "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic
Peace, 1946-1986" was a significant dyadic quantitative study on DPT. They studied
pairs of independent democratic states that they deemed "relevant" democracies, or ones
that had real probabilities of going to war. There were roughly 265,000 dyad-years to
study; however, they deemed only 12 percent relevant. By placing numerical values on
regime type, executive constraints, and democratic norms, through various data sets they
were able to measure the probability of two states going to war or having a military
conflict. They also took into consideration state wealth, economic growth, alliances,
contiguity, and military capability. The specific time table was chosen for three reasons:
there were three times as many democracies to test in the second-half of the 20th century
than the first half; the role of democracy in restraining violent conflict between
democratic dyads may have been stronger in the second-half of the century because they

---

[37]Ibid. 1158.
[38] Michael Doyle, "Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace," *American Political Science Review*, 99.3 (Aug.
       2005): 463.
[39]Doyle, 1986. 1151.

were given proper time to penetrate their respective states; and lastly in the second-half of the century outside variables such as global wealth and growth, and deeper and farther ranging alliance systems were put in place, and a few other variables could be more highly accounted for.[40]

In the article they made three hypotheses; the first was a general hypothesis which stated that the more democratic both members of a pair of states are, the less likely they will have a militarized dispute, and the less likely it is that any disputes that do break out will escalate. The second hypothesis dealt with the normative aspect of DPT. They hypothesized that the more deeply rooted democratic norms are in the political processes of the two states, the lower the likelihood that disputes will break out or escalate. The third hypothesis dealt with the structural or institutional aspect of DPT. They hypothesized that the higher the political constraints on the executives of the two states, the lower the likelihood that disputes would break out or escalate.

Based on the results of the study, Russett and Maoz made four conclusions. First, the relative lack of conflict and war between democracies "…is probably not a spurious correlation. When controlling for other confounding factors, regime type has a consistent dampening effect on international conflict."[41] Second, the results were robust, regardless of which data set was used, the definition of the dependent variable, and the scale and type of measure of democracy. Third, both political constraints and democratic norms are good explanations for why democracies do not fight each other. And fourth,

---

[40] Zeev Maoz and Bruce Russett, "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986," *The American Political Science Review*, 87.3 (Sep. 1993): 624-637.
[41]Ibid, 636.

normative explanations may be a better overall account of DPT than structural

explanations.[42]

Arguments Against Democratic Peace Theory

In "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory" Sebastian Rosato provides a

qualitative analysis arguing against the causal logic of DPT. In his paper, he explores the

roles of norm externalization, which refers to states externalizing their shared democratic

norms, as well as the role of institutional constraints. On norm externalization, Rosato

explores liberal states' adherence to liberal norms and the theory that democracies only

go to war when "their safety and security are seriously endangered by the expansionist

policies of outlaw states."[43]

He analyzes a data set of imperial wars involving the liberal European

democracies, Britain and France, and the United States, spanning from 1838 to 1920 in

order to explore their intention in going to war. In the data set he uses a system created by

Adam Przeworsky (2000) to code states as democratic or nondemocratic. When the

coding is not sufficient he uses the criteria provided by studies of other DPT proponents

such as Russett (1993) and Dixon (1994). Rosato acknowledges that some theorists have

claimed these countries were not sufficiently liberal in the period analyzed in order to

conduct such a study. But, he argues that they are in fact considered to be classic liberal

democracies, and "if they cannot be expected to behave in a liberal fashion, then few, if

any, states can."[44] What Rosato finds is that the wars explored were not fought out of a

---

[42]Ibid, 636.

[43] John Rawls, *The Law of Peoples*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999): 90-91.

[44] Sebastian Rosato, "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory," *American Political Science Review*,
     97.4 (Nov. 2003): 590.

sense of norm externalization, but instead out of territorial ambition, the need to create

buffer areas between an enemy, and competition with other imperial powers.[45]

In analyzing democratic norm externalization Rosato gives specific attention to

the claims that liberal democracies trust and respect one another.   He explores a data set

of American Cold War interventions against other democracies. He states that the US

mission to contain the spread of communism overtook the respect for democracy. Had it

not been the case he argues, the United States would not have become involved, as "none

of the target states had turned to communism or joined the communist bloc, and were led

by what were at most left-leaning democratically elected governments…"[46] Rosato also

criticizes liberal theorists that attempt to use perception and regime defining tactics, as

they are too unstable and inaccurately assessed.[47]

Rosato focuses his argument against the institutional logic of DPT on five causal

mechanisms that proponents of DPT consider to be behind the institutional logic, all

relating to leadership accountability: constraints by pacific publics, constraints by antiwar

groups, the fact that democracies are believed to be slow to mobilize militarily,

democracies are open societies and are incapable of launching surprise attacks, and

because of the free flow of information democracies avert wars.[48]

First, Rosato tests the theory that democratic leaders are more accountable than

their autocratic counterparts. He uses a modified dataset of Goemans's 2000 work, War

and Punishment: The Causes of War Termination and the First World War. In his

analysis, Rosato found scant evidence that democratic leaders face greater expected costs

---

[45] Ibid, 588-589.
[46] Ibid, 590.
[47] Ibid, 592-593.
[48] Ibid, 593.

from fighting losing or costly wars. He states that based on the results of the study, autocratic leaders are likely to suffer more severe punishment for losing or taking part in a costly war.[49]

On the issue of public constraint, Rosato states that there are three reasons why public opinion does not constrain democracies from engaging in war. First, the costs of war typically fall on a small subset of the population that will likely be unwilling to protest government policy. Second, any public aversion to incurring the costs of war may be overtaken by the effects of nationalism. And third, democratic leaders are as likely to lead as to follow public opinion.[50] On group constraint, Rosato analyzes how societal actors contribute to state behavior. Based on previous studies Rosato concludes that while a state is a representative body, it is imperfect and more likely to represent groups that are better organized or have more at stake in an issue. Thus, "there is no reason to believe that pacific interest groups will generally win out over pro[-]war groups."[51] He then corroborates this with instances in where proponents of foreign aggression in democracies prevailed and a study in which he finds that autocracies are actually more often represent groups that have a vested interest in avoiding foreign wars.[52]

Democracies have no trouble mobilizing if necessary, according to Rosato. He corroborates this notion by exploring the wars of the United States relying predominantly on the work of John Rourke. The US has taken military action abroad 200 times during its history, and only five of these were declared by Congress. Most were authorized unilaterally. As such, Rosato claims that "checks and balances have generally failed to

---

[49]Ibid, 594.
[50]Ibid, 595.
[51]Ibid, 596.
[52]Ibid, 597.

operate and there have been frequent violations of the spirits if not the letter of the resolution," and that democratic leaders have a history of acting swiftly and decisively if need be.

Rosato also argues that democracies have no problem completing surprise attacks. He cites several examples of successful democratic surprise attacks and uses Ephraim Kam's work to support the notion that regime type does not matter, because attacks achieve surprise based on the opposition's inability to evaluate information.[53] Rosato uses similar argumentation for why the free flow of information also does not constrain democracies. He talks specifically about how governments are prone to misperceive information, or are overwhelmed by the abundance of information.[54]

Christopher Layne's "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace" focuses primarily on DPT's causal logic, the externalization of shared democratic norms and institutional constraints, and whether it can be a better predictor of international relations outcomes than realism.[55] Layne qualitatively tests the two competing explanations, DPT and realism, through four different case studies of "near misses," or crises where two democratic states almost went to war with each other, but did not. The four case studies are: the United States and Great Britain in 1861, the United States and Great Britain in 1895-96, France and Great Britain in 1898, and France and Germany in 1923.

According to Layne, "the selected case studies favor [DPT] because, in each, the pacifying effect of democratic norms and culture was bolstered by complementary factors

---

[53] Ibid, 598.
[54] Ibid, 599.
[55] Christopher Layne, "Kant of Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace," *International Security*, 19.2 (Autumn, 1994): 6.

(e.g., economic interdependence, or special ties linking the disputants)."[56] Each case study is conducted through a process-tracing approach and identifies the factors to which decision makers respond, how those factors influence decisions, the actual course of events, and the possible effect of other variables on the outcome.[57]

Based on the study, Layne concludes that realism provides the stronger explanation for why war was avoided in the case studies. On the externalization of shared democratic norms, he states that each of the cases had at least one democratic state ready to go to war based on vital strategic or reputation interests that were at stake. War was only avoided because one side decided to pull back from the brink. The "live and let live" spirit of peaceful dispute resolution, at the DPT core, did not hold up, Layne says. It was realist factors that played the heaviest role.

On DPT's institutional logic, Layne says that if public opinion is antiwar and it really has an effect on decision making, then democracies would be peaceful with all nations, democratic or not. He says, "[i]f citizens and policy makers of a democracy were especially sensitive to the human and material costs of war, that sensitivity should be evident whenever their state is on the verge of war, regardless of whether the adversary is democratic: the lives lost and money spent will be the same."[58] His study claims that public opinion has also been an inhibitor of war, citing examples from the turn of the 20th century. Domestic political structures, Layne says, cannot explain DPT either, because checks and balances focuses on an independent variable, decisional constraints embedded in a state's domestic political structure, that is associated with, but not exclusive to, democracies.

---

[56]Ibid, 7.
[57]Ibid, 13.
[58]Ibid, 12.

In "The Insignificance of the Liberal Peace," David Spiro argues that the absence of wars between liberal democracies is not a significant pattern of the last 200 years. He pays particular focus to Michael Doyle's claim that no liberal democracy has ever fought a war with another liberal democracy. He criticizes pro-DPT studies on the basis that their analyses are "highly sensitive to the ways that they select definitions of the key terms of democracy and war, and to the methods they choose for statistical analysis."[59] He also argues that a significant portion of the quantitative studies on democracy and war has little to do with the theories they seek to corroborate, "and that the results rest on methods and operationalization of variables that undergo contortions before they yield apparently significant results."[60]

The beginning of the article explores the liberal legacy of DPT and its main literary contributors, as well as the different definitions that have been given to "democracy" and "war." The main section of the work is a probability analysis of dyadic country pairings during the period of 1918-1980. It explores how random chance of wars compares to quantitative studies that have proclaimed there to be "zero wars" between democracies.

Spiro concludes that the statistics found in his study are in line with Mearsheimer's speculation that there have been few democracies over the last two centuries, and as a result there have not been many cases where two democracies were in a position to fight each other. He states that out of all the pro-DPT theorists, Rummel's claims on liberal theory are the strongest. Rummel tested the relationship between

[59] David E. Spiro, "The Insignificance of the Liberal Peace," *International Security*, 19.2 (Autumn, 1994): 51.
[60] Ibid, 51.

freedom and pacifism.[61] Spiro recommends that future research give more attention to

why democracies have allied with one another. "The question for future research should

be whether the normative basis for liberal democracy leads regimes to join one another in

waging war on non-believers," wrote Spiro.[62] He also states that if representative

government is the reason for liberal alliances, then future research should take into

account difference in relative autonomy of liberal states.[63]

---

[61]Ibid, 76.
[62]Ibid, 80.
[63]Ibid, 80.

Chapter 2: Background on the Turkish-Israeli Relationship

The Turkish-Israeli Relationship

The Turkey-Israel relationship is complicated, dynamic, and always changing. This chapter will provide a brief, yet thorough, review of their relations, dating back to 1949. The chapter will be broken down into three sections, each reflecting a different period of the relationship. The first section will discuss Turkish-Israeli ties from 1949-1968, known as the "Peripheral Alliance." The second section will explore relations from the mid-1980s through the early 2000s, known as the "1990s Alignment." The third and concluding section will explore the relationship from 2006 to the present.

1949-1968, "The Peripheral Alliance"

Turkey officially recognized Israel in 1949, an unthinkable move at the time for a Muslim country. Early on, the two states had established diplomatic relations, but they eroded when Turkey joined the Baghdad Pact in 1955. Searching for a more established role in the Middle East, Turkey enhanced its alliances with the Baghdad Pact states, most notably Iraq. This resulted in the regression of its relations with Israel, and was further compounded by the 1956 Suez Canal War, which resulted in Turkey recalling its ambassador to Israel. The Jewish state spent the next ten years attempting to mend relations, with 1958 proving to be the turning point.[1]

In 1958 Turkey and Israel began what is commonly referred to as "The Peripheral Alliance" or the "Phantom Pact." Its foundations were laid by Israeli Prime Minister

---

[1] OfraBengio, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Partners*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010): 33-39.

David Ben-Gurion and Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes. At the request of Turkey the alliance was largely kept covert, in large part because of its fluctuating relations with the Arab nations.[2] Nonetheless, both countries had their own specific reasons for wanting to re-kindle the relations that had begun in 1949, as well as some overlapping ones.

In The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Partners, Ofra Bengio credits Israel for the initiation and ongoing development of the alliance, stating that it had three primary reasons for doing so. First, Israel wanted to break the ring of isolation that the Arab states had placed on it by forming an alliance with the non-Arab countries of the periphery. Second, it wanted to stabilize the region and form a new balance of power. And third, it wanted to strengthen relations with the West, specifically the United States, it helped that Turkey belonged to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).[3]

Turkey's reasons for developing the peripheral alliance resulted from a timeline of circumstantial events that drastically altered their strategic thinking. Turkey was furious with Iraq over its decision to vote against it on the issue of Cyprus at the United Nations (UN) in December 1957.[4] This came after Iraq had told Turkish officials that they would not only vote in Turkey's favor, but try to influence other Arab states to as well. While the voting did not end up deciding Cyprus' fate, it left a negative impression on Turkish officials and public opinion.[5] In February 1958 Turkey was put on alert by the establishment of the United Arab Republic (UAR), a merging of Egypt and Syria.

