

TURKISH - EGYPTIAN RELATIONS (1922-1956)  
AND THE IMPACT OF THE FREE OFFICERS REVOLUTION

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

BY

SELİM ÖTERBÜLBÜL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
THE DEPARTMENT OF MIDDLE EAST STUDIES

MARCH 2015



Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŐIK  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. zlem TÜR  
Head of Department

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

---

Prof. Dr. zlem TÜR  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŐIK (METU,IR) \_\_\_\_\_

Prof. Dr. zlem TÜR (METU, IR) \_\_\_\_\_

Prof. Dr. İlhan UZGEL (ANKARA UNI, IR) \_\_\_\_\_



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

Name, Last name: Selim Öterbülül

Signature :

## ABSTRACT

### TURKISH - EGYPTIAN RELATIONS (1922-1956) AND THE IMPACT OF THE FREE OFFICERS REVOLUTION

Öterbülül, Selim

M.Sc., Department of Middle East Studies

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür

March 2015, 171 pages

This thesis analyses the period of Turkish-Egyptian relations from 1922 until the June of 1956. Bilateral issues are presented in the form of a chronological narrative by containing the main theme of this study. Besides, this thesis also searches the impact of the Free Officers Revolution in Egypt on the bilateral relations by taking into consideration Turkey's reactions and its impact on Egypt's foreign policy during the formative period of Nasser's leadership. Turkey and Egypt, which had some minor bilateral issues and a dispute over the Caliphate issue during the interwar period, have come face to face due to their gradually improved activism in the Middle East affairs after the Second World War. The course of problematic bilateral relations emerged once again within the struggle for regional leadership in the 1950s. This study points out that Turkey and Egypt had an exceptional period and a short-lived rapprochement following the Free Officers Revolution, although they had a problematic relation during the interwar period and a rivalry in 1950s. This thesis aims to look into the problematic background, the Tugay Affair and the Turkish-Egyptian quarrel over the Baghdad Pact and the Bandung Conference to understand the bilateral policies during the consolidation period of the new regime.

**Keywords:** Turkey, Egypt, Caliphate, the Free Officers Revolution, Gamal Abdel Nasser.

## ÖZ

### TÜRKİYE - MİSİR İLİŞKİLERİ (1922-1956) VE HÜR SUBAYLAR DEVRİMİ'NİN ETKİSİ

Öterbülül, Selim

Yüksek Lisans, Orta Doğu Araştırmaları Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür

Mart 2015, 171 sayfa

Bu tez, Türkiye-Mısır ilişkilerinin 1922 yılından 1956 yılındaki Süveyş Krizi'ne kadar olan dönemini analiz etmektedir. İkili sorunlar, tezin temasına uygun olarak kronolojik bir anlatıyla sunulmaktadır. Ayrıca bu tez Türkiye'nin tepkilerini ve Nâsır'ın liderliğinin biçimlendiği dönemde Mısır dış politikası üzerindeki etkilerini gözönünde bulundurarak Mısır'daki Hür Subaylar Devrimi'nin ikili ilişkiler üzerindeki etkilerini araştıracaktır. İki savaş arası dönemde bazı ikili sorunlar ve Hilafet tartışması üzerinden karşı karşıya gelen Türkiye ve Mısır, İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında Orta Doğu ilişkilerinde giderek artan etkinlikleri nedeniyle karşı karşıya gelmiştir. İkili ilişkilerinin sorunlu seyri 1950'li yıllardaki bölgesel liderlik mücadelesi ile yeniden ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu çalışmada, iki savaş arası dönemde sorunlu, 1950'lerde ise rekabet halinde ilişkileri olan Türkiye ve Mısır'ın Hür Subaylar Devrimi sonrasında istisnai bir dönem ve kısa süreli bir yakınlaşma yaşadığına işaret edilmektedir. Bu tez ikili ilişkilerin, 1952 yılında gerçekleşen Hür Subaylar Devrimi'nden önceki sorunlu arka planını, Tugay Olayı'nı ve Bağdat Paketi ve Bandung Konferansı üzerinden yeni rejimin sağlama dönemindeki Türkiye-Mısır çekişmesini analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Türkiye, Mısır, Hilâfet, Hür Subaylar Devrimi, Cemal Abdul Nâsır.

*To My Beloved Parents*



## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

First and foremost, my utmost thanks to Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür whose patience, tolerance and comments throughout the research I will never forget.

I would also like to thank to my thesis examining committee Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık and Prof. Dr. İlhan Uzgel for their suggestions and constructive critics.

Above all, I want to express my gratitude to my family. Without the moral and material support of my parents, Gülderen Öterbülül and İbrahim Öterbülül, I would not have sustained this academic study. I would like to thank them for their never-ending patience, encouragement and trust during the writing of this thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM .....	III
ABSTRACT .....	IV
ÖZ.....	V
DEDICATION .....	VI
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	VIII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	X
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. TURKISH-EGYPTIAN RELATIONS UNTIL THE FREE OFFICERS REVOLUTION: 1922-1952 .....	20
2.1. FOREIGN POLICY ORIENTATIONS OF TURKEY AND EGYPT: 1922- 1952.....	20
2.1.1. Turkish Foreign Policy towards the Arab Middle East: From “Indifference” to Activism .....	20
2.1.2. Egyptian Foreign Policy: Search for a Prominent Role and Identity Construction .....	28
2.2. BILATERAL RELATIONS AND REGIONAL ISSUES.....	33
2.2.1. Bilateral Issues and Agreements in Turkish-Egyptian Relations.....	33
2.2.2. The Caliphate Issue .....	37
2.2.3. From Palestine Issue to Arab-Israeli Conflict .....	48
2.2.4. The Middle East Defence Projects .....	52
3. TURKEY’S AND EGYPT’S FOREIGN POLICIES AFTER 1952 .....	60
3.1. DETERMINANTS OF TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY DURING THE 1950s .....	61
3.1.1. The Cold War Conjuncture and Turkey under the Democrat Party.....	61
3.1.2. Turkish Foreign Policy towards the Middle East.....	64

3.2. EGYPT'S FOREIGN POLICY AFTER THE FREE OFFICERS REVOLUTION.....	67
3.2.1. The Free Officers Movement and the July Revolution.....	67
3.2.2. Consolidation of Power and Personification of the Revolution.....	72
3.2.3. Three Circles Theory and Nasser's Foreign Policy Objectives .....	86
3.2.4. Egypt's Foreign Relations after the Revolution.....	94
3.2.4.1 Egypt-Soviet Union Relations.....	96
3.2.4.2. Egypt-US Relations .....	98
3.2.4.3. Anglo-Egyptian Relations .....	102
3.2.4.4. Egyptian-Israeli Contact.....	110
 4. POST-REVOLUTION RELATIONS BETWEEN TURKEY AND EGYPT: 1952-1956.....	 113
4.1 TURKISH-EGYPTIAN BILATERAL RELATIONS: 1952-1956.....	113
4.1.1. Turkey's Response to the July Revolution.....	113
4.1.2. New Egyptian Regime's Stance on Turkey .....	118
4.1.3. Rupture in Diplomatic Relations: The Tugay Affair .....	121
4.1.4. Turkish-Egyptian Relations after the Tugay Affair: 1954-1956.....	127
4.2. TURKISH-EGYPTIAN RELATIONS ON REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS .....	133
4.2.1. The Regional Confrontation: The Baghdad Pact .....	133
4.2.2. Confrontation on International Level: The Bandung Conference.....	138
 5. CONCLUSION.....	 142
 6. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 148
 7. APPENDICES.....	 172
TURKISH SUMMARY	
TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

CUP	Committee of Union and Progress
GNAT (TBMM)	Grand National Assembly of Turkey
MEC	Middle East Command
MEDO	Middle East Defense Organization
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
RCC	Revolutionary Command Council
SBF	Ankara University Faculty of Political Science
SEATO	Southeast Asia Treaty Organization
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNCCP	United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSCOP	United Nations Special Committee on Palestine
US	United States

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

My only allegiance is to the July 1952 Revolution. But when it comes to the situation today... For a long time, I have considered Egyptian history as really beginning on 23 July 1952. It's only since the June 1967 War that I've started looking back earlier than that.<sup>1</sup>

Turkey and Egypt are two major countries in the Middle East that are bound to each other with strong historical and cultural ties. They share another common feature; they both have a, geopolitical importance for the Middle East and international relations. They have strategically significant routes such as the Suez Canal, the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. The Ottoman Empire ruled Egypt since the reign of Selim I until the gradual decline of its authority in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The Ottoman Empire lost its de facto rule of Egypt after the British occupation in 1882. The status of the British protectorate in Egypt<sup>2</sup> and the unilateral declaration of Egyptian independence in February 1922 were ratified by the renunciation by Turkey of all rights and titles over Egypt in the Lausanne Peace Treaty.

Turkey and Egypt established bilateral diplomatic relations in 1925. These resident diplomatic missions were on the level of Chargé d'affaires, which were upgraded to Ambassadorial level in 1948. However, this constructive process was

---

<sup>1</sup> Naguib Mahfouz, **Karnak Café**, Cairo, The American University in Cairo Press, 2007, p.43.

<sup>2</sup> The British protectorate was declared in 1914 after the declaration of war with the Ottoman Empire, of which Egypt was still de jure a part.

disrupted due to some minor bilateral problems, especially the Caliphate issue during the interwar period. After the Second World War, regional and international factors gradually changed the Middle East affairs, such as the rise of the Arab-Israeli conflict or the outcomes of Britain's losing its ability to influence Middle East affairs. The most decisive issue between Turkey and Egypt was the regional defence pact projects, and then the formation of the Baghdad Pact during the first decade of the Cold War. This confrontation was a result of both a struggle for regional leadership in the Middle East and a clash of different foreign policy orientations in the political conjuncture of the Cold War.

Historically, the Turkish-Egyptian struggle for hegemony in the Middle East is an extension of the ancient rivalry between the Nile Valley and Anatolian peninsula over the hegemony in the Fertile Crescent.<sup>3</sup> After the end of *pax Ottomana*, this struggle for hegemony re-emerged with Muhammad Ali's seizure of power in Egypt Eyalet. Turkey and Egypt became two independent states in the Middle East after the Great War. The time period of this thesis includes the period from 1922 to 1956, which comprises of Turkish-Egyptian bilateral relations during the interwar period and early period of the Cold War as well as the impact of the formative period of Nasser's leadership after the Free Officers revolution. 1922 is the year of unilateral declaration of Egyptian independence which was going to be the first contact point between Turkey and Egypt. The Treaty of Lausanne on 24 July 1923 removed Turkey's rights and claims over Egypt and so ratified the British protectorate in Egypt (1914-1922) as per the Article 17 and Article 19. Therefore, it also legalized the British decision over Egypt between 1914 and 1923, including the declaration of independence.

Nevertheless, the core of this thesis is the year 1952 which signifies both Turkey's entrance to the Western alliance thanks to its NATO membership on 18 February 1952 and the Free Officers coup d'état in Egypt on 23 July 1952. A group of young nationalist Egyptian officers, known as the Free Officers Movement,

---

<sup>3</sup> The earliest diplomatic record of this rivalry is *the Egyptian-Hittite Peace Treaty*, or called *Treaty of Kadesh*, from the 13th century BC. It was concluded between Egyptian Pharaoh Ramesses II and Hittite King Hattusili III. It is the earliest peace treaty known surviving to-date.

toppled down the Egyptian regime on 23 July, 1952. This date is considered as the beginning of true Egyptian independence from colonialism, monarchy and foreign influence. After the consolidation period of the new regime, which lasted until the end of 1954, the true leader of the Free Officers Movement, Jamal ‘Abd al-Nasir (“Gamal Abdel Nasser” in common transliteration and usage, and henceforth in this study) secured his leader position and started the Nasserite era of Egypt. On the other side, Turkey secured its long-felt security concerns by joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on February 18, 1952. Thus, Turkey became the only NATO member in the Middle East and the only Middle Eastern country among NATO allies. The value of NATO membership and Turkey-West relations, to which Ankara assigned a huge importance, were increasingly decisive in Turkey’s foreign policy and especially its decisions on Middle East issues.

Therefore, the time period of this thesis is separated into two parts. The first one begins from the date that these two countries gained their independences to 1952, which provides a complete background of bilateral relations. The second one covers years between 1952 and 1956. The time period of this study is limited to 1956 due to some reasons. From the perspective of foreign policy, Turkey regarded the formation of the Baghdad Pact (1955) as an essential obligation or duty after joining the Western alliance.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the outcomes of the Baghdad Pact on both regional affairs and Turkish-Egyptian relations can be observed in this period. Moreover, as Sever noted, the Suez Crisis was an example of the clash of national and bloc interests, contrary to Turkey’s fully commitment to bloc policies.<sup>5</sup>

The year 1956 signifies some major changes and boost of legitimacy in Egyptian politics, such as the Suez Crisis and the Egyptian Constitutional Referendum and Presidential Plebiscite of Nasser in June 1956. This thesis limited its content and timeline to June 1956. First of all, 1956 Constitution changed the

---

<sup>4</sup> Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, *Türkiye’nin Arap Orta Doğusu’na Karşı Politikası (1945-1970)*, Ankara, Barış Kitap, 2010, p.72-73.

<sup>5</sup> Ayşegül Sever, “A Reluctant Partner of the US over Suez? Turkey and the Suez Crisis”, Simon C. Smith (ed.), *Reassessing Suez 1956 New Perspective on the Crisis and its Aftermath*, Hampshire, Ashgate, 2008, p.132.

Egypt's domestic politics as Nasser officially took the presidency; the National Union scheme replaced all political parties. This was a transition from securing and consolidating the power towards the maintenance of the state. Secondly, Lewis refers to the Evacuation Agreement in 1954 as "removal of the last Egyptian grievance against the West, real friendship and cooperation would at last become possible."<sup>6</sup> In this regard, the credit crisis for the construction of the Aswan Dam, the Egyptian-Czech arms deal and the Suez Crisis in 1956 were a disappointment of hopes for this kind of relations. Moreover, Barnett evaluates the year 1956 as the beginning of the ascent of Arabism until its descent in 1967.<sup>7</sup> Not only political means, but also the economic aspect of Egypt changed after the Suez Crisis. Ikram pointed out the transition from the predominance of private sector to the growing government intervention in the Egyptian economy in the following years of 1956.<sup>8</sup>

Moreover, the Suez Crisis has changed regional and international dimensions. The failure of Britain and France in their Suez campaign was a defining event for assuming the burden of leadership in the region by the growing preponderant power of the United States, as well as the growing influence of the Soviet Union. In terms of Egyptian politics, the outcomes of the nationalization of the Suez Canal Company and the Suez Crisis were interpreted as a victory against the old mandate power and their imperialist interventions, even though Egyptian army was defeated on the battleground. In any case, the Egyptian survival in the Suez Crisis exalted Nasser's pioneer role for Arab nationalism and Egypt's role in the Third World and the Middle East. Egypt praised its resistance with such as the myth of Port Said, which described a Stalingrad-like resistance, to gain prestige and "the spirit of Egyptian independence and dignity."<sup>9</sup> To sum up, Nasser gained a

---

<sup>6</sup> Bernard Lewis, **The Shaping of the Modern Middle East**, New York, Oxford University Press, p.153.

<sup>7</sup> Michael N. Barnett, **Dialogues in Arab Politics: Negotiations in Regional Order**, Columbia University Press, 1998, p.121-129.

<sup>8</sup> Khalid Ikram, **The Egyptian Economy, 1952-2000 Performance, Policies, and Issues**, New York, Routledge, 2006, p.2-6.

<sup>9</sup> P. J. Vatikiotis, **Nasser and His Generation**, London, Croom Helm, 1978, p.275-277.



political victory in this clash; although he lost the war in military terms. After the Suez Crisis, Nasser's popularity and charismatic leadership became unmatched in the Arab Middle East. Therefore, his policies towards the Middle East became more demanding in terms of Arab nationalism, Pan-Arabism, neutralist foreign policy and advocating the Arab cause against Israel. In this regard, Colombe evaluated the nationalization of the Suez Canal Company as not only a challenge for the West but also to the Arab states, particularly Iraq after the formation of Baghdad Pact and struggle for the leadership of Arab nationalism.<sup>10</sup> This thesis evaluates the Suez Crisis as a beginning of a new phase in Nasser's charismatic leadership, a new stage of Cold War in the Middle East, as well as in Turkish-Egyptian relations with the new prominent role of Nasser's Egypt in regional affairs and international relations. Therefore, the thesis limited its search before the beginning of this new era to analyse the impact of the revolution on bilateral relations during the formative period of Nasser's leadership.

Before searching the literature on the bilateral relations and the impact of the revolution, we have to touch briefly their official narratives about the Ottoman past and mainly the interwar period that our thesis will analyse as a background of the main theme.<sup>11</sup> The Egypt's Ministry of Foreign Affairs skipped the bilateral relations during the Cold War until the rule of Mubarak. However, the official valuation on the Turkish side touched upon the Free Officers revolution and the Nasserite regime by emphasizing the continued British presence, proclamation of the republic after the "coup d'état", close Egyptian-Soviet ties, Arab defeats against Israel and role of Nasserite Egypt in Non-Aligned Movement. While the Turkish side referred to the difference in foreign policy agendas, the Egyptian side ignored the problematic relations during the Cold War and started the major narrative with the latest period.

---

<sup>10</sup> Marcel Colombe, "Egypt Yesterday and Today", **Middle Eastern Affairs**, Vol. X, No. 4, April 1959, p.147.

<sup>11</sup> Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs describes that background as "the Ottoman occupation" while Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs mentions "the Ottoman rule" and "being part of the Empire until 1914, nominally". Egyptian MFA, "Bilateral Relations with Turkey; A Brief History" <<http://www.mfa.gov.eg/English/EgyptianForeignPolicy/EgyptianEuropeanRelation/BilateralRelations/Turkey/Pages/History.aspx>> (Accessed on 22.01.2015). Turkish MFA, <<http://www.mfa.gov.tr/misir-siyasi-gorunumu.tr.mfa>> (Accessed on 22.01.2015)

In the academic literature, Turkish, Egyptian and Western academics and researchers usually have some similar topics of Turkish-Egyptian relations by focusing on a specific era. Their studies on Turkish-Egyptian political relations can be categorized into three: The first group only analyses bilateral diplomatic relations, its reflections in the media or focus on a specific bilateral issue from a specific period. The second one examines the role of each country in the other's foreign policy perception and relations. The last group chooses a regional or an international development to evaluate Turkish and Egyptian perceptions and their clash, cooperation or interpretation. To sum up, there was a deep interest on analysing the bilateral relation through their general foreign policies, in previous academic research. They were mainly focused on the struggle for leadership in the region over the Baghdad Pact and their different foreign policy orientations. However, there was a little interest on the formative period of Nasser's leadership, early impact of the revolution and transition of bilateral relations from interwar period to the Cold War.