---

[2]Ibid, 45.
[3] Ibid, 39-40.
[4]Ibid, 37.
[5]Ibid, 38.

Cairo was already a longstanding rival of Ankara, and now technically became a border country in the south.

The UAR also threatened to surround Turkey with pro-Soviet countries, and Turkey was fearful that the UAR would try to keep expanding to include other Arab states.[6] Finally, in July 1958 the Iraqi monarchy fell, which initiated an immediate change in Turkey's outlook on the region and Israel. There was fear that a new regime in Iraq would not honor the Baghdad Pact, which was largely held together by the personal relationship of Turkey's Menderes and Iraq's leader Nuri al-Sa'id. Turkey was also wary of the effects the Iraqi fall might have on its neighbors, possibly engulfing it with hostile countries.

Israel and Turkey also had some shared concerns that helped bring them back together. First and foremost, both were adamant about keeping Soviet expansion at bay. Turkey was a NATO member and Israel was searching for closer relations with NATO. Helping to halt Soviet influence in the region was in both of their interests.[7] Both states also wanted to contain pan-Arabism, which the Egyptian rival of both states, Gamal Abdel Nasser, was quickly championing and expanding. Pan-Islamism was also a concern for both states, in particular Turkey, whose entire state infrastructure was centered on keeping the state secular. Terrorism was becoming a growing trend and both countries sought the other's cooperation in helping fight it. Lastly, both countries wanted to improve their images in the West and creating an alliance was thought to help that cause.[8]

---

[6] Ibid, 38-39.
[7] Ibid, 46.
[8] Ibid, 46.

The Peripheral Alliance resulted in increased relations mainly in economic areas, agriculture, and military cooperation. Israel helped train Turkish farmers to increase their crop output and Turkey continually sent its own officials to Israel to learn the most advanced agricultural processes the world had to offer. By early 1965 bilateral trade between the two reached $30,000,000.[9] Areas of economic cooperation included joint research projects, joint industrial projects, and tourism. Israeli experts also helped in the planning of the Turkish Keban dam.[10]

Military cooperation was the heart of the alliance, and at the time it was Israel's only military agreement with another country. Regular meetings between high-level military intelligence officials were held every six months. These included the exchange of intelligence and information, coordination and cooperation on various military issues, exchange of know-how in the field of military industry, joint enterprise to manufacture mortars for Germany, training in various areas of military expertise, and the use of each other's airspace. [11]

Beginning in 1958, the Peripheral Alliance lasted eight years, but its erosion began in 1964 over an issue in Cyprus. Conflict between Cyprus' Turkish and Greek residents was flaring up and the issue of how to split up the land was brought to the UN. While the vote on what to do was never fully accomplished, Israel had abstained much to the anger of Turkey.[12] Following this, Turkey began shifting its foreign policy toward the Arab states, at the expense of Israel. From 1966 onward official relations began to enter a deep freeze, with no signs of improvement. Following the 1967 Six-Day War and the

---

[9]Ibid, 51.
[10] Ibid, 50-51.
[11] Ibid, 52-53.
[12] Ibid, 54-56.

Palestinian refugee issue that ensued, Turkish-Israeli relations were more or less publicly

neutralized and Turkey became even more aligned with the Arab states. However, very

low-level, unofficial relations continued as Turkey still allowed Israeli Air Force flights

to cross its airspace, and Turkey accepted Israel's humanitarian aid following an

earthquake in 1967.

Overall, the Peripheral Alliance was largely at the whim of Turkey's strategic

needs. When those strategies called for change, they did not necessarily include Israel in

the plan, and thus the relationship cooled. Israel never got the public acknowledgement it

was looking for in order to boost its image and credibility in the Middle East, though it

would spend the next 30 years attempting to restore ties.

The 1990s Alignment

Secret military relations between Israel and Turkey started back up in the mid-

1980s. In 1991, the two officially upgraded relations to embassy status and in 1996 they

signed a formal agreement.[13] Unlike the Peripheral Alliance, the 1990s alignment was a

joint public-project, in which the two partners contributed equally to its formation and

success. As is always the case with alliances, both Turkey and Israel had their individual

reasons for wanting to jump start their relationship, as well as a few overlapping

motivations.

For Turkey, the international setting had changed drastically since the Peripheral

Alliance. In general, international attitudes towards Israel had changed. Egypt had a full

peace treaty with the Jewish state. Turkey's main rivals in the region, Greece and the

---

[13] Ibid, 78-80.

Soviet Union, had established full diplomatic relations with Israel, setting a precedent for other states. The fact that the Palestinians, Syrians, and Jordanians were also engaged in peace talks with Israel also secured legitimacy for Turkey upgrading ties.[14] An Israeli-Syrian agreement had significant implications for Ankara, as Turkey believed it might lose important strategic leverage over Damascus should Syria make peace with Israel before the Turks did. Coincidentally, for some time Turkish officials discouraged Israel from making peace with Syria.[15]

While regional issues created the environment for Turkish interest in Israel, it was the military that was the driving force behind the rapprochement. Conflict with the minority Kurdish population began in 1984, and the Turkish military was very interested in learning all it could from the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF). Israel possessed immense training skills from real life experience, as it had fought several wars over since its inception. It also had sophisticated weaponry and an abundance of technological know-how.[16] The Turkish military also began to see Israel as a natural ally based on its secularism and pro-Western leanings. Following the end of the Cold War, Turkey felt it had to re-establish its importance to the West, and in proportion it was more rebuffed by Europe, so it sought closer ties to the US. Israel proved a valuable player in that respect.[17]

Israel had been amenable to rapprochement with Turkey for some time. While there was some domestic political debate about whether it could negatively impact the peace process with the Arab states, it was generally accepted that ties with Turkey would

---

[14] Ibid, 79.
[15] Ibid, 80.
[16] Ibid, 86.
[17] Ibid, 87-88.

be a positive step forward.[18] The shared Turkish-Israeli concern over the regional

balance was Israel's main motivation. Following the Gulf War, Israel felt it needed

strategic relations with Turkey to help balance the three radical countries in the Middle

East: Syria, Iraq, and Iran.[19] This was particularly important if peace talks with Syria

failed. Further, Israel felt that should it lose land in negotiations with the Palestinians and

Syria, Turkey could offer strategic depth.[20]

     Just as it had in the 1950s, Israel also desired Turkey's help in reaching out to

Muslim states, as well as Central Asia, in order to increase bilateral trade and to moderate

anti-Islamic forums.[21] Not only would this help Israel's global credibility, it could bring

countries into its orbit that might otherwise fall into that of Iran's.

     The 1996 formal agreement substantially increased and legitimized the Israel-

Turkey alignment, and in particular their military cooperation. Several high-ranking

officials began making regular visits to both countries and in 1998 Turkey decided to

increase its number of military attachés from one to three. This made Israel the fourth

country after the United States, Germany, and France to receive three vs. the regular one

Turkey usually sent.[22] In the latter part of the 1990s Israel and Turkey would sign several

more agreements increasing military cooperation in training, airspace, and intelligence

issues, among other things. The two also began conducting arms deals, which between

1996 and 1998 were valued at $700 million. This represented the biggest-ever foreign

contract for Israel's aircraft industry.[23] In 2001, American, Israeli, and Turkish air forces

---

[18] Ibid, 89-94.
[19]Ibid, 95.
[20]Ibid, 95.
[21] Ibid, 95-96.
[22]Ibid, 111.
[23]Ibid 113-114.

held joint air maneuvers over Konya, Turkey, the first of any kind between Israel and Turkey. These arms purchases and maneuvers became more extensive and frequent in the early 2000s.[24]

The two also substantially increased economic trade, and agricultural, industrial, scientific, and cultural cooperation. The two agreed to a free trade zone, a treaty to prevent double taxation, and an agreement for mutual encouragement and protection of investment. By 2010 bilateral trade reached $3.5 billion.[25] As arms trades started picking up in the early 2000s, so did Israeli purchases of Turkish water and the means to transport it. Both sides contributed to people-to people interactions to promote cultural exchange as each hosted the other's museum exhibitions, bands, concerts, and students.[26]

Overall, the 1990s and early 2000s were a period of prosperity in the Israel-Turkey relationship. A major testament to the strength and development of the relationship was that it was largely unaffected by the second intifada, which was a five year period of significantly increased violence between the Palestinians and Israelis. However, in 2006 the nature of the relationship began to noticeably change, mostly as a result of the changes wrought by the conservative Islamist Justice and Development (AKP) party.

Turkish-Israeli Relations from 2006-Present

In 2002 the AKP was elected as the majority party in Turkey. With its conservative and Islamist ideals, many anticipated that it would change the policy on

[24] Ibid, 113-115.
[25] Arieh O'Sullivan, "Ties remain strained, but Turkey, Israel keep on trading,:" *The Jerusalem Post*, Apr. 17, 2011, Accessed Mar. 25, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/DiplomacyAndPolitics/Article.aspx?id=216941.
[26] Bengio, 122-123.

Turkish-Israeli relations. However, in the beginning relations with Israel remained fruitful, both materially and diplomatically. One reason was that the AKP sought to prove European skeptics wrong about its sincerity in building a new type of Islamic state, one which adhered to the principles of Western democracy.[27] This was crucial to Turkey's desire to be admitted to the European Union. Second, the AKP's openness to Israel may have been a result of wanting to avoid additional friction with Turkey's military establishment, which was already suspicious of their intentions.[28]

In 2006, however, the first step in the current diplomatic downswing occurred when the AKP began engaging the ruling party in the Gaza Strip, Hamas. Israel formally recognizes Hamas as a terrorist organization and the two refuse to negotiate directly with each other. The AKP invited senior Hamas official Khalid Maashal, who was residing in Damascus, to visit Ankara.

Turkish engagement of Hamas signified several changes in Turkey: 1) Turkey's ultra-nationalist and Islamist parties and movements had grown stronger and now posed a threat to relations with Israel; 2) the Turkish military elite, who were largely responsible for the close ties with Israel, had lost much of their political influence and ability to dictate foreign policy; 3) the 2003 US- Iraq war had brought a deterioration in Ankara's relations with Washington, resulting in a negative perception of Israel's role in the region; 4) Turkey's closer relations with Syria, had altered the balance of power in the region and decreased the need for relations with Israel; 5) for the AKP party, Iran was

---

[27]Ibid, 172.
[28]Ibid, 172.

being seen as much less a threat than before; 6) Israel's handling of the Palestinian situation was creating significant resentment among Turkish politicians and the public.[29]

Bengio also notes that under the AKP government anti-Semitism has largely been unaddressed and even indirectly incited, "where as Germany and other stated forbid the publication of <u>Mein Kampf</u>, the Turkish government did not do so on the flimsy pretext of protecting democracy."[30] Nonetheless, even after the controversial visit by Maashal trade between Turkey and Israel remained prosperous, as did tourism.

In 2008, Turkey tried to broker a peace treaty between Syria and Israel. Turkey was becoming increasingly closer with Syria and was using Syrian-Israel feud to further establish itself as a regional power. However, it would prove unsuccessful, largely as a result of the 2009 war in Gaza.

In the weeks leading up to the Gaza war, Turkey was trying hard to get Israel and Syria to the negotiating table. Right before the Gaza war began, the then Israeli Prime Minister, Ehud Olmert, made a visit to Turkey. While there he made no mention of Israel's intentions to attack Gaza in an attempt to weaken Hamas and its rocket cache. The war resulted in Assad protesting against Israel and pulling out of pre-negotiations for a peace treaty, and Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan was severely insulted.[31]

Feeling betrayed Erodgan led the way in criticizing Israel, stating that history would judge them for the black stain they were leaving on humanity. He even called Israel's actions "a crime against humanity," and demanded that Israel be expelled from the United Nations for ignoring the organization's call to stop the conflict in Gaza. He then famously stormed out of a debate with Israeli President Shimon Peres at the Davos

---

[29]Ibid, 177.
[30] Ibid, 178.
[31]Ibid, 183.

economic forum. While Turkey had no intention of cutting off relations with Israel, as was obvious when it acted as the mediator in the Gaza war, Turkey's tilt away from Israel became more obvious.[32]

The next two major events in Turkish-Israel relations were those that that are the focus of this case study. First, in May 2010, a Turkish flotilla of ships carrying anti-Gaza blockade protestors tried to break the blockade, but was met by Israeli commandos. The confrontation resulted in the deaths of eight Turkish nationals. Second, the UN Palmer report, which was an investigation into the flotilla incident which found that Israel had used excessive force, but the blockade of Gaza was legal under international law.

---

[32] Ibid.

Chapter 3- The Case Study

In trying to understand the applicability of Democratic Peace Theory (DPT) on small powers, I will employ a case study exploring two related events involving Israel and Turkey which could have potentially brought them to a physical conflict. The first is the Flotilla incident in which a number of humanitarian ships attempted to break the Israeli blockade of Gaza, resulting in the death of eight Turkish nationals.   The second is the release of the UN Palmer Report, which was an investigation of the Flotilla incident, and a series of recommendations that condemned the attack on the ships but deemed the Israeli blockade legal. To provide proper context the chapter will begin with a review of the Israeli blockade on the Gaza Strip. It will followed by a recounting of the Flotilla incident and UN Palmer Report.

The Israeli Blockade

In 2005 Israel withdrew all forces and settlers from the Gaza Strip, but kept control of its borders. In 2006 Hamas, which is considered a terrorist organization by Israel, the United States, and the European Union, won the Palestinian legislative elections and took control of Gaza following a bloody conflict with their political rival, Fatah. In 2007 Israel responded to the Hamas takeover by imposing a strict blockade of Gaza, which still seriously impedes any persons and goods from entering or leaving the territory.[1] Israel only allows items into Gaza that it labels as "humanitarian." According to Israeli officials, the blockade was established so that illegal weapons and equipment

---

[1] "Blockade of Gaza," *Global Security*, Accessed Apr. 2, 2012,
    http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/palestine/gaza-blockade.htm.

used for rockets could not enter and be used against Israel. Between 2005 and 2008 over 4,000 rockets were fired into southern Israel from the Gaza Strip.[2]

There is international debate about whether Israel does allow sufficient humanitarian aid into Gaza. To corroborate its claim Israel issues a detailed *Weekly Summary of the Humanitarian Aid Transferred into Gaza*. However, the UN office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Aid regularly issues reports on the situation stating that the blockade has made conditions worse for Palestinians by creating increased poverty, increased unemployment, and decreased economic activity. They also state that the blockade has made reconstruction from the 2009 Israeli invasion of Gaza all but impossible.[3] The blockade has resulted in increased animosity towards Israel by several humanitarian NGOs and countries around the world.

The Turkish Flotilla Incident

On May 22, 2010, the MV Mavi Marmara, a former Turkish passenger ferry owned by the Foundation for Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief (IHH), departed Istanbul in an attempt to break the Israeli naval blockade of Gaza. On its way it stopped at the Mediterranean port of Antalya to pick up more than 500 passengers, and then met up at sea with five other ships, including several from the Free Gaza Movement. The six-ship flotilla then attempted to make its way to the Gaza Strip with the stated intention of delivering 10,000 tons of humanitarian aid, while at the same time

---

[2] "More Than 4,000 Rockets Have Been Fired at Israel from Gaza," *The Israel Project*. Accessed Apr. 12, 2012,
   http://www.theisraelproject.org/site/apps/nl/content2.asp?c=hsJPK0PIJpH&b=689705&ct=4966107#_ftn1.

[3] US Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, *Israel's Blockade of Gaza, Mavi Marmara Incident, and Its Aftermath*, by Carol Migdalovitz, June 21, 2010, 1-2.

making a symbolic event out of breaking the Israeli blockade. In total, there were about 700 activists from 28 countries onboard the ships, including 11 Americans and some European parliamentarians.[4]

On May 30th the flotilla received an offer from Israel requesting that it dock at the Israeli port of Ashdod so that the cargo could be inspected before delivery. Under Israeli protocol, shipments of any kind to Gaza are inspected by Israeli authorities accompanied by representatives of the sending NGO. This is done to halt weapons smuggling to Hamas. The Flotilla refused the request.[5]

On May 31st the flotilla was intercepted by Israeli navy zodiac boats in international waters between 80-100 miles off the Israeli coast. Commandos took control of five of the six boats with ease. However, the Mavi Marmara resisted. When the commandos dropped in from helicopters, they were confronted by the passengers and activists wielding iron rods, knives, broken glass bottles, and slingshots. They were also equipped with gas masks, night vision goggles, and life vests. The commandos were carrying both paintball guns and live firearms. While it is unclear how the confrontation began, it resulted in the death of eight Turkish nationals and an American citizen, and injuries to 24 other passengers and ten Israeli commandos.

Following the clash, the flotilla of ships was taken to Ashdod. The passengers were detained and the cargo was removed, inspected, and trucked to the Kerem Shalom border crossing between Israel and Gaza. Israeli officials said that they found Molotov cocktails, detonators, wood and metal clubs, slingshots and rocks, large hammers, and sharp metal objects on the Marmara. Meanwhile, the passengers denied having started

---

[4]Ibid, 2.
[5]Ibid, 2.

the conflict or having acted in an offensive manner. Hamas refused to allow the aid to be

transferred into Gaza and the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) stored it at a military base

while it consulted international organizations. By June 3rd all the detainees who were not

severely injured had been deported. On June 15th, it was announced that the UN would

distribute the aid.[6]

Tensions between Turkey and Israel were already high before the Flotilla

incident. In 2009, Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan was furious with Israel over its

invasion of Gaza. He felt personally slighted when then Israeli Prime Minister Ehud

Olmert was in Turkey days before the invasion began, and did not let Erdogan know of

Israel's intentions. In anger Erdogan cancelled a joint Turkish-Israeli war game and got

into a very public feud with Israeli President Shimon Peres at the Davos Economic

Forum.

The Flotilla was seen by Turks as a blatant act of unnecessary Israeli aggression,

and led to a spillover of already pent up emotions. Almost immediately following reports

that Turks on the Mavi Marmara had been killed, the streets of Istanbul filled with a

reported 10,000 people screaming various anti-Israel and anti-Semitic slogans, including

"death to Israel."[7] Turkish security forces had to stop one crowd from storming the

Israeli consulate.[8] Similar protests also occurred in Ankara and other areas of Turkey, as

well as around the Muslim world and in Europe.

---

[6]Ibid, 3.

[7] "Condemnation Follows Israeli Raid on Gaza Flotilla," *NPR*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012,
        http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=127286256.

[8] "Turkish protesters try to storm Israeli consulate in Istanbul," *The Star*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr.
        25, 2012, http://www.thestar.com/news/world/article/816673--turkish-protesters-try-to-storm-
        israeli-consulate-in-istanbul.

Turkey immediately cancelled three future military exercises with Israel and recalled its ambassador to the Jewish state. These moves were internationally acknowledged as a dangerous and rapid erosion of relations. Bulent Yildirim, chairman of the Foundation for Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief (IHH), stated during the protests that he had received one million applications from volunteers wanting to take part in future flotillas.[9] If Turkey was so outraged over this one Flotilla incident, and had downgraded diplomatic ties over it, what would the fallout be like if flotillas became a regular occurrence? Israel made clear that it would not hesitate to act in similar fashion against future attempts. Adding to the tension, Israel stated that there was evidence that Turkish officials were indirectly involved in planning and facilitating the Flotilla.

Since its inception as the ruling party in 2002, the AKP Party has continually battled with the opposition secular parties. But following the Flotilla incident Devlet Bahceli, the leader of the Nationalist Movement Party, one of the AKP's main rivals, stated that "the detailed basics of the political, legal, diplomatic and, if necessary, military responses to this should be determined. The harshest response should be given immediately without making the process material for domestic politics along the lines of being pro or anti-Israel."[10]

Prime Minister Erdogan stated that Israel would face "unprecedented and incalculable reprisals" for its actions.[11] He also said that "Israel in no way can legitimize

[9] "Gaza flotilla vow as thousands rally in Istanbul," *BBC*, May 31, 2011, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-13601251.

[10] "Israel's attack blatant hostility toward Turkish nation, Bahceli says," *Todays Zaman*, Jun. 2, 2010, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/newsDetail_getNewsById.action;jsessionid=2948AD28CCFEF72F56DDF299E7654639?newsId=211857.

[11] Paul L. Williams, "Are the Turks Preparing for War Against Israel?," *Accuracy in Media*, Jun. 1, 2010,

this murder, it cannot wash its hands of this blood."[12] According to Israeli officials, this comment raised serious concerns about the reports coming out of Ankara that it might be willing to send navy ships to escort future flotillas. "This is a definite possibility that we need to prepare for," a senior Israeli defense official said.[13] If Turkey followed through on its threats, physical conflict was all but assured as Israel continually emphasized that it would enforce the blockade at all costs and would not apologize for its use of force. This sentiment was shared by the military and the Israeli Supreme Court.

Israel clearly took the threat from Turkey seriously as the government issued a travel warning for all Israelis planning to go to Turkey and asking that all Israelis already in Turkey return to Israel. Increasing the tension even more, Israel announced on June 3, 2010 that it would conduct a 10-day joint exercise between the Israeli and Greek air forces.[14] Greece has been in a decade's long dispute with Turkey over the status of land in Cyprus. Israel and Turkey appeared to be heading down a dangerous road that could have conceivably led to an armed conflict.

The United Nations Palmer Report

On August 2, 2010, United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon established a Panel of Inquiry to explore the events of the Flotilla incident. It became internationally known as "the Palmer Report," ("the Report"). The Report was convened by Sir

---

Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.aim.org/guest-column/are-the-turks-preparing-for-war-against-israel/.

[12] Yaakov Katz, "IDF: Global Jihad links on flotilla," *The Jerusalem Post*, Jun. 1, 2010, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=177169.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Anshel Pfeffer and Sami Kohen, "Turkey and Israel relations in crisis after flotilla," *The Jewish Chronicle*, Jun. 3, 2010, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.thejc.com/news/israel-news/32532/turkey-and-israel-relations-crisis-after-flotilla.

Geoffrey Palmer, Colombian President Àlvaro Uribe, Mr. Joseph Ciechanover Itzhar of

Israel, and Mr. Suleyman Ozdem Sanberk of Turkey, and included national findings by

both Turkish and Israeli investigations. Upon review of the national findings, and some

additional independent investigation, the UN panel was tasked with making

recommendations concerning how to avoid similar incidents in the future. The report

was not meant to adjudicate any legal liability or responsibilities on the part of either

country.[15]

The Report of Turkish National Commission of Inquiry

The *Turkish National Commission of Inquiry* (the "Commission") began its report

by noting that Israel's naval blockade is an "illegal" form of economic and political

warfare, which also created restrictions on ordinary consumer items that served no

security purpose. The Commission claimed that this has had a disproportionate and

punitive impact on the civilian population, and has increased the severity of the

humanitarian crisis going on in Gaza.[16]

The Commission gave several reasons why the Israeli blockade is illegal under

international law. First, "a blockade may only be imposed in a situation of international

armed conflict and the State of Israel has never recognized Palestine as a State or its

armed conflict with Hamas as an international one."[17] Second, "it did not comply with

customary international law requirements regarding notification and enforcement set out

---

[15] United Nations, "Report of the Secretary-General's Panel of Inquiry on the 31 May 2010 Flotilla
Incident," Geoffrey Palmer, Alvaro Uribe, Joseph CiechanoverItzhar, and Suleyman Ozdem
Sanberk, Sep. 2011, 3.
[16]Ibid, 14.
[17]Ibid, 15.

in the San Remo Manual on International Law Applicable to Armed Conflicts at Sea."[18]

Moreover "Israel did not adequately notify the 'duration and extent' of the blockade. No list of the goods that were prohibited has been made publicly available and no end date has been specified; and the blockade was not consistently enforced."[19] Third, the blockade is disproportional under the laws of the San Remo Manual. Fourth, the blockade is a form of collective punishment, illegal under Article 33 of the Fourth Geneva Convention. Fifth, Israel is an occupying power in Gaza, and as such cannot blockade the borders.[20]

The Commission's findings on the actual Flotilla were that all those aboard were civilians, including politicians, academics, journalists, and religious leaders. The ships were only carrying humanitarian supplies; no guns or other weapons were found to be on board, and thus the ship could not be attacked under international humanitarian law. All passengers and baggage were thoroughly screened prior to boarding, and the ports that the ships departed from were certified under the International Maritime Organization International Ship and Port Facility Security Code.[21] Moreover, the Turkish government claimed that there was a diplomatic understanding with Israel that the vessels in the flotilla would not force a breach of the blockade but rather would alter their course of destination to the port of Al-Arish if necessary, and that Israel would not use force.

On the issue of the actual boarding of the ships by the IDF, the Turkish Commission concluded that it was illegal under international law because the flotilla was

---

[18] The *San Remo Manual on International Law Applicable to Armed Conflicts at Sea* is a codification of customary international law and an integration of existing legal standards for naval conflict.

[19] United Nations, "Report of the Secretary-General's Panel of Inquiry on the 31 May 2010 Flotilla Incident," 15.

[20] United Nations, "Report of the Secretary-General's Panel of Inquiry on the 31 May 2010 Flotilla Incident," 15-16.

[21] Ibid, 16-17.

still in international waters. Specifically, it stated that under the 1958 High Seas

Convention and the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, a foreign flagged vessel

may not be boarded on the high seas without the consent of the flag State. In regards to

the controversy over the Mavi Marmara passengers attacking IDF soldiers, the

Commission stated that the passengers were panicked and acted in self-defense to prevent

the IDF soldiers from boarding the vessels.

The Commission claimed that it used excessive force both before and after the

boarding, and that there was indiscriminate shooting, including from the helicopter that

was in the vicinity. It accused IDF soldiers of targeted attacks on individuals who did not

represent a threat and claimed that attacks by the IDF continued even after attempts by

the passengers to surrender.[22] Finally, the Commission stated that Israel has a duty to

make reparations for the accused violations of international law, including to the families

of those killed, and to issue a formal apology to Turkey. [23]

The Israeli Commission's Report

Unlike the Turkish commission, the Israeli Commission's report (the

"Commission") noted that the blockade of the Gaza Strip is legal under international law.

Since the beginning of 2001, thousands of rockets and mortars have been fired into Israel

from Gaza. Because of this, Israel has been engaged in an armed conflict with

Palestinian terrorist organizations, and the normative framework to be applied to the

activities of the IDF are the principles and rules of the law of armed conflict.[24] Thus, the

---

[22] Ibid, 19-20.
[23]Ibid, 26.
[24]Ibid, 27.

blockade is justified based on the need to prevent weapons, terrorists, and money from entering or exiting the Gaza Strip.