These researchers mainly dealt with on either a limited period of Turkish-Egyptian relations such as just focusing on Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's era or touched upon the bilateral relations in terms of significant regional or international issues without demonstrating the bilateral background of those clashes such as the formation of the Baghdad Pact. The period between 1922 and 1952 should be considered as the background of Turkish-Egyptian relations before the Free Officers Movement seized power. Previous academic studies on Turkish-Egyptian relations during the interwar period mainly focused on the reformist period of Turkey and Egyptian interpretation of it.<sup>12</sup> Some of these studies have failed to put an international relations perspective according to their area of expertise, the history of Turkish revolution and principles of Atatürk. These articles mainly situate Turkish

---

<sup>12</sup> Mehmet Okur, "Cumhuriyet'in İlk Yıllarında Türkiye-Mısır İlişkileri ve Mısırlı Bir Gazetecinin Gözüyle Mustafa Kemal Paşa", **Modern Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi**, Vol. 8, No.3, 2011, pp.199-211. Ahmet Özgiray, "Türkiye-Mısır İlişkileri (1920-1938)" **Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi**, No. 11, 1996, pp.55-70. Melek Çolak, "Türk Mısır İlişkileri Çerçevesinde Mısır'ın Atatürk ve Türk Devrimine Bakışı (1919-1938)" **Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi**, No.6, (Spring 2010), pp.24-35.

reforms in the context of reflections on behalf of Egyptian state, scholars, ulama or press, such as the Turkish reforms and their reflection in the Egyptian press.<sup>13</sup>

On the other side, there are some academic works and a thesis on diplomatic relations. Tamer Aslan's thesis provides a research on bilateral relations of Turkey and Egypt between 1922 and 1981.<sup>14</sup> Although the abolition of the caliphate or secular reforms in Turkey were not welcomed by Egyptian society; Aslan argues that, Turkey and Egypt had good relations during the first decades of the diplomatic relations until the recognition of Israel and Turkey's pro-West foreign policy caused a rupture in Turkish-Arab relations. Any analysis that adheres to the view that Turkey and Egypt had good relations until Turkey adopted pro-West and pro-Israeli policies does not only disregard the problematic background of bilateral relations during the interwar period but also misinterprets the impact of transition of Turkish and Egyptian domestic and foreign policies after the Second World War, especially in 1950s.

Two other works attempted to evaluate Turkish-Egyptian political relations from a rational perspective. Bilal N. Şimşir's "Fes Olayı Türkiye-Mısır İlişkilerinde Bir Sayfa (1932-1933)" provided a valuable narrative describing the two-month long bilateral crisis during the interwar period.<sup>15</sup> This study highlights the importance of the crisis by presenting the factual story, its impact on bilateral political relations and its reflections in Turkish, Egyptian and foreign newspapers and diplomatic correspondences. Semih Bulut's "Atatürk Dönemi Türkiye-Mısır İlişkileri (1926-1938)" is also an important article about the bilateral relations in this period.<sup>16</sup> It has

---

<sup>13</sup> Richard Hattamer, "Atatürk and the reforms in Turkey as reflected in the Egyptian press" " **Journal of Islamic Studies**, Vol. 2, No. 1, January 2000, pp.21-42. Mehmet Serdar Yılmaz, "Türkiye'deki Şapka ve Kıyafet İnkılabının Mısır Kamuoyunda Yansımaları (1925-1932)", **Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi**, Vol.1, No.2, Fall 2005, pp.91-103.

<sup>14</sup> Tamer Aslan, **Türkiye-Mısır İlişkileri: 1922-1981**, (unpublished master's thesis), Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey, 2013.

<sup>15</sup> Bilâl N. Şimşir, "Fes Olayı Türkiye-Mısır İlişkilerinde Bir Sayfa (1932-1933)", **Bellekten**, Vol.XLVIII, No.189-190, (January-April 1984), pp.1-54.

<sup>16</sup> Bulut, Semih, "Atatürk Dönemi Türkiye-Mısır İlişkileri (1926-1938)", **Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi**, Vol. XXVI, No.78, (November 2010).

a chronological narrative of political, economic, commercial and cultural relations. His article presents the ups and downs in bilateral relations and their reasons, as well as their outcomes in the long run.

Turkish-Egyptian relations after the Free Officers Revolution are mainly analysed through regional affairs, not their political relation. The majority of academic studies touched upon the role of Egypt in Turkish foreign policy -and vice versa- through regional issues and international developments. Three other works mention the prominent issues in Egyptian-Turkish relations. Elie Kedourie's "Egypt and the Caliphate 1915-1946" searches the reasons of Egypt's quest for the Caliphate and analyses its motivations in the Caliphate issue by emphasizing close relations of religion and politics.<sup>17</sup> The Caliphate issue was a major conflict in diplomatic relations, considering the instrumentalization of the caliphate in Egyptian politics and Turkey's limitation, based on its reformist and security concerns, for its involvement to the Middle Eastern affairs. In addition to that, Jankowski and Gershoni provided a constructivist approach to Egypt's politics during the interwar period. Their research titled "Egypt, Arab Alliance, an Islamic Caliphate, 1930-1939" focuses on the role of religion and domestic discussions on supra-Egyptianism in Egypt's politics. It presents a domestic background of Egyptian efforts for the Caliphate as well as the process of identity construction in Egypt.<sup>18</sup> Ömer Kürkçüoğlu's PhD thesis "Türkiye'nin Arap Orta Doğu'suna Karşı Politikası (1945-1970)" is an early study about Turkey's policy towards the Arab Middle East.<sup>19</sup> Kürkçüoğlu analyses Turkey's relations with the Arab countries in the Middle East in consideration of contrariwise effects of their relations with the West. Thus, this study provides a descriptive and analytical work about continued differentiation between Turkey and Egypt about MEC and MEDO efforts to the Baghdad Pact and also Arab-Israeli conflict to the Suez Crisis.

---

<sup>17</sup> Elie Kedourie, "Egypt and the Caliphate 1915-1946", **Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland**, No. 3/4, (October 1963), pp.208-248.

<sup>18</sup> Israel Gershoni and James Jankowski, **Redefining the Egyptian Nation, 1930-1945**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995, p.145-166.

<sup>19</sup> Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye'nin Arap Orta Doğusu'na Karşı Politikası (1945-1970)**, Ankara, Barış Kitap, 2010.

The role of Egypt in Turkish foreign policy can be considered as beginning with Nasser's confrontation to the Turkey's regional policy and formation of Baghdad Pact, due to the majority of academic interests on this subject. However, Gürün's "Dış İlişkiler ve Türk Politikası (1939'dan Günümüze)" provides wider coverage to Egypt and its role in the Middle East.<sup>20</sup> As an example of this lack of interest; Oran's "Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1980)" only gives place to non-Arab states in its chapters of Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East between 1923 and 1945, except the Sa'adabad Pact.<sup>21</sup> This study focuses on the neighbour countries in the Middle East in relation to major issues in this period. Moreover, Turkey's relations with the Arab Middle East are discussed over Turkish-British or Turkish-French relations due to unsettled issues between two sides, existing mandate rule in these regions and their influence in these countries.

After the Second World War, Turkish foreign policy towards the Arab Middle East transformed due to changing conjuncture and its Western-oriented foreign policy choices. Egypt had a significant place in this new activism due to its importance in the regional affairs. Turkey hoped to incorporate regional countries, especially Egypt, into Western defence systems as the MEDO/MEC proposals, after the changing political agenda in post-revolution era. Thus, Egypt became an essential part of Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East in the 1950s, expecting cooperation with this major country, not being a prominent rival. This was a transition from limited involvement to the activism in regional politics. By the time the Democrat Party came to power in Turkey, this activism made progress, which Menderes defined as "the era of dynamic action".<sup>22</sup>

The political relations between Turkey and Egypt did not attract scholars' attention that much when we compared with the current literature on their foreign

---

<sup>20</sup> Kamuran Gürün, **Dış İlişkiler ve Türk Politikası (1939'dan günümüze kadar)**, Ankara, Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1983.

<sup>21</sup> Baskın Oran (ed.), **Türk Dış Politikası, Kurtuluş Savaşı'ndan Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Vol. I: 1919-1980**, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2008.

<sup>22</sup> Hüseyin Bağcı, **Türk Dış Politikasında 1950'li Yıllar**, Ankara, ODTÜ Yayıncılık, 2007, p.42.

policies during the 1950s. Baruch Gilead's "Turkish-Egyptian Relations 1952-1957" is an exception that analyses the political bilateral relations of the post-revolution period.<sup>23</sup> It is still the only academic article that exclusively focuses on Turkish-Egyptian relations in the post-revolution era. It was written in 1959, when Nasser was at the peak of his influence, charismatic leadership and his achievements for Pan-Arabism with the establishment of the United Arab Republic. Gilead defines Turkish-Egyptian relations prior to 1952 as strained relations. This short article focuses on the proposals to establish MEDO and MEC before the keen rivalry for leadership of the Middle East occurred between them.<sup>24</sup> His research did not refer to the consolidation period of Egypt, thus did not analyse the motivations of the new Egyptian regime to conduct a neutralist foreign policy. He touched upon the background of the Tugay Affair without considering the Egyptian press attacks on Ambassador Tugay and his wife. After the Tugay Affair, his article connects the rapprochement efforts of Turkey with Nasser prior to the formation of the Baghdad Pact. It touches upon the Turkish-Egyptian confrontation through Turkish visit to the Middle East countries in persuading their government to join the Baghdad Pact and Egyptian responses by provoking mass demonstrations, conducting defiant radio campaigns and even accusation against the pact.<sup>25</sup> Except the Tugay Affair, his research mainly focuses on their different foreign policy orientations and especially Turkey's efforts to bring the Arabs into the Western defence organization and Egyptian opposition.

The reflection of the Free Officers coup d'état in Turkish press is examined in R. Kürşat Rüstemoğlu's master's thesis "1949-1981 Yılları Arasında Suriye ve Mısır'da Vuku Bulan Hükümet Darbeleri ve Bunların Türkiye'deki Yankıları" and Şinasi Sönmez's article, "Cemal Abdül Nasır İktidarında Mısır-Türkiye İlişkilerinin

---

<sup>23</sup> Baruch Gilead, "Turkish-Egyptian Relations, 1952-1957" **Middle Eastern Affairs**, Vol. 10, No. 11, November 1959, pp.356-363.

<sup>24</sup> **Ibid.**, p.356.

<sup>25</sup> **Ibid.**, p.360-363.

Türk Basınına Yansımaları (1954-1962)".<sup>26</sup> Sönmez's article has a chronological narrative and presents a useful survey on the reflections of some Turkish newspapers and articles to the regional issues and critics to Nasser's Egypt. In addition to them, Reem Abou-El-Fadl's master's thesis compares Atatürk's Turkey and Nasser's Egypt through state building process and her PhD thesis connects this perspective with their different foreign policy perceptions in the 1950s.<sup>27</sup>

The other dimension of the academic studies on Turkish-Egyptian relations either focuses on their foreign policies during the 1950s in general or the bilateral issues in particular. There are many studies that analyses Turkish foreign policy and Egyptian foreign policy during the 1950s. In this regard, works by Vatikiotis, Güler, Jankowski and Podeh on Egyptian foreign policy; and studies by Oran, Gürün, Ülman, Laçiner, Soysal or Gönlübol studies on Turkish foreign policy have to be considered.<sup>28</sup> There also many theses those focus on Turkish foreign policy during the 1950s, and one or two about the Egyptian foreign policy in Turkey's academia.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Kürşat R. Rüstemoğlu, **1949-1981 Yılları Arasında Suriye ve Mısır'da Vuku Bulan Hükümet Darbeleri ve Bunların Türkiye'deki Yankıları**, (unpublished master's thesis), Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey, 2008. Şinasi Sönmez, "Cemal Abdül Nasır İktidarında Mısır-Türkiye İlişkilerinin Türk Basınına Yansımaları (1954-1962)", **Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi**, No.43, Spring 2009, p.491-516.

<sup>27</sup> Reem Abou-El-Fadl, **Rethinking the National Projects of Egypt and Turkey**, (Master's thesis), Oxford University, U.K., 2005. Reem Abou-El-Fadl, **Divergent pasts, diverging choices: foreign policy and national building in Turkey and Egypt during the 1950s**, (DPhil thesis), University of Oxford, U.K., 2010.

<sup>28</sup> Oran, **op.cit.**; Gürün, **op.cit.**; Zeynep E. Güler, **Arap Milliyetçiliği: Mısır ve Nasırcılık**, İstanbul, Yazılama, 2011. Panayiotis Jerasimof Vatikiotis, **Nasser and His Generation**, London, Croom Helm, 1978. Elie Podeh, **The Quest for Hegemony in the Arab World The Struggle Over the Baghdad Pact**, Leiden, E.J.Brill, 1995. Haluk A. Ülman, "Türk Dış Politikası'na Yön Veren Etkenler (1923-1968) I", **Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi**, Vol.23, No.3, 1968, pp.241-273. Gönlübol, Mehmet, "NATO, USA and Turkey", 13-50, in Karpat, Kemal H. (ed.) **Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition, 1950-1974**, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1975. James Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt, Arab Nationalism, and The United Arab Republic**, Colorado, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002. Sedat Laçiner, "The Democratic Foreign Policy Approach (1950-1960)", **USAK Yearbook**, Vol.4, 2011, pp.109-157. İsmail Soysal, "Turkish-Arab Diplomatic Relations after the Second World War (1945-1986)", **Studies on Turkish-Arab Relations**, Annual 1986, p.249-266.

<sup>29</sup> Ahmet Ateş, **1952-2011 Yılları Arası Mısır Dış Politikası**, (unpublished master's thesis), Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey, 2012. Kürşat Nusret Erden, **Menderes Dönemi Türkiye'nin Arap Ortadoğu Politikası**, (unpublished master's thesis), Dumlupınar University, Kütahya, Turkey, 2009. Seçil Özdemir, **Demokrat Parti Dönemi Türk Amerikan İlişkileri ve Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu Politikaları**, (unpublished master's thesis), Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey, 2009.

These issue-oriented studies are very changeable according to the bilateral or regional issue. The Tugay Affair is briefly mentioned and focused on personal mishap of the ambassador in general narrative on Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East. However, the reasons of this crisis in relation with Egypt's domestic policies, Nasser's personification and consolidation processes and instrumentalization of the crisis by Nasser did not get enough attention from researchers. The main resource on this diplomatic crisis was not worked in the academic research; even Sönmez did not mention the reflection of the first persona non grata declaration of a Turkish diplomat; on Turkish newspapers. Moreover, many studies did not write the ambassador's name correctly, even Turkish ones, or had incorrect information about the date of this event.<sup>30</sup> Two significant references to the Tugay Affair were a memoir of Mahmut Dikerdem and Şehsuvaroğlu's work for Tugay's biography.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, there are many significant studies that refer to Turkey's and Egypt's different foreign policies towards the Middle East in connection with regional issues, such as "The Baghdad Pact Anglo-American Defence Policies in the Middle East, 1950-1959" by Behçet Kemal Yeşilbursa, "The Compliant Ally? Turkey and the West in the Middle East 1954-1958" by Ayşegül Sever and "Diverging Perceptions of the Cold War: Baghdad Pact as a Source of Conflict between Turkey and the Nationalist Arab Countries" by Uzer.<sup>32</sup> These studies focus on the formation of the Baghdad Pact as a result of Turkey's efforts and Egyptian opposition.

---

<sup>30</sup> Bağcı's book cited the date of declaration of persona non grata on 4 July 1952, which has to be the 5 January 1954. Bağcı, **op.cit.**, p.44, cit.23.

<sup>31</sup> Mahmut Dikerdem, **Ortadoğu'da Devrim Yılları (Bir Büyükelçinin Anıları)**, İstanbul, İstanbul Matbaası, 1977. Bedii Nuri Şehsuvaroğlu, **Hekim Bir Siyasimizin Portresi, Büyükelçi Doktor A. Hulusi Fuad Tugay**, İstanbul, Hüsnütabat Matbaası, 1972.

<sup>32</sup> Behçet Kemal Yeşilbursa, **The Baghdad Pact Anglo-American Defence Policies in the Middle East, 1950-1959**, Oxon, Frank Cass, 2005. Ayşegül Sever, "The Compliant Ally? Turkey and the West in the Middle East 1954-1958", **Middle Eastern Studies**, Vol.34, Vo.2, April 1998, pp.73-90. Umut Uzer and Ayşe Uzer, "Diverging Perceptions of the Cold War: Baghdad Pact as a Source of Conflict Between Turkey and the Nationalist Arab Countries", **The Turkish Yearbook**, Vol.36, 2005, pp.101-118.



The Egyptian opposition has an important place in the Turkish perspective, however inter-Arab relations have prominence in the Egyptian perspective as can be seen in Elie Podeh's "The Quest for Hegemony in the Arab World The Struggle Over the Baghdad Pact", which primarily focuses on the Egyptian-Iraqi struggle for regional leadership in the Arab Middle East to championing Arab nationalism.<sup>33</sup> The majority of these academic studies elaborate on the importance of the Baghdad Pact and detailed analyses about the confrontation of Turkey and Egypt via this regional defence organization. Besides these studies on political relation, there are some other academic works that go into the details of domestic transition in Egypt and Nasser's charismatic leadership as seen in the works by Güler, Lacouture, Hassouna and Kiremitçi.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, there are some other studies that compare Turkey and Egypt in terms of different issues, such as the role of army in politics, fundamental religious movements or student protests that took place at the time this thesis was written.<sup>35</sup>

This thesis refers to Turkish foreign policy towards the Arab Middle East during the interwar period as a limited involvement, since Turkey had concerns about its reformist period. First of all, some studies describe this approach as "Activity but No Adventurism in Foreign Policy" in the name of realist political choices and keeping away from passivity in foreign policy.<sup>36</sup> However, we have to underline that- this state-building process, and reformist period involved the elimination of Islam and Middle Eastern identity in the definition of the new Turkish

---

<sup>33</sup> Elie Podeh, **The Quest for Hegemony in the Arab World The Struggle Over the Baghdad Pact**, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1995.

<sup>34</sup> Güler, **op.cit.**; Gamze Güner Kiremitçi, **Otoriter rejimlerde karizmatik meşruiyet: Nasır Dönemi Mısır**, (unpublished master's thesis), Kadir Has University, Istanbul, Turkey, 2012. Moustafa El Said Hassouna, **Leadership efficiency and Weberian charisma : the case of Gamal Abdel Nasser (1952-1970)**, University of Kent at Canterbury, 1990.

<sup>35</sup> Steven A. Cook, **Ruling but not Governing The Military and Political Development in Egypt, Algeria and Turkey**, Baltimore, John's Hopkins University Press, 2007. Jordi Tejel Gorgas, "The Limits of the State: Student Protest in Egypt, Iraq and Turkey, 1948-63", **British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies**, Vol.40, No.4, 2013, p.359-377.

<sup>36</sup> Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "An Analysis of Atatürk's Foreign Policy 1919-1938", **The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations**, Vol.20, Annual, 1980, pp.154-155.

State. Therefore, the Middle East symbolized what Turkey wanted to leave behind. Secondly, Turkey conducted its foreign policy towards the Arab Middle East in relation with its relation with the Western mandate powers during this period. Thirdly, this limited involvement was not a total indifference to regional affairs since Turkey had to solve its remaining issues on its southern border or its concerns on the Kurdish issue, as well as its domestic reforms and any foreign efforts to set back them, such as the Caliphate issue. In this regard, Egypt became a subject of this policy. Thus, Turkish foreign policy towards the Arab Middle East should be named as a limited Turkish involvement in the regional affairs, not totally standing aloof from them.<sup>37</sup>

Moreover, these studies did not connect the consolidation period in Egyptian politics with the pre-Tugay Affair period. Therefore, they did not link the instrumentalization of the Tugay Affair, and Turkish-Egyptian relations, in Nasser's personification of the revolution as well as his struggle for regional leadership. It throws light on the missing parts of foreign policy studies on the Middle East that focused only on Nasser's ideology, nationalist policy of Egypt or Turkey-West connection and the Baghdad Pact.<sup>38</sup> Thereby, it hopes to make a contribution to the understanding of Turkish-Egyptian political relations and regional political process beyond the point of interest. For this purpose, this thesis will use primary sources of actors or witnesses as much as it can, in order to prevent any material damage to its arguments and presentation. For this kind of study, the books and speeches by key figures are highly important. Thus, Nasser's Philosophy of Revolution and public speeches, Ambassador Dikerdem's memories and the minutes of GNAT meetings have been examined comprehensively.

After emphasizing the academic literature on Turkish-Egyptian relations during the years that our thesis covers, we have to point some gaps that the thesis

---

<sup>37</sup> Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, **Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach**, New York, Routledge Press, 2003, p.111.