The Commission also stated that the blockade meets all customary international law requirements for the use of a blockade, including the requirements of notification, effectiveness and enforcement. This reasoning relied on the 1909 London Declaration, the San Remo Manual, military manuals, and other various commentaries.[25] The Commission also stated that Israel was complying with its humanitarian obligations, including the prohibition on starving the civilian population or preventing the supply of essential objects needed for a civilian population's survival. This reasoning was also based on paragraphs 102-104 of the San Remo Manual, the Fourth Geneva Convention, Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions[26], military manuals, and other commentaries.[27] On the accusation of collective punishment, the Commission stated that there is no evidence of deliberative restrictions imposed on bringing goods into Gaza with the sole or main purpose of denying the civilian population.[28]

The Commission stated that it engaged in several diplomatic initiatives with Turkey and other countries to halt the departure of the Flotilla. But these initiatives were either ignored or rejected.[29] On the Flotilla itself, the Commission explained that its purpose was to bring publicity to the humanitarian situation in Gaza by attempting to breach the blockade. It said that the Flotilla was largely led by IHH, described as a

---

[25] The 1909 *London Declaration concerning the Laws of Naval War* is an international code of maritime law, especially as it relates to wartime activities. It was proposed at the 1909 London Naval Conference by the leading European Naval power, as well as the United States and Japan.
[26] *Protocol I* is a 1977 amendment protocol to the Geneva conventions relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts. It reaffirms the international laws of the original Geneva Conventions, but adds clarifications and new provisions to accommodate developments in modern international warfare.
[27] United Nations, "Report of the Secretary-General's Panel of Inquiry on the 31 May 2010 Flotilla Incident," 28-29.
[28] Ibid, 29.
[29] Ibid, 30.

"humanitarian organization with a radical-Islamic orientation" which provides support to anti-Western and radical groups including Hamas.[30] The Commission stated that the majority participating in the flotilla were peace activists, but that there was a "hardcore group" of about 40 IHH activists on the Mavi Marmara who boarded separately in Istanbul and without any security checks. The "hardcore" group had made it known who they were during the voyage, and had made preparations to resist any boarding attempt by IDF personnel.

Interestingly, the Commission stated that only three of the six flotilla vessels contained humanitarian supplies. Further, weapons and combat equipment were found on board the Mavi Marmara, including flares, rods, axes, knives, tear gas, gas masks, protective vests, and night-vision goggles.   No firearms were found, but the Commission expressed that it was not convinced that pre-boarding security measures for the Flotilla had ensured no firearms were brought aboard.

On the actual boarding of the Mavi Marmara, the Commission explained that the first attempt by speed boat was met with resistance and failed. Once IDF commandos did manage to board, violence against the soldiers was carried out in an organized fashion by a group of passengers armed with weapons, including firearms. Suggestions that the passengers were acting in legitimate self-defense were not corroborated by the evidence, said the Commission.

Palmer Report Findings and Recommendations

The Palmer Report considered both the Turkey and Israeli reports and found the naval blockade of Gaza to be legal under international law:

---

[30] Ibid, 29-30.

The Israeli report to the Panel makes it clear that the naval blockade as a measure of the use of force was adopted for the purpose of defending its territory and population, and the Panel accepts that was the case…Hamas is the de facto political and administrative authority in Gaza and to a large extent has control over events on the ground there. It is Hamas that is firing the projectiles into Israel or is permitting others to do so. The Panel considers the conflict should be treated as an international one for the purposes of the law of blockade…The law does not operate in a political vacuum and it is implausible to deny that the nature of the armed violence between Israel and Hamas goes beyond purely domestic matters.[31]

Further, the Report stated that Israel had complied with the rules of effectiveness and notification in regards to establishing a blockade.

The Report expressed that Israel had the right to enforce its blockade, and that such enforcement may take place on the high seas. It concluded that it was reasonable for the Israeli Navy to believe the vessels of the Flotilla were going to proceed to Gaza. They had ignored and openly resisted calls to re-direct to the Port of Ashdod or Al-Arish. What it also found, however, was that the Navy did not need to board the vessels before sunrise, as the ship was still 64 nautical miles outside the blockade zone and would not have reached it until after sunrise. Boarding in the dark only complicated the situation. The Report also stated that Israel did not make a real-time attempt to provide immediate warning to the vessels that IDF commandos would be boarding, and did take them by surprise in that sense. However, it conceded that the vessels were aware of the IDF presence shadowing them.[32]

Before boarding the vessels, IDF commandos launched stun and smoke grenades in order to halt any resistance by passengers. Israeli reports confirm that beanbag and

---

[31] Ibid, 40-41.
[32] Ibid, 50-51.

paintball guns were also used. The Report said that the manner and environment of the

boarding was excessive and that less violent means should have been considered and

executed. On the force used once aboard the Mavi Marmara, the Report concluded that

there was organized, pre-meditated resistance requiring the IDF commandos to use force

for their own protection. It also stated, however, that the loss of life and injuries resulting

from the used force was "unacceptable."[33]

The Report made a series of recommendations regarding how to avoid similar

incidents in the future. It suggested that Israel try its best to ease the restrictions on Gaza,

that it constantly review the necessity of its blockade, that force should be used

cautiously and as a last resort, that all humanitarian missions to Gaza go through the

established procedures Israel had created, and that states aware of their citizens' attempts

to try and break any naval blockade proactively warn them of the risks involved and try

to dissuade them from doing so. The Report suggested that Israel offer an "appropriate

statement of regret" about what happened and that it pay reasonable reparations for the

deceased and injured, which would be administered by the two governments through a

joint trust fund. Finally, it encouraged Israel and Turkey to re-establish full diplomatic

relations for the sake of Middle East stability and peace.[34]

The fallout between Israel and Turkey as a result of the Palmer Report was even

worse than after the actual Flotilla incident. Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan was

outraged, stating that he would ignore the Report's findings and still see the blockade as

illegal. In response, Turkey expelled the Israeli ambassador and other high-level Israeli

diplomats, and severed all military ties with the Jewish state. A US State Department

---

[33] Ibid, 54-60.
[34] Ibid, 70-75.

cable released by Wikileaks reported that upon her expulsion, Israeli Ambassador Gaby Levy stated, "[h]e (Erdogan) hates us…he hates us religiously and his hatred is spreading."[35]

Further, Prime Minister Erdogan officially announced that Turkish warships would escort new flotillas to Gaza. Soner Cagaptay of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy asked, "what if the Israelis decide to stop the next Turkish navy-escorted flotilla as they stopped the Turkish-backed flotilla in 2010? Will the Turkish navy ships choose to react? As chilling as this scenario sounds, it is not unlikely. If the two countries fail to slow the escalating situation, they could well find themselves in conflict."[36]

Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu said, "the time has come for Israel to pay for its stance that sees it above international laws and disregards human conscience… the first and foremost result is that Israel is going to be devoid of Turkey's friendship … as long as the Israeli government does not take the necessary steps, there will be no turning back."[37] Even though Israel's initial fears after the Flotilla incident were now being made official by Turkey's highest authorities, the government remained steadfast. It refused to apologize for the Flotilla incident, and it maintained that it would continue to enforce the Gaza blockade, now under the justification of the Palmer Report.

---

[35] Owen Matthews, "The Erdogan Doctrine," *The Daily Beast*, Sep. 12, 2011, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/09/11/why-israel-fears-the-regional-ambitions-of-turkey-s-p-m-erdogan.html.

[36] Soner Cagaptay, "Could Israel and Turkey go to war?" *CNN*, Sep. 8, 2011, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2011/09/08/cagaptay-israel-turkey-conflict/.

[37] "Julian Borger and Constanze Letsch, "Turkey expels Israel's ambassador over refusal to apologize for Gaza flotilla raid," *The Guardian*, Sep. 2, 2011, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/sep/02/turkey-israel-ambassador-mavi-marmara.

Speaking to American television personality Charlie Rose, Erdogan stated that "the killing of nine people is in fact a cause of war…that could be done if necessary."[38] He also stated that Turkey would increase its naval presence in the Mediterranean, a very serious provocation which put the Israeli military on high alert. Israel saw this as a direct threat to its own resources as there was Turkish animosity towards Israel's agreement with Cyprus on an energy sharing deal. Further, Israel had recently discovered a major gasoline field off its coast, and viewed Turkey's proclamations as a direct threat to its sovereignty over the area. In response to the threat, Israeli Energy Minister Uzi Landau stated that Israel would support and defend its rigs if necessary.

---

[38] "Erdogan on crisis with Israel: We can go to war if necessary," *Todays Zaman*, Sep. 22, 2011, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/news-257613-erdogan-on-crisis-with-israel-we-can-go-to-war-if-necessary.html.

Chapter 4- Democratic Peace Theory & the Case Study

Since Turkey and Israel are democracies, Democratic Peace Theory (DPT) proposes that institutional and normative constraints would play a primary role in preventing the two countries from engaging in physical conflict. This chapter will explore the circumstances of the Flotilla incident and the release of the United Nations (UN) Palmer Report ("the Report") to determine whether the accepted DPT causal logic played a role in halting a physical engagement. Institutional constraints will be explored first and will specifically focus on public opinion, legislative bureaucracies, and autonomous institutions. The second section will explore normative constraints, specifically shared democratic norms and mutual trust.

Institutional Constraints

DPT's institutional constraint logic states that democracies do not go to war or escalate conflicts with each other because of constraints placed upon them by the public, legislative bureaucracies and other autonomous entities within the country. Maoz and Russett state:

> International action in a democratic political system
> requires the mobilization of both general public opinion
> and of a variety of institutions that make up the system of
> government, such as the legislature, the political
> bureaucracies and key interest groups. This implies that
> very few goals could be presented to justify fighting wars
> in democracies.[1]

---

[1]Maoz and Russett, "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986," 626.

It is important to note that when exploring public constraint, three specific questions need to be addressed: is the public pacific as DPT claims? Did the public constrain the government? And, did the public hold the government accountable for its policies or actions that could have led to physical conflict?

Flotilla Incident- Turkey

The AKP Party openly supported the efforts of the Foundation for Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief (IHH) to help Gaza. While their direct involvement in helping the Flotilla is disputed, there has been evidence found on laptops confiscated by Israel following the docking of the ships in Ashdod, suggesting that Turkish officials helped organize it.   The Turkish public, however, showed no signs of concern that their government may have helped facilitate putting citizens in the line of fire. There was also very limited criticism from the Turkish public of Prime Minister Erdogan's and Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu's aggressive rhetoric and threats towards Israel.

Following the Flotilla incident Istanbul's Taksim Square was flooded with a reported ten thousand protestors showing their support for the victims of the Flotilla incident and for future flotilla attempts, as well as their animosity towards the Israeli blockade of Gaza.[2] Turkish police were forced to block dozens of stone-throwing protestors who tried to storm the Israel Consulate in Istanbul. Similar protests were also conducted in Ankara. Bulent Yildirim, chairman of the IHH, proclaimed that he had

---

[2] "Global rallies continue over Israel," *Al Jazeera*, Jun. 1, 2010, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2010/06/2010618503229683.html.

received over one million requests by individuals that wanted to join future flotillas.[3]

Further, no anti-AKP or anti-flotilla rallies seemed to have occurred in Turkey at the

time. With all of this, DPT's claim that the public is pacific does not hold. The Turkish

public acknowledged the dangerous repercussions of the flotilla movement, being

attacked by Israeli navy boats, but supported the government and the movement

nonetheless. This also makes the question of whether the public constrained the

government moot, it clearly did not.

Since the public supported the government's actions and the flotilla movement,

there was nothing for the public to hold the government accountable for. Thus, DPT's

assumption that governments which produce policies that put citizens in harm's way will

likely not get re-elected does not apply. Prime Minister Erdogan and his AKP party were

re-elected in June 2011, with a whopping 50 percent of the vote, up four points from the

last election.[4]

DPT also states that competing legislative bureaucracies and independent

institutions place a multitude of constraints on a government's ability to wage war.[5]

Following the Flotilla incident there was near universal Turkish political outrage against

Israel.[6] Devlet Bahceli, the leader of the Nationalist Movement Party, one of the AKP's

main rival parties, stated that he could not wait to see how Prime Minister Erdogan would

---

[3] "Gaza flotilla vow as thousands rally in Istanbul," Accessed Apr. 16, 2012.
[4] "AK Party wins by landslide, fails to secure majority for new constitution," *Today's Zaman*, Jun. 12, 2011, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/news-247049-ak-party-wins-by-landslide-fails-to-secure-majority-for-new-constitution.html.
[5] Maoz and Russett, "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986," 626.
[6] Congressional Research Service, *Israel's Blockade of Gaza, Mavi Marmara Incident, and Its Aftermath*, 5.

back up his indirect threats towards Israel. He also suggested that war might be necessary.[7]

Traditionally, Turkish foreign policy has been considerably influenced by the military. While the AKP party has significantly reduced the military's autonomy and control over foreign policy, it is still the most influential and powerful institution in Turkey outside of the government. Israeli-Turkish relations flourished in the 1990s and early 2000s largely because Israel played a central role in the development and modernization of the Turkish military. Israeli intelligence has also been important in the Turkish fight against the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK). Turkey is also a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which is led by the United States, Israel's staunchest ally. No Turkish institution has more to lose from an armed conflict with Israel than the military.

However, the military appeared to have no discernible objections to the Flotilla itself or the government's response to Israel. Military officials made no public complaints when three planned military exercises with Israel were cancelled or when the Turkish ambassador to Israel was recalled.[8] As can be seen, the theory that legislative bureaucracies and autonomous institutions constrain the government's ability to engage in war does not apply to Turkey in the case of the Flotilla incident.