<sup>38</sup> For different approaches on Nasser's policies by different generations of scholars, see also: Podeh, **The Quest for...**, p.4-5. James Jankowski, James Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt, Arab Nationalism, and The United Arab Republic**, Colorado, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002, p.3-7.

tries to fill them. First of all, these studies on the bilateral relations lack of either an international relations perspective or a domestic determinant of their foreign policy understandings. Due to their deficiencies, their research points missed the domestic determinants of the study or the transition of the international conjuncture from the interwar period to a bipolar system and its impact on the foreign policy orientation of both sides. Therefore, this thesis looks into both foreign policy perceptions of Turkey and Egypt towards the Middle East, and these in-depth studies focusing on a specific issue or period. This thesis tries to integrate these determinants of Turkish-Egyptian relations and presents both bilateral issues as well as regional and international points of contact. Therefore, it has holistic analyses on Turkish-Egyptian relation with regard to its time period and subjects of the bilateral diplomacy. For instance, it fills the gap in academic literature by analysing Turkish-Egyptian political issues in the light of Turkey and Egypt's foreign policy priorities before the Free Officers revolution to present not only the reflections of reformist period but also their difference in regional perceptions and reasons of confrontations in this early stage. Therefore, the domestic and foreign policy relations of the new Egyptian regime will be examined insofar as affecting the Turkish-Egyptian political relations.

Secondly, this diplomatic history research achieves a holistic approach on the stated transition of bilateral relations from interwar period to the Cold War since there is no other academic study that analyses and compares the transition process of the bilateral relations during these two different conjunctures. It goes beyond Turkey's neighbours so as to understand regional foreign policy setting during the interwar period. In this respect, it demonstrates the problematic background of political relations before the Free Officers Revolution and crystalizes Turkey's expectations from the new regime, as well as revolutionary officers changed perception towards Turkey. It searches the effects of the revolution on Turkish-Egyptian relations by keeping in mind that Turkey's expectations from this new regime and the impact of the revolution on Egypt's foreign policy. Not only the diplomatic relations but also the domestic transition by virtue of the consolidation of the regime and personification of the revolution will be investigated with respect to

its relation with the foreign affairs. The consolidation of Nasser's regime was the main determinant of Egyptian politics in this formative period. It also promoted Egyptian neutralist policy in relation with the need of legitimacy of the new regime and rapprochement with many countries, and even Israel, in this period.

Thirdly, the formative period of Nasser's leadership and the Tugay Affair were mainly disregarded or touched upon briefly in these studies. This thesis attempts to fill the gap in the story of Turkish-Egyptian relations and the Tugay Affair during the formative period of Nasser's leadership by searching for the impact of the Free Officers Revolution on Egyptian domestic and foreign policies and their reflection on Turkish-Egyptian political relations. The formative period of Nasser's leadership is neglected even though Nasser's Egypt has been studied throughout due to Egyptian activism in the region, Turkish-Egyptian confrontation through the Baghdad Pact or the role of leader in decision-making process.<sup>39</sup>

Therefore, the main question of this thesis can be present as how the Free Officers Revolution affected Turkish-Egyptian relations? The answer of this question is going to find in the light of three dimensions: domestic, regional and international aspects and by looking into the background of bilateral relations, major bilateral issues as well as regional and international conjuncture. Nasser's charismatic leadership and particularly his consolidation of power were decisive factors that identified Egypt with his pioneer role and enabled Egypt's rise in regional affairs although it worsened the relations between Turkey and Egypt. Consequently, new Turkish activism in the Middle East during the 1950s concurred with Nasser's nationalist, neutralist and "circle"-oriented policies in the aftermath of the Free Officers Revolution.

---

<sup>39</sup> For the role of leader in policy making process and the impact of political leaders' personality and characteristic features, these research present a theoretical framework: Richard C. Snyder, H.W. Bruck and Burton Sapin, **Foreign Policy Decision Making**, New York, Free Press, 1962. Margaret G. Hermann, "Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders", **International Studies Quarterly**, Vol. 24, No. 1, March 1980, p.7-46. Margaret G. Hermann and Charles F. Hermann, "Who Makes Foreign Policy Decisions and How: An Empirical Inquiry", **International Studies Quarterly**, Vol. 33, No. 4, December 1989, p. 361-387.

In this regard, this study aims to pursue the answers to questions about two interrelated issues, the bilateral relations and the impact of the Free Officers Revolution on their relations, to provide a comprehensive framework: What were the main issues in Turkish-Egyptian relations before the Free Officers coup d'état? How did Turkey interpret the Free Officers coup d'état and conduct a policy towards the new Egyptian regime? What were the impact of the consolidation of power period and Nasser's ideological framework on Egypt's foreign policy choices? What were the reasons of the Tugay Affair and its outcomes on diplomatic relations? How did Turkey and Egypt confront each other through struggle for regional leadership? Did Nasser's Egypt pursue a hostile policy towards Turkey or did it just instrumentalize Turkey's orientation in Middle East affairs?

This thesis states four arguments about the issues and conflicts in Turkish-Egyptian relations covering the period between 1922 and 1956 and the impact of revolution on Turkish-Egyptian relations. First of all, the problematic relations between Turkey and Egypt did not occur by the Free Officers coup d'état or just after the Second World War. It already had a problematic background before 1952, except short-lived Turkey's rapprochement to the Arab Middle East after the Second World War. Secondly, after the Free Officers Movement seized power, Gilead suggested that Turkish-Egyptian relations did not improve after the revolution even though Egyptian revolutionary officers called Neguib as Egypt's Atatürk.<sup>40</sup> However, our thesis argues that, there was a short-term rapprochement in Turkish-Egyptian relations due to different expectations of both sides. Thirdly, the Tugay Affair caused a rupture in Turkish-Egyptian diplomatic relations in 1954, but also had a domestic reasons and instrumentalization outcomes in Egyptian politics. Finally, the impact of the revolution on the bilateral relations was an unprecedented confrontation during the 1950s since both sides struggle for regional leadership in the region. While Turkey was adopted a bloc policy in its foreign affairs and advocating the Western interest in the region, Egypt adopted an activist, nationalist, neutralist foreign policy due to Nasser's objectives and struggle for leadership in his three circles.

---

<sup>40</sup> Gilead, *op.cit.*, p.357.

This thesis consists of three chapters, besides introduction and conclusion parts. In the chapter covering the period from Egypt's independence (1922) to the Free Officers Revolution (1952), Turkey's policies towards the Middle East is defined as limited involvement to the regional affairs. On the other side, Egypt tried to gain its true independence against dominant British influence and conducted a regional foreign policy in the light of its domestic discussions about the Egyptian identity and Egypt's role in the Middle East. This chapter aims to analyse their foreign policy orientations from the interwar period to post-Second World War period. Its second part focuses on the bilateral issues between the two countries. The Caliphate issue and some other bilateral problems were the main topics of political relations during the interwar period. After the Second World War, the Arab-Israeli Conflict and the Western oriented regional defence organization efforts came into prominence in the Middle East agenda, as well. Therefore, the first chapter presents the background of problematic relations between these countries before the Free Officers Revolution, as well as the shift in their foreign policy understanding from the interwar period to the Cold War conjuncture.

The second theme of the thesis, the impact of the Free Officers revolution on Turkish-Egyptian relations, will be examined in the following chapters. The second chapter tries to highlight the main theme of the foreign policy understanding of these countries during the 1950s when, Turkey's attachment to the West became prevalent. This study briefly demonstrates the activism of Turkish foreign policy during the 1950s and its policies towards the Arab Middle East in the Democrat Party era. Besides, this thesis refers to the domestic changes in Egypt to understand the regional objectives of the new regime, the need of legitimacy in this early stage, Nasser's Three Circles Theory as well as the impact of consolidation and personification periods on the Egyptian foreign policy choices. As Jankowski summarizes the internal history of the new regime is somewhat more relevant for understanding Egyptian foreign policy in the Middle East.<sup>41</sup> Therefore, this thesis presents the domestic aspect of the foreign policy choices, as well as the impact of the revolution on bilateral relations through domestic and foreign policy choices.

---

<sup>41</sup> Jankowski, *Nasser's Egypt...*, p.3.

In the context of post-revolution relations between Turkey and Egypt, the third chapter will primarily focus on the early stage of post-revolution era until the Tugay Affair caused a rupture in diplomatic relations. Its first part analyses the stance of new Egyptian regime on Turkey and Turkey's interpretation of the revolution by looking into the official documents and their reflection in the press. In the following headlines, this study touches upon the reasons and outcomes of the Tugay Affair and the Turkish-Egyptian contact after that event. Its second part tries to analyse Turkish-Egyptian relations through regional and international confrontations of these two countries. Therefore, this thesis will have the framework of Turkish-Egyptian relations from 1954 to 1956 with respect to their struggle for regional leadership and confrontations in regional and international stages. In the conclusion part of the thesis, Turkey's relation with Egypt is depicted, demonstrating the transition from the interwar period to the Cold War and analysing the impact of the Free Officers revolution on the Egyptian foreign policy and also Turkish-Egyptian relations.

The transliteration of words to a different alphabet is a problematic and a controversial issue. The most common forms and a simplified system of transliteration are used in the text. This includes the leader who stands at the centre of the thesis. The name of Gamal Abdel Nasser has been widely anglicized in this way, despite discussions about its abbreviation and transliteration. He is also referred to as Jamal 'Abd al-Nasir and other variants. Several names (Nasser, Neguib, and Farouk) are rendered as in common usage. Ineluctably, there are some variations in the spelling of names in quoted material or resources from different languages.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **TURKISH-EGYPTIAN RELATIONS UNTIL THE FREE OFFICERS REVOLUTION: 1922-1952**

Turkey and Egypt conducted different foreign policies during the period from their independences until 1952, and this period includes different conjunctures as the interwar era, the Second World War and the Cold War. Turkey was limitedly involved in the Middle East affairs during the interwar period. Its foreign policy towards the Middle East shifted due a pursuit for activism in the region and new foreign policy orientation to adopt the changing conjuncture after the Second World War. On the other side, Egypt had different priorities in its domestic and foreign policies during this period; such as struggle for true independence or search for a prominent role in the regional politics while discussing the Egyptian identity. The first part of this chapter will analyse the foreign policy understanding of these countries during this era. The second part examines Turkish-Egyptian relations that consisted of major problems in bilateral relations, and the impact of regional and international affairs.