Flotilla Incident- Israel

Israel also faced protests following the Flotilla incident, though there are varying reports about the number of protestors. The general estimate of those who took to the

---

[7] "Israel's attack blatant hostility toward Turkish nation, Bahceli says," Accessed Apr. 16, 2012.
[8] "Turkey recalls Israeli ambassador, cancels exercises," *CNN*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://news.blogs.cnn.com/2010/05/31/turkey-recalls-israeli-ambassador-cancels-exercises/.

streets is put around 6,000-8,000. Unlike Turkey, however, the protestors were divided, with several thousand protesting both against Turkish provocations and against Israel's handling of the incident.[9] Most reports state that there were more critics of the Israeli government on the streets than there were supporters. Those critical of Israel's handling marched through Tel Aviv's central hub, Rabin Square, and towards the Tel Aviv defense compound. Those protesting in support of the Israeli government's actions massed in front of the Turkish embassy. Both sides even went so far as to file petitions to the Supreme Court in support of their various causes. However, all were rejected by the Court.[10]

While government critics may have been more numerous than their counterparts on the streets, public opinion polls suggest that, in general, Israelis were quite supportive of their government's actions. A well-known Middle Eastern public opinion center, Pecther Middle East Polls, released data from a nationally representative telephone survey of 500 Israeli Jews conducted June 7, 2010. Of those polled, 45.5 percent said that the Israeli navy used the correct amount of force in commandeering the ships. Thirty-nine percent said not enough force was used and only 7.6 percent said too much force was used.

To the question of whether Israel should open Gaza to international humanitarian shipments only 9.2 percent said they strongly felt it should be opened up. Fifty-eight percent said they felt strongly that it should not. Further, on the question of how to handle a flotilla if Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan came along as well as Turkish naval

[9] Dahlia Scheindlin, "Israelis speak up," *Foreign Policy*, Jun. 10, 2010, Accessed Apr. 20, 2012, http://mideast.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/06/10/israelis_speak_up.
[10] "Court dismisses flotilla petitions," *The Jerusalem Post*, Jun. 4, 2010, Accessed Apr. 20, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=177365.

vessels, 68 percent said that they strongly agreed that Israel should do whatever it takes to stop it. Only 14 percent said that they either strongly or somewhat believed he should quietly be let in, 7 percent for each "strongly" and "somewhat." When asked about Iranian ships trying to break the blockade those who believed strongly anything should be done to stop them jumped to 77 percent.[11]

On June 9, 2010, Israeli market research institute New Wave Research conducted a poll of 561 adult Israeli Jews on their thoughts about the Flotilla incident for an Israeli publication, *Yisrael Hayom*. Ninety-two percent of those surveyed said they believed that the Flotilla should have been stopped. Ninety-one percent said that future flotillas should also be halted. Seventy-three percent said the blockade of Gaza should not be lifted. Seventy-eight percent stated that they viewed Turkey as an enemy state.[12] This data, along with the fact that there were pro-government protests, suggests that the public was not pacific, as DPT claims. This renders the question of whether they constrained the Israeli government's ability to go to war and whether they held the government accountable moot.

Christopher Layne and Sebastian Rosato also provide an intriguing theory about a public's ability to constrain its government from engaging in conflict. Layne's general argument is "[i]f citizens and policy makers of a democracy were especially sensitive to the human and material costs of war, that sensitivity should be evident whenever their state is on the verge of war, regardless of whether the adversary is democratic: the lives

[11] "June 7, 2010 Israeli Poll on aftermath of Ship Boarding: Top Line Results," *Pechter Polls*, Jun. 8, 2010, Accessed Apr. 20, 2012, http://www.pechterpolls.com/june-7-2010-israeli-poll-on-aftermath-of-ship-boarding-top-line-results/.

[12] "Poll: Israelis Support Flotilla Raid, Gaza Blockade, PM and IDF," *Arutz Sheva: Israel National News*, Jun. 11, 2010, Accessed Apr. 20, 2010, http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/138009#.T5HoVasV1IQ.

lost and money spent will be the same."[13] Corroborating this suggestion, Rosato provides

a convincing assertion that "democratic leaders are as likely to lead as to follow public

opinion...Any call to defend or spread 'our way of life,' for example, is likely to have a

strong resonance in democratic polities…"[14] Throughout history Israeli leaders have

consistently proven that they are willing to lead, or go to war, without consulting public

opinion.   In 1956 Israel joined a coalition with the U.K. and France and attacked Egypt

in order to put the Suez Canal back in Western control. In 1967 Israel preemptively

attacked Egypt and took control of the Sinai Peninsula. In 1973, Israel was caught off

guard and took heavy casualties. Prime Minister Golda Meir and Defense Minister

Moshe Dayan both resigned under heavy public pressure.[15] Nonetheless, Israel invaded

Southern Lebanon only five years later in 1978, and again in 1982.

The 1982 invasion was particularly unpopular war in Israel, but the Israel Defense

Forces (IDF) did not fully withdraw from the territory until 2000. In 2006, Israel fought

a war with Hezbollah, a recognized terrorist group based out of Lebanon, and was largely

seen to have made serious strategic errors costing it heavier casualties than first

anticipated. Public pressure forced then Chief of Staff Dan Halutz to resign and played a

role in Prime Minister Ehud Olmert's resignation in 2007. Nonetheless, Israel carried out

another full-scale invasion of Gaza in 2009. Since its formation, Israel has acted without

consulting the public. In any event, the Israeli public largely agreed with government

action in the case of the Flotilla, so the question of whether the public held the

government accountable is irrelevant.

---

[13] Layne, "Kant of Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace," 12.
[14] Rosato, "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory," 595.
[15] Arnold Blumberg, *The History of Israel*, (Greenwood: Westport, 1998): 123.

The Israeli parliament is one of the most unstable in the world. The way the electoral system is set up governments are built on vulnerable coalitions, which many of the parties included have highly competing interests. Of the four prime ministers that served from 1996-2009, none completed their term, and three of them either resigned or called early elections for political reasons (Ariel Sharon was incapacitated after he had a stroke). The Kadima party won the 2009 election, but because party leader Tzipi Livni was unable to put together a working coalition government she was forced to allow the opposition Likud party to put one together with its leader, Benjamin Netanyahu, as its head. Even with all the inter-governmental tensions, instability, and infighting, criticism was minimal after the Flotilla incident. The only outspoken governmental dissident of Israel's actions was Hanin Zoabi, an MK in the Arab Balad party who was a passenger on the Mavi Maramara. Balad is a minority party and not in the coalition, its power and influence is minimal. Legislative constraints did not exist, as the leading coalition had near universal support for its actions and policies.

The Israeli Supreme Court sided with the government and IDF on all matters related to the Flotilla. This is significant as the Court has gained a reputation in the world of jurisprudence for being particularly independent. Its show of support in the Flotilla incident is outside the norm, as it has regularly ruled against government and IDF actions and decisions. In March 2000 it ruled that Arabs could settle on Jewish National Fund lands. In January 2003 it overturned a decision by the Central Election Commission to disqualify the Balad Party and its then leader, Ahmed Tibi, who had been a long-time adviser to Yasser Arafat. The court has consistently ordered the re-routing of the West Bank security barrier, reducing the amount of West Bank territory it encompasses and

bringing it closer to the Green Line. It also forced open Route 443 connecting Mod'in and Jerusalem to Palestinian traffic, even though it was believed vulnerable to terrorism.[16]

Following the Flotilla incident, three petitions demanded information on the whereabouts of all or some of the passengers after they were taken into custody, but they were rejected. Further, the court stated that it supported the IDF's actions on the Mavi Marmara saying, "the soldiers were forced to respond in order to defend their lives. Unfortunately, the action ended with the loss of lives. Nine people were killed and soldiers and flotilla participants were wounded."[17]

Israel also has a wide ranging network of non-governmental organizations, many of which act as watchdogs on Israeli policy in the Palestinian territories. Following the Flotilla incident, the major organizations, including the New Israel Fund and B'tselem, expressed regret over the deaths of the Turkish nationals, as well as a desire to see the blockade of Gaza eased and an internal investigation on the incident. However, neither discussed any concern over conflict with Turkey or whether the IDF should or should not handle future flotillas in the same manner. Again, the argument that autonomous institutions will place constraints on the executive branch's ability to wage war is largely moot. In this case the Israeli Supreme Court was in agreement with government actions and policies, and Israeli NGOs were less interested in the events with Turkey as they were with humanitarian issues inside Gaza.

---

[16] "A resonant flotilla ruling from the High Court," *The Jerusalem Post*, Jun. 6, 2010, Accessed Apr. 20, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Editorials/Article.aspx?id=177581.

[17] "Court dismisses flotilla petitions," *The Jerusalem Post*, June 4, 2010, Accessed April 20, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=177365.

UN Palmer Report- Turkey

While the release of the UN Palmer Report did not bring Turks to the streets the same way the Flotilla incident did, public opinion on the Turkish government changed little over that span of time. Following the Report's release Turkey made direct military threats to Israel, with little to no public backlash. Additionally, Prime Minister Erdogan and his AKP Party had been granted another term in office just two months before the Report's release with an overwhelming 50 percent of the vote. The public was not pacific and it did not constrain the government's ability to escalate conflict with Israel, nor was the government held accountable by the public.

Additionally, at the time of the Report's release the Turkish public was experiencing a heightened sense of pride and elitism in the Middle East. As the Arab Spring was picking up Turkey was being lauded as the example that revolution stricken countries should strive to emulate.[18] While the Arab Spring countries were keen to understand Turkey's democracy so as to implement it in their own states, Turkey's popularity coincided with its growing resistance to Israel and its reaction to the Report. The Arab League Secretary-General Nabi Al-Arabi stated that Turkey's reaction to the report was appropriate and normal. "As far as I reviewed it, many facts have been ignored in the UN report which shows the blockage of Gaza as legitimate. The decision taken by Turkey is an appropriate and normal reaction. It is the decision which would be expected from Turkey," Al-Arabi said.[19] The Organization of Islamic Cooperation Secretary-General Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu voiced support for Turkey's reaction and its

---

[18] Gonul Tol, "Erodgan's Arab Spring Tour," *Middle East Institute*, Sep. 21, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.mei.edu/content/erdogans-arab-spring-tour.

[19] "OIC, Arab League lash out at Palmer report as 'biased'," *Todays Zaman* Sep. 4, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/newsDetail_getNewsById.action?newsId=255724.

expulsion of Israel's ambassador and severing of military ties. Ihsanoglu said that "Israel should be compelled to lift this embargo and be held accountable for all its illegal actions."[20]

In November 2011, the Brookings Institute's Shibley Telhami conducted an Arab public opinion poll in which he surveyed 3,000 people from various Arab countries. Fifty percent polled thought that Turkey had played the most constructive role in the Arab Spring. Twenty-two percent polled said the leader they admired most outside of their own country was Prime Minister Erdogan (the next closest was Hassan Nasrallah with 13 percent). Of the 750 Egyptians polled, 44 percent said they wanted their next leader to be like Prime Minister Erdogan (the next closest was King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia with 9 percent).[21]

The AKP's handling of the Palmer Report did get met with criticism from the main opposition party, the Republican People's Party (CHP). Its leader, Kemal Kilicdaroglu, stated that Erodgan's decision to cut military ties and expel the Israeli ambassador was "pointless…no good can come of it and there is no need for us to risk our interest with petty actions."[22] As for the threats to send the Turkish navy to escort ships to break the blockade of Gaza, Kilicdaroglu called on Erdogan to "justify" them in Parliament, stating that the Red Crescent was already sending aid to Gaza without breaching the blockade.[23]

---

[20]Ibid.

[21] Shibley Telhami, "2011 Annual Arab Public Opinion Survey," *University of Maryland*, Oct. 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/reports/2011/1121_arab_public_opinion_telhami/1121_arab_public_opinion.pdf.

[22] Aviel Magnezi, "Erdogan painted himself into a corner,' *Ynetnews*, Sep. 4, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4117626,00.html.

[23] Susan Fraser, "Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Turkey Prime Minister, Says Gaza Aid Ships Will Be Escorted

Regardless of the CHP's sentiments, it is important to note that their power was significantly limited. The party won only 26 percent of the vote in the previous election, was headed by new leadership, was suffering from infighting, and was still struggling to come up with a platform and identity that would make it a credible and relevant party.[24] Further, its reputation was slightly tarnished after a scandal in which its former long-time leader was videotaped having an affair with a former colleague. Thus, there was little reaction to the party's complaints, and legislative constraint on the government was minimal.

As stated before, no Turkish institution or entity had more to lose from a war with Israel than the military. However, it neither intervened nor made significant verbal objections following both the downgrading of diplomatic ties with Israel and the suspension of all military associations following the release of the Report. Furthermore, it did nothing when Erdogan threatened Israel by stating that the Turkish navy would escort future humanitarian missions to break the blockade of Gaza. As noted earlier, even though the military's autonomy has been reduced by the AKP party over the last several years, it is still extremely powerful. In a poll conducted by Yilmaz Esmer of Bahcesehir University under the auspices of the 2011 World Values Survey, 75 percent of Turks polled supported the military. Though that number is down from 94 percent in 1996, it is still significant. Murat Somer, associate professor of international relations at

---

By Country's Navy," *The Huffington* Post, Sep. 9, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/09/09/recep-tayyip-erdogan-gaza_n_955196.html

[24] "Will the CHP, Turkey's Main Opposition Party, Ever Become a Relevant Political Alternative?," *Crethi Plethi*, Sep. 6, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.crethiplethi.com/will-the-chp-turkeys-main-opposition-party-ever-become-a-relevant-political-alternative/islamic-countries/turkey/2011/.