#### **2.1. FOREIGN POLICY ORIENTATIONS OF TURKEY AND EGYPT: 1922-1952**

2.1.1. Turkish Foreign Policy towards the Arab Middle East: From “Indifference” to Activism

Turkish foreign policy can mainly be divided into four sub-periods from 1923 to 1952. Until 1930, the primary objective of foreign policy was solving the



issues that remained unresolved in the Treaty of Lausanne.<sup>42</sup> From 1930 until the Second World War, the indifferent stance of Turkey on the Middle East continued, when issues such as nation building, reformist modernization and statism were the top priorities of the state. In addition to that, Turkey left its fear from the West behind and its relations with the West witnessed a rapprochement in the 1930s.<sup>43</sup> Until the Second World War, Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East had been formed on two bases; national security and the need for regional stability for Turkish nation-building and regime-building processes. The third period is the exceptional one during the conjuncture of the Second World War, whereas the last period started after the Second World War and the beginning of the Cold War.

After the Second World War, Turkey identified itself with both Western and Middle Eastern identities to demonstrate itself as an essential route between these regions.<sup>44</sup> The predominant foreign policy objective of Turkey was winning the alliance of the West, as it had security related concerns due to the Soviet demands in this period.<sup>45</sup> Turkey's relation with the Arab Middle East was also shaped by security related concerns and avoidance from a potential controversy with mandatory Western powers, due to its desire to establish close relations with

---

<sup>42</sup> These remaining issues as the main item on the foreign policy agenda were the Mosul dispute, the instalment of the Ottoman public debt, the exchange of the Greek and Turkish populations' et.al. William Hale, **Turkish Foreign Policy Since 1774**, New York, Routledge, 2013, p.54-55.

<sup>43</sup> For Turkey's concerns from West, see also: A. Haluk Ülman, "Türk Dış Politikası'na Yön Veren Etkenler (1923-1968) I", **SBF Dergisi**, Vol.23, No.3, 1968, p.245-256.; For the rapprochement in Turkey-West relations; A. Haluk Ülman, Oral Sander, "Türk Dış Politikası'na Yön Veren Etkenler (1923-1968) II", **SBF Dergisi**, Vol.27, No.1, 1972, p.3-7.

<sup>44</sup> Nihat Erim, a deputy of ruling party, the RPP, and the subsequent Prime Minister during 1970-1971, commented on that period and Turkey's role to the US Ambassador Edwin C. Wilson on 9<sup>th</sup> January 1947 as: "Turkey has become a bridgehead of the Western civilization. Its exceptional attraction on Arab countries would cause these countries became closer to the Western civilization, ere long." Nihat Erim **Günlükler, 1925-1979**, Vol.I, İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2005, p.86.

<sup>45</sup> Walter Laqueur, **The Soviet Union and the Middle East**, New York, Praeger, 1959, p.143-145. Oral Sander, **Siyasi Tarih 1918-1994**, Ankara, İmge Kitabevi, 2007, p.252-253.

Western countries and then its willingness for the involvement in the Western community, and lastly in the Western alliance.<sup>46</sup>

Until the 1950s, Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East had prioritized its own security with a peace-protection perspective and by considering the international/regional conjunctures that demonstrated a dominant control of the mandatory powers over the region.<sup>47</sup> This regional foreign policy towards the Middle East is sometimes referred as Turkish indifference.<sup>48</sup> However, that period signified a limited involvement of Turkey in the Middle East issues. This limited involvement is based on two main principles: The first one is, ensuring national security and regional stability to concentrate on the nation building process. The main reflection of this principle on Turkey's relations with the Middle East countries is based on Kurdish rebellions in particular and regional security in general. Taşpınar described the founding decades of Turkey as "benign neglect" and stated that the regional foreign policy initiative indirectly involved the Kurdish question, including the Sa'adabad Pact which had no specific mention of the Kurds but in fact

---

<sup>46</sup> The commonly missing part of that security concern was a regional instability factor due to the Middle East events. These factors were the Arab-Israeli conflict, which would lead up to many wars, Iranian crisis of 1946, domestic instability in newly independent countries and their reflection to regional instability, and rising Arab nationalism. Even it could not recognize as important as Soviet demands within Turkish security concern; the security concern from the south hastened and maintained Turkey's choice. Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "An Analysis of Turkish-Arab Relations", **SBF Dergisi**, V.27, N.1, 1972, p.117.

<sup>47</sup> That security-oriented perspective of Turkey could be interpreted as a realist decision in the context of alienating itself from the Middle East issues. Because this also means that alienating itself from possible conflicts that would occur between regional actors and the mandatory powers in any case and would left Turkey amid both sides. It was a reasonable declaration in terms of international system, which head Turkey towards being a part of Western system and protect its nation state. Ahmet Davutoğlu, **Stratejik Derinlik**, İstanbul, Küre Yayınları, 2012, p.69.

<sup>48</sup> Dikerdem summarized the foreign policy towards the Middle East as "an indifference and the leaving Arabs alone" in Atatürk's era. Mahmut Dikerdem, **Ortadoğu'da Devrim Yılları (Bir Büyükelçinin Anıları)**, İstanbul, İstanbul Matbaası, 1977, p.9-10. Only the exception of the Mosul dispute and the Sanjak dispute, Turkish foreign policy was remained secondary in general agenda of Turkish politics. Hale went further and suggested that the presence of Britain and France as dominant powers in the Middle East was a fortunate effect for Turkey that virtually removing the Middle East item out of the list of foreign policy concerns, until 1941. Hale, **op.cit.**, p. 65-71.

intended to cooperate in case of a subversive rebellion.<sup>49</sup> The second one is solving the unreconciled or newly emerged issues that were stirring controversy between Turkey and mandate powers; such as the Mosul issue, the Sanjak (Hatay) dispute; or between Turkey and Middle East countries as the Caliphate issue, which was mainly aroused by the Egyptian efforts to bring the Caliphate to the Egyptian King.<sup>50</sup> Turkey chose to remain indifferent to events and developments in the region, and not to become a part of an intra-regional dispute as long as they did not interfere with these principles.

These issues in Turkish-Arab relations had nothing more than territorial meanings since the real interlocutors of Middle Eastern Arab countries were Britain and France in interbellum. However, Turkey's relations with non-Arab states such as Iran and Afghanistan were far closer.<sup>51</sup> This limited involvement perspective towards the Arab Middle East would not change in general; with the only exception of Iraq in the Sa'adabad Pact (Treaty of Non-Aggression in 1937). After all, Arab Middle East interpreted this stance of Turkey and its reforms for the nation building process would draw it away from the Arab/Islamic world as a continuation of the moral rupture since the 1908.<sup>52</sup> On the other hand, Turkey was gradually improving

---

<sup>49</sup> Ömer Taşpınar, **Carnegie Papers, No.10: Turkey's Middle East Policies Between Neo-Ottomanism and Kemalism**, Washington DC, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Publications Department, 2008, p.6.

<sup>50</sup> Oral Sander, **Siyasi Tarih...**, p.93-110. For more information about Mosul dispute, see also Nevin Coşar and Sevtap Demirci, "The Mosul Question and the Turkish Republic: Before and After the Frontier Treaty, 1926" **The Turkish Yearbook**, Vol. XXXV, 2004, pp. 43-59; Quincy Wright, "The Mosul Dispute", **The American Journal of International Law**, Vol.20, No.3, Jul. 1926, pp. 453-464; Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, **Mondros'tan Musul'a Türk-İngiliz İlişkileri**, Ankara İmaj Yayıncılık, 2006. For Hatay (Sanjak) Issue, see also: Avedis K. Sanjian, "The Sanjak of Alexandretta (Hatay): Its Impact on Turkish-Syrian Relations (1930-1956)", **The Middle East Journal**, Vol. 10, No. 4, Autumn 1956, p.379-394.

<sup>51</sup> For the reasons and progress of these relations, see also Atay Akdevelioğlu and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1919-1923 Arap Olmayan Ülkelerle İlişkiler", "1923-1939 Ortadoğu ile İlişkiler", Baskın Oran (ed.), **Türk Dış Politikası, Kurtuluş Savaşı'ndan Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Vol. I: 1919-1980**, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2008, p.204-209; p.357-369.

<sup>52</sup> Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye'nin Arap Orta Doğusu'na Karşı Politikası (1945-1970)**, Ankara, Barış Kitap, 2010, p.6.

its relations with Britain and France, whereas the Arabs were struggling for their independence against these two mandatory powers.<sup>53</sup>

After the Second World War, the Western-oriented foreign policy became a primary determinant in Turkey's foreign policy and had a divisive influence on Turkish and Arab perceptions. This activism in Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East started for reasons of regional insecurity and also to improve Turkey's position in the eyes of Western countries as an extension of Turkey's Western orientation.<sup>54</sup> Even before the Democrat Party came to power, the Republican People's Party had started an initiative of activism and rapprochement with the Arab Middle East.<sup>55</sup> On the basis of this activism, the effect of the Western-oriented foreign policy choice of Turkey, which was more limited between 1945 and 1947 than the following years, was the primary determinant until the 1960s. This activism and Turkey's new positioning in the region could be observed in regional issues such as regional defence pact projects.

In the context of Turkish-Egyptian relations, Turkey's limited involvement in Middle East issues coincided with the Arab struggle against the colonial dominance of mandatory powers. While Egypt was struggling against the British dominance for its true independence and release from colonial constraints in its internal affairs, Turkey had already fought for this cause after the First World War, by making no concessions to its independence in the field of diplomacy or war of independence. Turkey had passed over this national struggle period by making internal reforms for modernization and nation building, while having a regional insecurity perception and avoidance from Middle East complexity. Turkey had

---

<sup>53</sup> Kürkçüoğlu, "An Analysis of Turkish-Arab Relations", *op.cit.*, p.130.

<sup>54</sup> Melek Fırat, Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1945-1960 Ortadoğu'yla İlişkiler", Oran (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.615. Sander pointed out the reasons of that change in foreign policy towards the Middle East by the Soviet demands, establishment of parliamentary system, security concerns of Turkey based on regional instability and economic necessity for modernization. Oral Sander, **Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası**, Melek Fırat (ed.), Ankara, İmge Kitabevi, 2013, p.228-233.

<sup>55</sup> In this period, Turkey recognized the independence of Syria and Lebanon in 1946. In 1945 Regent of the King Faisal II, the Crown Prince Abdel Ilah of Iraq; in 1946 first post-independence President of Lebanon Bishara Al Khoury, in 1947 King Abdullah of Jordan visited Turkey and Treaty of Friendship and Neighbourly Relations between Turkey and Iraq signed in 1946; Treaty of Friendship between Jordan and Turkey signed in 1947.

attached much more importance to its relation with the West rather than its relation with Middle East countries. Moreover, Turkey maintained its relations with the Middle East over Western powers by considering that the real interlocutors of the Arab Middle East countries were Britain and France during the interwar period. Turkish-Arab Middle East relations and Turkey's relations with their mandatory powers, Britain and France, were interdependent in this regard.

Egypt was not an exception of that choice. In this period of Turkish-Egyptian relations, these points must be kept in mind: the British control over Egyptian politics, Egyptian dependency to British colonial and regional policies, Turkish-British relations, domestic struggle of Egypt for true independence and gaining the control of Egyptian politics among the Wafd, the Palace and the British authority. In this regard, Prime Minister Ali Fethi's (Okyar) speech demonstrated how Turkey gave priority to its relations with Western powers vis-à-vis a Middle East country by his comments on the Egyptian-British controversy. The reason behind the Prime Minister's speech was a deed of protest, which was sent to the GNAT, as all other parliaments in the world and the League of Nations, by the Egyptian parliament. It caused a controversy with one Member of Parliament, Ağaoğlu Ahmet Bey who addressed in favour of that call.<sup>56</sup> This Egyptian deed of protest call was issued for British interference in Egypt's internal affairs, on the Sudan controversy between Egypt and Britain, and a "libellous" ultimatum from Britain to Egypt was sent about the assassination of Sir Lee Stack, who was the Sirdar of the Egyptian Army and the British Governor General of Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Ağaoğlu Ahmet Bey compared British policies on Egypt to British policies during the Turkish War of Independence and on Mosul Issue, criticizing the colonial policies of Britain from the British Raj to the Middle East and anticipated a favourable reply from the GNAT to the Egyptian deed of protest.<sup>57</sup> Due to Turkey's solicitude for any possible controversy with Great Britain, Prime Minister Ali Fethi (Okyar) had an exemplary response in terms of limitation of Turkish involvement to the Middle East problems:

---

<sup>56</sup> For the text of the deed of protest; **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 2, Vol. 10, Session. 14, 01.12.1340 (01 December 1924), p.413-414.

<sup>57</sup> For the address of Ağaoğlu Ahmet Bey, **Ibid.**, p.414-417.

Your (the GNAT's) government wants to submit its will to our High Assembly respectfully to disapprove these words and expressions about the Government of the United Kingdom, which we aspire to continue good relations with... It is surely beyond doubt that the Turkish nation wants and desires in good faith that the, Egyptian nation attain freedom and welfare. On the other hand, it also desires to improve its relations with the Government of the United Kingdom and acts in the circle of friendship... Moreover, we want to improve our relations all the better. Our national interests also necessitated that... I do not feel the need to suggest any assessment about the controversy between Egypt and British government, by some means or other.<sup>58</sup>

The geographical distance of Egypt also provided itself another obstacle from any possible Turkish rapprochement, which prioritized its bilateral relations with neighbouring countries due to security concerns or common problems. Although, the Caliphate issue and some minor bilateral problems in Egyptian-Turkish relations, which did not have any relevance in regional conjuncture, were the exception of that general perspective. It could be added that, there was a similarity between Turkey and Egypt in terms of focusing on their own *wataniya*.<sup>59</sup> Egyptian *wataniya* could be understood in the context of Egyptianism dominance in politics. It had internal objectives towards true independence and taking a leading part for social, political and economic modernization in comparison with other Arab regions.<sup>60</sup> From that perspective, Turkish *wataniya* was a good example for Egypt to focus on its own affairs, which were a combination of social, political, economic

---

<sup>58</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 2, Vol. 10, Session. 14, 01.12.1340 (01 December 1924), p.417.

<sup>59</sup> *Wataniya* could be summarized as nation-state patriotism, in contrast with culturally, politically or militarily irredentist nationalism. It includes Arab nationhood and state particularism in common.

<sup>60</sup> Dawisha also indicated the role of Islam in internal politics and Islamic organizations as a prominent challenger against the Egyptian *wataniya* orientation. Adeed Dawisha, **Arab Nationalism in the Twentieth Century From Triumph to Despair**, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2003, p.98-102. The newly independent states as Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq were mirrored other existing Arab states, which had more historically rooted foundations, such as Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, Yemen, and Oman. Philip Mattar (ed.), **The Encyclopedia of the Modern Middle East and North Africa V.I**, Michigan, Thomson Gale, Second Edition, 2004, p.261-262.

reforms.<sup>61</sup> This inward looking attitude of Egypt grew after the 1948 defeat, not only for the economy or political reforms but also for modernization of the army. As Dawisha remarked, of all the Arab countries the one that shifted inward the most was Egypt and that would result with, a renewed affirmation of Egyptian wataniya in the wake of the debacle of Palestinian war.<sup>62</sup> In fact, some calls were made for Egypt's withdrawal from the Arab League so that country could focus on its own affairs following the example of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in Turkey after World War I, as Dawisha quoted.<sup>63</sup>

After the Second World War, the Turkish-Egyptian relations were on a normal level. While Egypt was dealing with Egyptian-British negotiation, Turkey was dealing with its own problems, as Gürün noted.<sup>64</sup> Turkey would carry out its Western-oriented foreign policy more directly after the Second World War. Furthermore, Turkey had started its active foreign policy towards the Middle East by using bilateral rapprochement and active participation in regional issues. These regional issues were the Palestine issue and the discussion on Middle East Defense Organization. Egypt favoured Turkey's decision on a partition plan, as other Arab states also did. Despite much domestic and regional criticism, Turkey recognized the state of Israel, which had a deprecating effect on its reputation in the Arab Middle East. In terms of the regional defence pact, Turkey's contribution to a Western-oriented defence project was considered as a contribution of a regional actor to the Western domination, which was a symbol Turkey's of Western-advocated foreign policy. It could be suggested that, Turkey's involvement in the Middle East issues in post-Second World War era would push Egyptian activism to be more Arab, became more nationalist and pursue more anti-Turkey policies in the context of Turkey's connection with the Western powers.

---

<sup>61</sup> The Turkish experience was given precedences to the independence, based on realist perspective and to the Westernization, based on balancing until 1930s; and afterwards the Kurdish issue and "balancing/alliance problem" until the Second World War. Oran (ed.), *op.cit.*, p.104-109; 251-257.

<sup>62</sup> Dawisha, *op.cit.*, p.132.

<sup>63</sup> Anwar G. Chejne, "Egyptian Attitudes Toward Pan-Arabism," *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 11, No.3, Summer 1957, p.259-261. in Dawisha, *op.cit.*, p.132-133.

<sup>64</sup> Kamuran Gürün, *Dış İlişkiler ve Türk Politikası (1939'dan günümüze kadar)*, Ankara, Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1983, p.347-348.

### 2.1.2. Egyptian Foreign Policy: Search for a Prominent Role and Identity Construction

Egyptian rulers aspired to control the Levant since the ancient times both for its strategic value as a buffer zone, and for economic and commercial facilities with exploitable resources.<sup>65</sup> Despite the dominant British control that began with the 1882 occupation, the opportunity for having an influence in the region had re-emerged for Fuad I by the authority gap in the wake of the World War. Egypt had many advantages over other states and newly emerged actors in the Middle East due to its geopolitical features or the ongoing modernization and developments since the period of Muhammad Ali.<sup>66</sup> There were many prominent figures; even some had initiated the Arab Revolt, from tribes or dynasties, who became more of an actor along with the authority gap due to the withdrawal of Ottoman power from the Middle East. During the post-Great War period, despite the intensive mandatory takeover of the region in general, some regional figures like Sharif Hussein of Mecca, Ibn Saud, Fuad I of Egypt were seeking the opportunity to spread their influence, to consolidate their positions and tried to assume power with great ambition.

The search for a prominent role for Egypt has two dimensions in this period: internal identity construction process and the implementations of this search in foreign policy. The Egyptian identity construction had been continuing since the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the Arabi Revolt, which was an iconic and a patriotic uprising with the

---

<sup>65</sup> Not only the economic or cultural ties were taking into consideration in Nasserist historiography but also the formation of Arab identity in Levant, especially in Syria, analysed and compared with the Egyptian experience. Ibrahim A. Karawan, "Identity and Foreign Policy The Case of Egypt", Shibley Telhami, Michael N. Barnett (eds.), **Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East**, New York, Cornell University Press, 2002, p.159.

<sup>66</sup> Ismael summarized that as "Mehmed Ali's struggle for power against the Ulama, the Turkish garrison, the Ottoman governor and the Mameluks in the name of modernization objectives which were establishing a strong Egyptian army, economic diversification, modern industrialization and the creation of modern bureaucracy." Tareq Y. Ismael, **Middle East Politics Today: Government and Civil Society**, Gainesville, University Press of Florida, 2001, p.416.



motto “Egypt for the Egyptians!”<sup>67</sup> In interbellum, Egypt shaped and redefined its identity by putting forward its features; which were Islamic, Arab, Pharaonic past, Mediterranean, African but essentially within an Egypt-oriented regional perspective.<sup>68</sup> That period would be interpreted as a search for a prominent role during its “liberal era” with identity construction.<sup>69</sup> Therefore, many different groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood, the Wafd Party or leftist movements had been established and they advocated their variant interpretations on Egyptian role in the region and Egyptian identity in this liberal era.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> For more information about Arabi Revolt, see also: Juan R. I. Cole, **Colonialism and Revolution in the Middle East Social and Cultural Origins of Egypt’s Urabi Movement**, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1993. Arthur Goldschmidt Jr., **A Concise History of the Middle East**, Colorado, Westview Press, 2002, p.179-183. Lewis interpreted that kind of first awakenings in the Middle East as patriotism, not nationalism. He explained it as “the first stirrings of the new loyalty in the Middle East took the form of patriotism, not nationalism. They inspired by the Western example of Western Europe, particularly France and England, where nationhood and statehood were combined and where patriotism was the loyalty that citizens owed to their country and normally paid to the government when it fell due.... The term used to convey the idea of country, or more precisely of the French *patrie*, was the Arab word *watan*, which has passed, with some changes of pronunciation, into Persian, Turkish, and other Islamic languages.” Bernard Lewis, **The Shaping of the Modern Middle East**, New York, Oxford University Press, 1994, p.75.