Koc University said about the poll, "…the image of the Turkish military traditionally has been strong and some people rely on the military because they distrust the government."[25]

UN Palmer Report- Israel

The UN Palmer Report was met in Israel with praise, thus offering the government credibility and justification for its blockade of Gaza and its right to defend it. Public opinion polls after the Flotilla incident suggested that Israelis supported the blockade and the use of force to defend it. The Palmer Report only reinforced these sentiments. The public was clearly not pacific, and the fact that it supported the government's policies again renders the questions of whether the public constrained the government or held it accountable moot.

The Report was also released during Israel's mass social protests in which hundreds of thousands of people all over the country were marching in the streets demanding social reforms. No reports can be found about protests relating to the blockade of Gaza or Israel's response to Turkey that it would not change its policies even in the wake of Turkish threats or ultimatums.

The Israeli government's position on the Flotilla and blockade of Gaza was reinforced by the Report. As such, following the Report's release and the subsequent Turkish threats there were no constraints on the government by either the legislative bureaucracy or powerful autonomous institutions, including major Israeli NGOs.

---

[25] Menekse Tokyay, "World Values Survey reveals important trends in Turkey," *South Eastern Times*, May 8, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/08/05/feature-03.

Normative Constraints

Since there were few institutional constraints in the cases under study, we now turn to another possible explanation: normative constraints. According to the normative constraints logic of DPT, democracies intentionally externalize domestic democratic preferences for solving conflicts peacefully and finding ways to reconcile and compromise. These shared norms in turn constrain two democracies from engaging in conflict. According to Russett and Maoz:

> democratic regimes are based on political norms that
> emphasize regulated political competition through peaceful
> means…Political conflicts in democracies are resolved
> through compromise... This norm allows for an
> atmosphere of 'live and let live'...It follows that when two
> democracies confront one another in conflicts of interest,
> they are able effectively to apply democratic norms in their
> interaction, thereby preventing most conflicts from
> escalating to a militarized level, involving the threat,
> display, or use of military force, and-of-course from going
> to all-out war…disputes between democracies are more
> likely to be settled by third-party conflict management, by
> agreement or by stalemate.[26]

A byproduct of the shared norms logic is that democracies also trust one another, further constraining them from having a conflict.[27]

Flotilla Incident

Based on the aftermath of the Flotilla incident, shared democratic norms do not appear to have played a significant role in constraining the two countries from conflict. Ankara immediately announced that it would recall its ambassador to Israel and call off all military exercises with Israel. At the UN, only a day after the incident, Turkey's

---

[26]Russett and Maoz, "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986," 625.
[27] Doyle, "Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace," 464.

Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu aggressively demanded an immediate Israeli apology, an end to the blockade of Gaza, and international legal action against Israel.[28]

He also stated that "normalization of Turkish-Israeli relations was out of the question," unless Israel conformed with international law, which to Turkey meant lifting the blockade, which they saw as illegal.[29] One month after the incident Prime Minister Erdogan said in a televised interview that an Israeli apology would be a condition for continued Turkish mediation in any future peace talks between Israel and Syria. He also stated that Israel must provide reparations for those killed in the operation.[30] Further, there were reports coming out of Ankara that Turkish naval ships might escort future flotillas to Gaza.

Israeli officials were not as vocal or verbally aggressive as the Turkish government, nor did they take any diplomatic action. When the Israeli Prime Minister found out about the Flotilla situation, he was in Canada meeting with Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper. At a photo-op he announced that he was cancelling a trip to the US and going home to take care of the situation. In the statement he did not refer to Turkey, speaking only of Israeli policy on the blockade. He commented: "regrettably in this exchange at least 10 people died. We regret this loss of life. We regret any violence that was there. We would like – I would like to wish speedy recovery to the wounded, including to four of our own soldiers."[31] However, Prime Minister Netanyahu repeatedly

---

[28] "Bloody Israeli raid on flotilla sparks crisis," *MSNBC*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012,
   http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/37423584/ns/world_news-mideast_n_africa/t/bloody-israeli-raid-
   flotilla-sparks-crisis/#.T5MjJ6sV1IQ.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Natasha Mozgovaya, "Erdogan: Israel must apologize for Gaza flotilla, blockade," *Haaretz*, Jun. 29,
   2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012. http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/erdogan-israel-
   must-apologize-for-gaza-flotilla-blockade-1.298932.
[31] "FULL TEXT- Statement by Israel's Netanyahu on flotilla deaths." *Reuters*, May 31, 2010, Accessed
   Apr. 21, 2012, http://in.reuters.com/article/2010/05/31/idINIndia-48947620100531.

responded to Turkey's apology demand by saying that "Israel will not apologize for the events."[32] He also continually stated that the blockade policy would not change, regardless of international pressures.

Normative constraint logic also suggests that democracies have a mutual trust. As a result, when a conflict of interest or disagreement does arise, this trust constrains them from resorting to violence.[33] In this case, trust between Turkey and Israel was obviously absent. The Turkish Metro Poll Strategic and Social Research Center (Metro Poll) conducted a two question public opinion poll to find out what Turks thought about the Flotilla situation. The first question asked was: "Why do you think Israel attacked the Gaza flotilla?" The three response options given were: to halt a breach of the blockade; to undermine the Turkish Prime Minister domestically and internationally; and "don't know." Forty-five percent answered that they believed Israel wanted to discredit Prime Minister Erdogan. Only 33.2 percent believed it was to enforce the blockade.[34]

Another public opinion poll conducted by Metro Poll in February 2011 found that out of 2,000 Turks surveyed, 28 percent thought Israel was Turkey's number one enemy. Only America ranked higher at 42 percent.[35] In April 2010, the BBC World Service Poll found that 77 percent of Turks polled had negative views of Israel. In a 2009 Pew Global Attitudes survey, 73 percent of Turks polled rated their opinions of Jews as "negative."[36]

---

[32] "Leaders Express Regret for Loss of Life Despite Pre-Meditated Attack," *The Israel Project*, Jun 6, 2012, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.theisraelproject.org/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=hsJPK0PIJpH&b=689705&ct=8427261&printmode=1.

[33] Doyle, "Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace," 464.

[34] "Israel's Gaza Flotilla Attack-June 2010," *Metro Poll Strategical and Social Research Center*, Jun. 3, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.metropoll.com.tr/report/israels-gaza-flotilla-attack-june-2010-en.

[35] "Poll: US, Israel Turkey's main enemies," *Press TV*, Mar. 8, 2011, Accessed Apr, 21, 2012, http://edition.presstv.ir/detail/168904.html.

[36] Steven J. Rosen, "Erdogan and the Israel Card," *Middle Eastern Forum*, Jun. 10, 2010, Accessed Apr.

Upon learning of the incident while on a trip in Chile, Prime Minister Erodgan stated that Israel was guilty of "state terrorism." Foreign Minister Davutoglu compared the attacks to 9/11 for Turkey.[37] This interpretation ignored the fact that the 9/11 attack on the United States was pre-meditated and undertaken against civilians who were doing nothing but going to work. The official Turkish Foreign Ministry press release on the incident stated that "Israel has once again clearly demonstrated that it does not value human life and peaceful initiatives through targeting innocent civilians."[38]

Israel made it clear that it no longer trusted Turkey when it issued a travel warning to Israelis. The warning stated: "in response to the events surrounding the flotilla, there are growing protests by the government and public in Turkey. This delicate state of affairs is liable to deteriorate into violent outbreaks against Israelis in Turkey."[39] Turkey had previously been known as a popular tourist spot for Israelis. Further, it would be hard to imagine that Israeli officials would trust Turkey following the diplomatic maneuvers and harsh and derisive general comments made about Israel following the incident. Israel has also been suspicious, albeit quietly, about the motivation of the AKP party since Prime Minister Erdogan invited Hamas officials to Ankara in 2006.

The lack trust between Turkey and Israel in general is not surprising. After all, the alliance has not been historically based on shared norms and values. The relationship

---

21, 2012, http://www.meforum.org/2668/erdogan-and-the-israel-card.

[37]Ibid.

[38] "No:115, 31 May 2010, Press Release Regarding the Use of Force by the Israeli Defense Forces Against the Humanitarian Aid Flotilla to Gaza," *Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_-115_-31-may-2010_--press-release-regarding-the--use-of-force-by-the-israeli-defense-forces-against-the-humanitarian-aid-fleet-to-gaza.en.mfa.

[39] "Israel issues travel warning to Turkey," *The Jerusalem Post*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=177002.

has mainly been centered on the balance of power in the Middle East. Gaps in the relationship can largely be attributed to Turkey's desire to shift its policies away from the West, in favor of the Arab states. Further, Turkey is a Muslim country and Israel Jewish, each with a completely different ethnic makeup. Although the two work together, there has traditionally been a deep seeded historical mistrust of Israel on the part of the Muslim community. Likewise, Israel has traditionally mistrusted the Muslim world based on what it perceives as continued Muslim hostility.

In view of the lack of trust, Turkey and Israel went to the brink of war following the Flotilla incident. But as DPT normative constraint logic suggests, the two states compromised by agreeing to an external intermediary in their efforts at reconciliation. They both agreed to a UN international investigation of the incident. The reason for this stems partly from both countries' relationship with the United States.

At the time of the Flotilla, United States-Turkish relations were at an all-time low. Ankara had recently refused to vote "yes" or even abstain from a UN vote to apply heavier sanctions on Iran, and had failed to ratify the protocols on the establishment of diplomatic relations with Armenia, both to the frustration of the United States.[40] Going to war with Israel would have put Turkey in a potentially irreconcilable situation with the United States, as Israel and the United States have a "special relationship." Further, it would have created a very complicated situation with NATO, of which Turkey is a member and the United States the main sponsor.

Turkey's distancing and disagreements with the United States went hand in hand with its increasing regional stature. However, Turkey's relations with Washington and

---

[40] Omer Taspinar, "2010: A difficult year in Turkish-American relations," *Todays Zaman*, Dec. 27, 2010, Accessed May 1, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/columnist-230770-2010-a-difficultyear-in-turkish-american-relations.html.

NATO have been crucial to its continued success. Over the last several decades, the

United States and NATO have helped build and maintain Turkey's military, and have

provided a valuable deterrent.[41] Going to war with Israel could have potentially halted

any future defense coordination, which was particularly important given the deteriorating

cooperation between the Israel Defense Forces and the Turkish military.

At the time, Israel's relationship with the United States was also extremely

strained. The two had been clashing diplomatically over the Palestinian peace process.

United States President Barak Obama made peace a foreign policy priority upon his

inauguration as president. However, he was met with disdain on the part of Israeli

officials, who perceived his proposals as problematic and as putting unfair pressure on

the Israeli government.[42] Tensions were exacerbated when settlement construction

increased. In one case of bad timing, Israel announced a major settlement construction

plan in East Jerusalem while United States Vice President Joe Biden was paying a visit.

The peace process issue by itself was not enough to endanger US-Israel relations.

But combined with a conflict with Turkey, a NATO member and a crucial US partner in

Iraq and the fight against terror, there would be an unprecedented strain on the

relationship. Israel could not afford to find itself in such a situation. Moreover, the

United States was playing a crucial role in pressing Iran to halt its nuclear program.

Israel believes that Iran is the most dangerous existential threat it has ever faced. The

Jewish state needs the United States to garner global support on this issue, as well as to

help Israel should it decide to attack Iranian facilities. While a conflict with Turkey may

---

[41] Meneske Tokyay, "Turkey and NATO: 60 Years On," *International Strategic Research Organization*,
Feb. 14, 2012, Accessed May 1, 2012, http://www.usak.org.tr/EN/makale.asp?id=2575.

[42] Ari Shavit, "Israel fears Obama heading for imposed Mideast settlement," *Haaretz*, Mar. 29, 2012,
Accessed May 1, 2012, http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-fears-obama-heading-
for-imposed-mideast-settlement-1.265466.

not have jeopardized the long-term health of the Israel-US relationship, it could have significantly undermined and side-tracked US and Israeli efforts on the Iranian front.

UN Palmer Report

Like the Flotilla incident, DPT logic on shared democratic norms and trust played no noticeable role in constraining conflict between Turkey and Israel following the release of the UN Palmer Report. The Report was publicly leaked before its official release date, and upon hearing that it would not favor Turkey's stance on the legality of the blockade Turkish Foreign Minister Davutoglu stated: "for us the deadline [for the formal Israeli apology] is the day the UN report gets released, or we resort to Plan B."[43] He also said that "Turkey will be imposing sanctions that are well known by Israel and some other international parties."[44]

After the Report's official release Prime Minister Erdogan rejected its credibility and said that Turkey would still maintain the position that the blockade was illegal. His position was supported by many in the international community, including a panel of five independent UN rights experts reporting to the UN Human Rights Council.[45] He also stated that the Flotilla incident was "grounds for war."[46] Further, Turkey asked all top Israeli diplomats to leave, including the Israeli ambassador, and suspended all military ties.

---

[43] Yitzhak Benhorin, "Turkish ultimatum to Israel: Apologize or face 'plan B'," *Ynetnews*, Sep. 1, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4116792,00.html.

[44] Marcy Oster, "Turkey issues apology ultimatum to Israel," *Jewish Journal*, Sep. 1, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.jewishjournal.com/israel/article/turkey_in_warning_to_israel_you_have_one_day_to_ apologize_for_gaza_flotilla/.

[45] "U.N. experts say Israel's blockade of Gaza illegal," *Reuters*, Sep.13, 2011, Accessed May 1, 2012, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/09/13/us-un-gaza-rights-idUSTRE78C59R20110913.

[46] "Erdogan says flotilla raid was 'cause for war'," *Ynetnews*, Sep. 12, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4121204,00.html.

Israel officially accepted the Report, although it rejected a section of its findings regarding the use of excessive force. In his official statement, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said: "The State of Israel has adopted the Palmer Report, with the exception of the reservations detailed by the Israeli representative to the Palmer Commission. As advised in the report, Israel once again expresses its regret over the loss of life, but will not apologize for its soldiers taking action to defend their lives."[47] In speaking about Israel's relationship with Turkey he said:

> Israel cherishes the significant ties, past and present, between the Turkish and Jewish peoples. For that reason, the State of Israel has made numerous attempts in the last few months to settle the dispute between the countries, but regrettably, these attempts have not been successful. The state of Israel hopes that a way will be found to move beyond this discord and will continue its endeavors to that end.

Nonetheless, Israel remained intransigent on issuing a formal apology as well as on changing its Gaza policies.

Israeli hardline Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman went to the extreme of suggesting that perhaps Israel should begin providing weapons to the PKK. He threatened: "we'll exact a price from Erdogan that will prove to him that messing with Israel doesn't pay off...Turkey better treat us with respect and common decency."[48] However, the Prime Minister's office quickly distanced itself from Lieberman and called for restraint with regards to all statements regarding Turkey.[49]

---

[47] "Prime Minister's Office announcement following publication of Palmer Report by UN Secretary General," *The Consulate General of Israel to New England*, Sep. 3, 2011, Accessed Apr., 22, 2012, http://boston.mfa.gov.il/index.php/en/news/breakingnews/566-prime-ministers-response-to-the-palmer-report.

[48] Shimon Shiffer, "Israel to 'punish' Turkey," Ynetnews, Sep. 9, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4119984,00.html.

[49] Barak Ravid, "Netanyahu's office distances itself from Lieberman's planned measures against Turkey,"

The lack of trust between Turkey and Israel following the release of the Palmer Report was even higher than after the Flotilla incident. Prime Minister Erdogan said that Turkey would boost its naval presence in the Mediterranean Sea. "Turkish warships will be tasked with protecting the Turkish boats bringing humanitarian aid to the Gaza strip," he said.[50] There was also mistrust over energy resources. Israel had just recently begun talks with Cyprus over energy sharing and Israel had also found a significant portion of natural gasoline off its coast. "We have taken action to make sure that the natural resources of the eastern Mediterranean will not benefit Israel alone…Israel is beginning to say that it has the right to be active in exclusive economic zones…they do not have that right," Erdogan said.[51]

Following Turkish threats to use naval ships to escort future flotillas to Gaza and to increase its naval presence in the Mediterranean, it was clear that Israel distrusted Turkey and took the threats seriously. Israel stated that it would continue to defend the blockade of Gaza and vowed to protect its gas rigs in the Mediterranean. When asked about whether Israel would safeguard the gas platforms following the Turkish threat Energy Minister Uzi Landau respondded, "That [is] the simple answer I can give."[52]

In sum, shared democratic norms and trust played a minimal role in constraining conflict between Turkey and Israel following the Palmer Report. However, as in the Flotilla incident, even though the two states were on the brink physical conflict was

Haaretz, Sep. 9, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/netanyahu-s-office-distances-itself-from-lieberman-s-planned-measures-against-turkey-1.383561.

[50] Thomas Seibert, "Recep Tayyip Erdogan says Turkish navy will protect Gaza aid ships," *The National*, Sep. 10, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.thenational.ae/news/world/middle-east/recep-tayyip-erdogan-says-turkish-navy-will-protect-gaza-aid-ships.

[51] Ibid.

[52] "Israel vows to defend gas after Turkey threatens to boost navy patrols in Mediterranean," *Haaretz*, Sep. 11, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/israel-vows-to-defend-gas-after-turkey-threatens-to-boost-navy-patrols-in-mediterranean-1.383820.

somehow avoided. This time, however, there was no third party intervention in as much as the tensions arose out of a third party (UN) attempt at reconciliation itself. Only 14 months had elapsed between the Flotilla incident and the Palmer report. The issues surrounding both nations' relationship with the United States remained. In fact, Israel's relationship with the United States had deteriorated even further since the Flotilla incident following a controversial speech in which President Obama called for peace negotiations with the Palestinians to be based on the 1967 borders-- something no previous US president had every publicly said.

The Arab Spring uprisings had also spread to Syria where a protracted civil conflict seemed inevitable. In view of this, the idea of conflict between Israel and Turkey lost steam. Leading up to the Arab Spring Turkey had been working to improve its relations with the Arab states, and in particular Syria. When conflict erupted Turkey, a model of Islamic democracy, felt tremendous pressure on Turkey to intervene.[53] Likewise, Israel turned its attention to that conflict, out of concern for its own security being that there is no peace treaty between Israel and Syria. Israel is concerned about the outcome as it relates to its own security. There is no peace treaty between Israel and Syria. With the growing humanitarian crisis and violence in Syria, neither Israel nor Turkey had any incentive to get involved in a conflict.

[53] Ceren Kumova and Noah Blaser, "Under Pressure to act on Syria, Turkey rules out intervention," *Todays Zalman*, Nov. 20, 2011, Accessed May 1, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/newsDetail_getNewsById.action?load=detay&newsId=263319&link=263319.

Chapter 5- Conclusion

Democratic peace theory (DPT) can be said to have limited applicability to small democratic powers such as Israel and Turkey. Balance of power and self-interest appear to play a much larger role in determining outcomes in states that may share some democratic norms, but are different culturally and ethnically. In Turkey's case its current interests lie more in deepening its relations with Middle Eastern Muslim states than with Israel. Israel meanwhile, prioritizes its security, surrounded as it is by hostile states.

Size may be another factor. Small developing powers struggle to provide economic, political, and military security for their citizens in the face of fewer resources than their great power counterparts. Their immediate concerns are therefore likely to take precedence in a crisis over values or norms. Small powers such as those in Europe opted for historical neutralism in order to protect their interests. Today, with few security concerns, they are focused on cooperation and conflict avoidance. On the other hand, countries such as Turkey and Israel are still trying to determine how best to deal with their security problems. While they are advanced and democratic enough to care about peaceful conflict resolution, they may not always avoid verbal belligerence and brinkmanship as a way to harness popular nationalism and to promote or defend their interests.

In both Turkey and Israel, because the public and parliament were generally supportive of government actions, institutional constraints played no identifiable part in preventing conflict and were largely irrelevant. The general public was not found to be pacific as DPT suggests, so the issue of constraining the government's ability to engage in physical conflict and thus hold them accountable was rendered moot. Furthermore,

Rosato's claim that leaders are more likely to lead than to give way to public opinion has generally been supported historically by the hardline positions taken by successive Israeli governments. Thus, even if public opinion in this case had been opposed, it is doubtful whether the Israeli government would have given way.

Normative constraints also provided little explanation for why the two states avoided physical conflict in both situations. Except for the fact that war was indeed averted, neither country acted in line with the theory that their shared democratic norms would lead them to trust each other or opt for a peaceful and compromising resolution. Each made clear their willingness to escalate conflict if necessary, making direct and indirect threats towards one another. Both made provocations, either militarily or politically, that put the other in a state of distrust. Instead, it is suggested here that both Turkey's and Israel's relationships with the United States, which for both largely revolves around political, military, and economic security, helped secure their restraint. In the case of the Palmer Report, the outbreak of violence in Syria also added a disincentive to wage war.

The case study did not address one topic which many DPT theorists argue is important to halting conflict between democracies, economic interdependence. Turkey and Israel have soaring trade, and outside of the military and tourism realms, this has been largely unaffected by the recent transgressions.[1] It is more than reasonable, even likely, that these economic ties played a factor in halting conflict between the two. However, this has no relation to the two being democracies, especially given the failings of the logic behind institutional and normative constraints. Economic ties play just as

---

[1] Nadav Shemer, "Israel-Turkey trade soars despite tensions," *The Jerusalem Post*, Oct. 24, 2011, Accessed Apr. 28, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Headlines/Article.aspx?id=242985.

large a role in halting conflict between democracies and authoritarian regimes as they do between competing democracies. Thus, the world's strongest democracies have had long standing relationships with the oil rich Middle Eastern countries, even though they continually engage in anti-Western violence and propaganda. In fact, in this case Turkey's growing relationship with Arab countries was actually an impetus to conflict with Israel.

In reviewing the history of the Turkish-Israeli relationship, it comes as no surprise that DPT was unable to offer an explanation for the avoidance of physical conflict. Since its inception in the middle stages of the 20th century, the alliance has never been based on democratic institutions, shared democratic principles, or trust. It was founded on regional balance of power interests, shared ethnic isolation and individual state interests. As was explained in chapter two, both have consistently used each other as balance of power allies, with Turkey proving to be the more influential power in deciding when the alliance would heat up or cool down. When Turkey wanted to be closer to the Arab states in the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s, it distanced itself from Israel. When it wanted to increase its connection to the West in the 1980s it upgraded and placed a higher importance on relations with Israel. Since 2006 Turkey has shown signs of tilting back to the Arab states, and harsh treatment of Israel has proven to be a quick and effective way to gain credibility, popularity, and praise in the Middle East. While the alliance has been largely dictated by Turkey, Israel's interest in the relationship can also be largely found in its desire to balance against its regional enemies.

Arab nationalism and pan-Islam were significant factors in Turkey and Israel forming an alliance. The two countries shared a feeling of alienation based on ethnic

identity, as well as protection of their secular ways of life. However, Arab nationalism has subsided in recent years, and the Justice and Development Party has promoted its conservative brand or politics in Turkey, eliminating a major reason for its union with Israel.

Lastly, the Turkish-Israeli partnership has been largely driven by self-interest. Turkey's relationship with Israel really blossomed in the 1990s when it wanted closer ties with the United States and the European Union. It was also interested in Israel's military resources, including hardware, training, and intelligence sharing. Similarly, in the 1950s Israel was interested in getting closer to the United States, at the time a major ally of Turkey. Later, Israel was interested in finding Muslim allies to help provide credibility, regional stability, and deterrence against its neighbors. When Turkey made its desire to re-align known in the 1980s, Israel was happy to oblige.

Overall, this case study challenges and helps disprove DPT as it relates to small states. However, continued discussion and debate about the effects and applicability of DPT, specifically in regard to small powers, should be continued, and has never been more important or relevant. Countries that were once considered small powers-- Brazil, India, and South Africa--- have seen their influence and power increase tremendously throughout the last decade. There is a need to understand small power behavior, especially as it relates to conflict. As the international political environment continues to change, the international relations community needs to test and adapt its theories to new circumstances.

Works Cited

"A resonant flotilla ruling from the High Court," *The Jerusalem Post*, Jun. 6, 2010, Accessed Apr. 20, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Editorials/Article.aspx?id=177581.

"AK Party wins by landslide, fails to secure majority for new constitution," *Today's Zaman*, Jun. 12, 2011, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/news-247049-ak-party-wins-by-landslide-fails-to-secure-majority-for-new-constitution.html.

"Ancient Greek Democracy," *The History Channel*, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://www.history.com/topics/ancient-greece-democracy.

"Background Note: United Arab Emirates," U.S. Department of Defense, Dec. 29, 2011, Accessed, May 10, 2012, http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5444.htm.

Bengio, Ofra, *The Turkish-Israeli Relationship: Changing Ties of Middle Eastern Partners*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Benhorin, Yitzhak, "Turkish ultimatum to Israel: Apologize or face 'plan B'," *Ynetnews*, Sep. 1, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4116792,00.html.

Benoit, Kenneth, "Democracies Really Are More Pacific: Reexamining Democracy and War Involvement," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 40.4 (Dec. 1996): 636-657.

Bilefsky, Dan and Sebnem Arsu, "Charges Against Journalists Dim the Democratic Glow in Turkey," *The New York Times*, Jan. 4, 2012, Accessed Mar. 21, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/05/world/europe/turkeys-glow-dims-as-government-limits-free-speech.html?pagewanted=all.

"Blockade of Gaza," *Global Security*, Accessed Apr. 2, 2012, http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/palestine/gaza-blockade.htm.

"Bloody Israeli raid on flotilla sparks crisis," *MSNBC*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/37423584/ns/world_news-mideast_n_africa/t/bloody-israeli-raid-flotilla-sparks-crisis/#.T5MjJ6sV1IQ.

Blumberg, Arnold, *The History of Israel*, (Greenwood: Westport, 1998).

Borger, Julian and Constanze Letsch, "Turkey expels Israel's ambassador over refusal to apologize for Gaza flotilla raid," *The Guardian*, Sep. 2, 2011, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/sep/02/turkey-israel-ambassador-mavi-marmara.

Burtenshaw, Claude J. "The Political Theory of Pluralist Democracy," *The Western Political Quarterly*, 21.4 (Dec. 1968): 577-587.

Cagaptay, Soner, "Could Israel and Turkey go to war?" *CNN*, Sep. 8, 2011, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2011/09/08/cagaptay-israel-turkey-conflict/.

Central Intelligence Agency, *The World Factbook: Turkey*, Updated Apr. 12, 2012, Accessed Apr. 15, 2012, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tu.html.

"Condemnation Follows Israeli Raid on Gaza Flotilla," *NPR*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=127286256.

"Court dismisses flotilla petitions," *The Jerusalem Post*, Jun. 4, 2010, Accessed Apr. 20, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=177365.

Dahl, Robert, "Equality and Power in American Society," in William V.D'Antonio and Howard J. Ehrlich (eds.), *Power and Democracy in America* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961): 73-91.

Doyle, Michael, "Liberalism and World Politics," *The American Political Science Review*, 80.4 (Dec.1986): 1151-1169.

Doyle, Michael, "Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace," *American Political Science Review*, 99.3 (Aug. 2005): 463-466.

"Erdogan on crisis with Israel: We can go to war if necessary," *Todays Zaman*, Sep. 22, 2011, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/news-257613-erdogan-on-crisis-with-israel-we-can-go-to-war-if-necessary.html.

"Erdogan says flotilla raid was 'cause for war'," *Ynetnews*, Sep. 12, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4121204,00.html.

Fraser, Susan, "Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Turkey Prime Minister, Says Gaza Aid Ships Will Be Escorted By Country's Navy," Sep. 9, 2011, *The Huffington Post*, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/09/09/recep-tayyip-erdogan gaza_n_955196.html

Friedman, Milton, *Capitalism and Freedom*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962) http://books.cat-v.org/economics/capitalism-and-freedom/chapter_02.

"FULL TEXT- Statement by Israel's Netanyahu on flotilla deaths." *Reuters*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://in.reuters.com/article/2010/05/31/idINIndia-48947620100531.

"Gaza flotilla vow as thousands rally in Istanbul," *BBC*, May 31, 2011, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-13601251.

"Global rallies continue over Israel," *Al Jazeera*, Jun. 1, 2010, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2010/06/2010618503229683.html.

Howard, Michael, *War and the Liberal Conscience*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

"Israel issues travel warning to Turkey," *The Jerusalem Post*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=177002.

"Israel vows to defend gas after Turkey threatens to boost navy patrols in Mediterranean," *Haaretz*, Sep. 11, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/israel-vows-to-defend-gas-after-turkey-threatens-to-boost-navy-patrols-in-mediterranean-1.383820.

"Israeli Arab Citizens: Submitted by the Commission on Social Action to the Union for Reform Judaism's 70th General Assembly," *Union for Reform Judaism*, Nov. 3, 2009, Accessed Apr. 15, 2012, http://urj.org/about/union/governance/reso/?syspage=article&item_id=27440.

"Israeli lawmakers pass West Bank settlement boycott law," *BBC News*, July 11, 2011. Accessed Mar. 21, 2012, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-14111925.

"Israel's attack blatant hostility toward Turkish nation, Bahceli says," *Todays Zaman*, Jun. 2, 2010, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/newsDetail_getNewsById.action;jsessionid=2948AD28CCFEF72F56DDF299E7654639?newsId=211857.

"Israel's Gaza Flotilla Attack-June 2010," *Metro Poll Strategical and Social Research Center*, Jun. 3, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.metropoll.com.tr/report/israels-gaza-flotilla-attack-june-2010-en.

"June 7, 2010 Israeli Poll on aftermath of Ship Boarding: Top Line Results," *Pechter Polls*, Jun. 8, 2010, Accessed Apr. 20, 2012, http://www.pechterpolls.com/june-7-2010-israeli-poll-on-aftermath-of-ship-boarding-top-line-results/.

Kashti, Or, "Israel aids its needy Jewish students more than Arab counterparts," *Haaretz*, Dec. 8, 2012, Accessed Apr. 15, 2012, http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-aids-its-needy-jewish-students-more-than-arab-counterparts-1.281830.

Katz, Yaakov, "IDF: Global Jihad links on flotilla," *The Jerusalem Post*, Jun. 1, 2010, Accessed Apr.25, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=177169.

Khoury, Jack, "Netanyahu's housing reform ignores Israeli Arab communities, says new research," *Haaretz*, Mar. 29, 2012, Accessed Apr. 15, 2012, http://www.haaretz.com/news/national/netanyahu-s-housing-reform-ignores-israeli-arab-communities-says-new-research-1.421357.

Krouse, Richard W., "Polyarchy & Participation: The Changing Democratic Theory of Robert Dahl," *Polity*, 14.2 (Spring 1982): 441-463.

Kumova, Ceren and Noah Blaser, "Under Pressure to act on Syria, Turkey rules out intervention," *Todays Zalman*, Nov. 20, 2011, Accessed May 1, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/newsDetail_getNewsById.action?load=detay&newsId=263319&link=263319.

Layne, Christopher, "Kant of Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace," *International Security*, 19.2 (Autumn, 1994): 5-49.

"Leaders Express Regret for Loss of Life Despite Pre-Meditated Attack," *The Israel Project*, Jun 6, 2012, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.theisraelproject.org/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=hsJPK0PIJpH&b=689705&ct=8427261&printmode=1.

Maoz, Zeev and Bruce Russett, "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986," *The American Political Science Review*, 87.3 (Sep. 1993): 624-638.

O'Sullivan, Arieh, "Ties remain strained, but Turkey, Israel keep on trading," *The Jerusalem Post*, Apr. 17, 2011, Accessed Mar. 25, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/DiplomacyAndPolitics/Article.aspx?id=216941.

"OIC, Arab League lash out at Palmer report as 'biased'," *Todays Zaman*, Sep. 4, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/newsDetail_getNewsById.action?newsId=255724.

Oster, Marcy, "Turkey issues apology ultimatum to Israel," *Jewish Journal*, Sep. 1, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.jewishjournal.com/israel/article/turkey_in_warning_to_israel_you_have_one_day_to_apologize_for_gaza_flotilla/.

Owen Matthews, "The Erdogan Doctrine," *The Daily Beast*, Sep. 12, 2011, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/09/11/why-israel-fears-the-regional-ambitions-of-turkey-s-p-m-erdogan.html.

Magnezi, Aviel, "Erdogan painted himself into a corner,' *Ynetnews*, Sep. 4, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4117626,00.html.

Medearis, John "Schumpeter, the New Deal, and Democracy," *The American Political Science Review*, 91.4 (Dec. 1997): 819-832.

"More Than 4,000 Rockets Have Been Fired at Israel from Gaza," *The Israel Project*. Accessed Apr. 12, 2012, http://www.theisraelproject.org/site/apps/nl/content2.asp?c=hsJPK0PIJpH&b=689705&ct=4966107#_ftn1.

Mozgovaya, Natasha, "Erdogan: Israel must apologize for Gaza flotilla, blockade," *Haaretz*, Jun. 29, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012. http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/erdogan-israel-must-apologize-for-gaza-flotilla-blockade-1.298932.

"No:115, 31 May 2010, Press Release Regarding the Use of Force by the Israeli Defense Forces Against the Humanitarian Aid Flotilla to Gaza," *Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_-115_-31-may-2010_--press-release-regarding-the--use-of-force-by-the-israeli-defense-forces-against-the-humanitarian-aid-fleet-to-gaza.en.mfa.

Oneal, John R. and Bruce Russett, "The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992," *World Politics*, 52.1 (Oct. 1999): 1-37.

Pfeffer, Anshel and Sami Kohen, "Turkey and Israel relations in crisis after flotilla," *The Jewish Chronicle*, Jun. 3, 2010, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.thejc.com/news/israel-news/32532/turkey-and-israel-relations-crisis-after-flotilla.

"Poll: Israelis Support Flotilla Raid, Gaza Blockade, PM and IDF," *Arutz Sheva: Israel National News*, Jun. 11, 2010, Accessed Apr. 20, 2010, http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/138009#.T5HoVasV1IQ.

"Poll: US, Israel Turkey's main enemies," Press TV, Mar. 8, 2011, Accessed Apr, 21, 2012, http://edition.presstv.ir/detail/168904.html.

Pollak, Richard, "In Turkey, Media Censorship is Rampant and the Internet Isn't Free," *The Nation*, May 24, 2011, Accessed Mar. 21, 2012, http://www.thenation.com/article/160897/turkey-media-censorship-rampant-and-internet-isnt-free

"Prime Minister's Office announcement following publication of Palmer Report by UN Secretary General," *The Consulate General of Israel to New England*, Sep. 3, 2011, Accessed Apr., 22, 2012, http://boston.mfa.gov.il/index.php/en/news/breakingnews/566-prime-ministers-response-to-the-palmer-report.

Rawls, John, *The Law of Peoples*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

Radnitzky, Gerard, "Hayek on the Role of the State: A Radical Libertarian Critique," *Policy*, (Autumn 2000): 16-20.

Ravid, Barak, "Netanyahu's office distances itself from Lieberman's planned measures against Turkey," *Haaretz*, Sep. 9, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/netanyahu-s-office-distances-itself-from-lieberman-s-planned-measures-against-turkey-1.383561.

Rosato, Sebastian, "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory," *American Political Science Review*, 97.4 (Nov. 2003): 585-602.

Rosen, Steven J., "Erdogan and the Israel Card," *Middle Eastern Forum*, Jun. 10, 2010, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.meforum.org/2668/erdogan-and-the-israel-card.

Rousseau, David L., Christopher Gelpi, Dan Reiter, and Paul Huth, "Assessing the Dyadic Nature of the Democratic Peace, 1918-1988." *American Political Science Review*, 90.3 (Sept. 1996): 512-533.

Scheindlin, Dahlia, "Israelis speak up," *Foreign Policy*, Jun. 10, 2010, Accessed Apr. 20, 2012, http://mideast.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/06/10/israelis_speak_up.

Schumpeter, Joseph, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1976) 3rd ed.

Seibert, Thomas, "Recep Tayyip Erdogan says Turkish navy will protect Gaza aid ships," *The National*, Sep. 10, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.thenational.ae/news/world/middle-east/recep-tayyip-erdogan-says-turkish-navy-will-protect-gaza-aid-ships.

Shavit, Ari, "Israel fears Obama heading for imposed Mideast settlement," *Haaretz*, Mar. 29, 2012, Accessed May 1, 2012, http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-fears-obama-heading-for-imposed-mideast-settlement-1.265466.

Shemer, Nadav, "Israel-Turkey trade soars despite tensions," *The Jerusalem Post*, Oct. 24, 2011, Accessed Apr. 28, 2012, http://www.jpost.com/Headlines/Article.aspx?id=242985.

Shiffer, Shimon, "Israel to 'punish' Turkey," *Ynetnews*, Sep. 9, 2011, Accessed Apr. 22, 2012, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4119984,00.html.

Sinclair-Webb, Emma "Turkey's human rights challenges," *Los Angeles Times* in *Human Rights Watch*, Dec. 19, 2011, Accessed Apr. 15, 2012, http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/12/19/turkeys-human-rights-challenges.

Spiro, David E., "The Insignificance of the Liberal Peace," *International Security*, 19.2 (Autumn, 1994): 50-86.

"Statistics on House Demolitions (1967-2010)," *The Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions*, 2010, Accessed, Dec. 12, 2011, http://www.icahd.org/?page_id=5508.

Taspinar, Omer, "2010: A difficult year in Turkish-American relations," *Todays Zaman*, Dec. 27, 2010, Accessed May 1, 2012, http://www.todayszaman.com/columnist-230770-2010-a-difficultyear-in-turkish-american-relations.html.

Telhami, Shibley, "2011 Annual Arab Public Opinion Survey," *University of Maryland*, Oct. 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/reports/2011/1121_arab_public_opini on_telhami/1121_arab_public_opinion.pdf.

"Text of President Bush's 2004 State of the Union Address," *Washington Post*, Jan. 20, 2004, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpsrv/politics/transcripts/bushtext_012004.html.

"Through No Fault of Their Own: Punitive House Demolitions during the al-Aqsa Intifada," *B'Tselem*, Nov. 2004.

Tokyay, Meneske "Turkey and NATO: 60 Years On," *International Strategic Research Organization*, Feb. 14, 2012, Accessed May 1, 2012, http://www.usak.org.tr/EN/makale.asp?id=2575.

Tokyay, Menekse, "World Values Survey reveals important trends in Turkey," *South Eastern Times*, May 8, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en_GB/features/setimes/features/2 011/08/05/feature-03.

Tol, Gonul, "Erodgan's Arab Spring Tour," *Middle East Institute*, Sep. 21, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.mei.edu/content/erdogans-arab-spring-tour.

"Turkey recalls Israeli ambassador, cancels exercises," *CNN*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 16, 2012, http://news.blogs.cnn.com/2010/05/31/turkey-recalls-israeli-ambassador-cancels-exercises/.

"Turkish protesters try to storm Israeli consulate in Istanbul," *The Star*, May 31, 2010, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.thestar.com/news/world/article/816673--turkish-protesters-try-to-storm-israeli-consulate-in-istanbul.

"U.N. experts say Israel's blockade of Gaza illegal," *Reuters*, Sep.13, 2011, Accessed May 1, 2012, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/09/13/us-un-gaza-rights-idUSTRE78C59R20110913.

United Nations, "Report of the Secretary-General's Panel of Inquiry on the 31 May 2010 Flotilla Incident," Geoffrey Palmer, Alvaro Uribe, Joseph Ciechanover Itzhar, and Suleyman Ozdem Sanberk, Sep. 2011, 3.

US Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, *Israel's Blockade of Gaza, Mavi Marmara Incident*, *and Its Aftermath*, Carol Migdalovitz, June 21, 2010.

Paul L. Williams, "Are the Turks Preparing for War Against Israel?," *Accuracy in Media*, Jun. 1, 2010, Accessed Apr. 25, 2012, http://www.aim.org/guest-column/are-the-turks-preparing-for-war-against-israel/.

"Will the CHP, Turkey's Main Opposition Party, Ever Become a Relevant Political Alternative?," *Crethi Plethi*, Sep. 6, 2011, Accessed Apr. 21, 2012, http://www.crethiplethi.com/will-the-chp-turkeys-main-opposition-party-ever-become-a-relevant-political-alternative/islamic-countries/turkey/2011/.

Wolfe, Joel D. "A Defense of Participatory Democracy," *The Review of Politics*, 47.3 (Jul. 1985): 370-389.