<sup>68</sup> Israel Gershoni and James Jankowski, **Egypt, Islam and the Arabs: the Search for Egyptian Nationhood 1900-1939**, New York, Oxford University Press, 1987, p.77-190.; Israel Gershoni and James Jankowski, **Redefining the Egyptian Nation, 1930-1945**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995, *passim.*; Amatzia Baram, “Territorial Nationalism in the Middle East”, **Middle Eastern Studies**, Vol. 26, No. 4, October, 1990, p.429-433.; Eric J. Hobsbawm, **Nations and Nationalism Since 1780 Programme, Myth, Reality**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992, p.137. Ibrahim A. Karawan, **Identity and Foreign Policy The Case of Egypt**, Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett (eds.), **Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East**, New York, Cornell University Press, 2002, p.156. Donald M. Reid “Nationalizing the Pharaonic Past: Egyptology, Imperialism, and Egyptian Nationalism, 1922-1952”, James Jankowski and Israel Gershoni (eds.), **Rethinking Nationalism in the Arab Middle East**, New York, Columbia University Press, 1997, p.127-149. Bassam Tibi, **Arab Nationalism Between Islam and the Nation State**, New York, St.Martin Press, 1997.

<sup>69</sup> The liberal term based on the main character of the regime as parliamentary monarchy and the liberal features in this period as the emergence of various political parties, parliamentary government, a free-enterprise economy, and Westernized social structure, promotion of secularism, individualism and modernism modelled on the European experience. Afaf Lutfi Al-Sayyid Marsot, **A History of Egypt From the Arab Conquest to Present**, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2007, p.98-126; Jankowski, *op.cit.*, p.11; P. J. Vatikiotis, **The Modern History of Egypt**, New York, Praeger, 1969, p.239-373.

<sup>70</sup> Many of these political parties were the instruments of a conservative upper class in the Egyptian society. On the other side, the pragmatic ability of the Ikhwan was its organizational skills for the formation of masses and to channel their national-religious emotions into its attentive long-range efforts. P.J. Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army in Politics Pattern for New Nations?**, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1961, p.29-30.

Despite the fact that Egypt was preserving and sometimes putting forward its unique characteristic elements, the Egyptian example shares many common features with other Arab countries. These common identities were mainly Arab and Islam identities, and Egyptian foreign policy was built on these constituent elements of the Middle East.<sup>71</sup> Thus, three issues shaped Egypt's regional foreign policy: the Caliphate issue, the Palestine issue and Arab nationalism. Firstly, bringing the Caliphate to the Egyptian monarch aimed to provide an internal advantage for the Palace and a regional influence for the King of Egypt and the Sudan; but his claims could not find any supporter. Egypt's efforts for Arab nationalism and Arab cause in Palestine have hitherto a continuing effect on Egyptian decision-making.

Regarding the Palestine issue, in the wake of the First World War, all political figures in the Arab world were striving for their own interests in order to gain their complete independence or control their internal affairs, while Palestinians had faith in all manner of Arab unity or the Arab League.<sup>72</sup> Notwithstanding, even after the traumatic 1948 defeat, Arab nationalists barely became aware of the importance of the Palestine issue, which had been a leading foreign policy issue for Egypt preponderantly.<sup>73</sup> Even the political leaders of Egypt hesitated to adopt a more activist regional policy because of this Egyptian leadership notion; the Palestine issue would be the pattern for Egyptian involvement in regional issues. Gershoni and Jankowski emphasized the role of growing interest of Egyptian public over Palestine and the effect of Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936, on Egyptian foreign

---

<sup>71</sup> Hobsbawm stated the role of religion in nationalist identity construction as: "religion is an ancient and well-tried of establishing communication through common practice and a sort of brotherhood between people who otherwise have nothing much in common." Eric J. Hobsbawm, **Nations and Nationalism since 1780 Programme, Myth, Reality**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992, p.68. While Egypt was conserving, even sometimes putting forward, its unique characteristic elements; the Egyptian example shares many common features with other Arab parties. However, the importance of the establishment of a common communication ground for nationalist discourse of Egypt, especially for its Pan-Arabist era, have to be underlined.

<sup>72</sup> 'Abd al-'Aziz A. Ayyad, **Arab Nationalism and the Palestinians 1850-1939**, Jerusalem, PASSIA, 1999, p.114.

<sup>73</sup> E.G.H. Joffé, "Arab Nationalism and Palestine", **Journal of Peace Research**, Vol. 20, No. 2, June 1983, p.166.

policy to have an external incentive to involve itself in the issue.<sup>74</sup> Even religious groups criticize the usage of Islam within nationalist perspectives; Islamic and nationalist groups have been in complete agreement on the issue of the demand for the evacuation of the British troops from Suez or Egypt's complete independence, in a patriotic way. Neither nationalists nor Islamists ardently take an interest in problems of other Arab/Islamic societies as the Algerian issue or the Palestine issue, as much as these internal objectives.<sup>75</sup>

Above all, Arab nationalism reached ideological maturity as a historical force with the disintegration of the Ottoman authority and emergence of a new regional system. Therefore, Egyptian search for a role had to relate with Arab nationalism inevitably because the region experienced the aura of Arab nationalism during its heyday after the First World War. Despite Zaghlul and his followers' rejection of the idea of Egypt as part of the fruitless Arab unity for struggle against the Europeans; Egyptians, especially the petty bourgeoisie and army officers, had been turning towards Arab nationalism since the 1930s.<sup>76</sup> During the same period, the enrolment of some lower-middle class Egyptians who grew up with nationalist ideals into the Military Academy caused the Egyptian Army to take a nationalist direction.<sup>77</sup> The search for a regional leadership role for Egypt was affected from the enthusiasm of Arab nationalism and the building process of Egyptian identity, which had integrated its components (Pharaonic, Arab, Islamic-a religiously based alternative-, et.al.) with nationalistic sentiments. It would build an identity based on

---

<sup>74</sup> Gershoni and Jankowski, **Redefining the Egyptian....**, p.170.

<sup>75</sup> Zafar Ishaq Ansari, "Contemporary Islam and Nationalism Case of Egypt", **Die Welt des Islams**, Vol. 7, Issue 1/4, 1961, p.20.

<sup>76</sup> Ralph M. Coury, "Who Invented the Arab Nationalism? Part I", **International Journal of Middle East Studies**, Vol. 14, No.3, August 1982, p.251. Regarding these newly raised groups, that period saw the rise of them in Egyptian society outside the triangular struggle between the Palace, the Wafd Part and the British. Vatikiotis described that newly raised groups as "The 1930s witnessed perhaps the most rapid evolution of social and political ideas in the country's history which was to undermine both the unpopular minority of Palace favourites and the allegedly popular Wafd." P.J. Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army....**, p.25-26.

<sup>77</sup> James V. DeFronzo (ed.), **Revolutionary Movements in World History Vol. I.**, California, ABC-CLIO, 2006, p.249. The Egyptian army was eligible to non-Egyptian groups like Turks and privileged sons of Pasha's until the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty.

Egyptian Islamic nationalism, Egyptian Arab nationalism or glorification of Pharaonic past; and pursue more effective foreign policy towards the region with the perspective of Egyptian leadership.<sup>78</sup> Gershoni and Jankowski summarized this outcome as “by the mid-1920s and for several years thereafter, there seemed to be but one political path before Egyptians: to be Egyptian, to think Egyptian, and to act Egyptian.”<sup>79</sup>

The Egyptian search for a role in the Middle East did not affect its relations with Turkey, except the Caliphate issue. First of all, identity construction process and foreign policy orientation of Egypt did not necessarily counter Turkish identity or Turkish foreign policy. Because rather than historical roots of the Ottoman legacy, Egypt had much more predominant struggle against the presence of mandatory structure and interference of Britain or later a struggle in the Palestine issue. The Ottoman legacy became a pragmatic discourse for the Arab nationalist perspective during the troubled times in Turkish-Egyptian relations to ruin Turkey’s reputation or hail the Egyptian one.<sup>80</sup> Secondly, Turkey’s limited involvement on either the Middle East issues or the inter-Arab problems prevented a possible confrontation with Egypt. Nevertheless, when there was a reason for Turkish involvement, as it is seen in the Caliphate efforts of Egypt, the confrontation was intense and inevitable.

Secondly, Turkish foreign policy on the Middle East prevented any confrontation with Egypt due to Turkey’s limited interest in the region. That limitation was crystalizing in this bilateral relation with the Caliphate issue. However, after the Second World War, Turkey’s changing foreign policy orientation would give rise to Turkish activism in the Middle East over the same period of

---

<sup>78</sup> Gershoni and Jankowski, **Redefining the Egyptian...**, p.79-142.

<sup>79</sup> Gershoni and Jankowski, **Egypt, Islam and the Arab...**, p.74

<sup>80</sup> Although the French writer who noted the statements of Ibrahim Pasha, interpreted this as a sign of Ibrahim’s aim to found an entirely Arab state, and “give back to the Arab race its nationalist and political existence”; he made an early example of this pragmatic nationalist discourse. Even he made that interpretation to hail Arab race against Turkish one as “I am not a Turk. I came to Egypt when I was a child, and since that time, the sun of Egypt has changed my blood and made it all Arab.” Albert Hourani, **Arabic Thought in The Liberal Age: 1798-1939**, London, Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 261.

Egyptian activism. That would also bring about issue-oriented confrontations like the regional defence pact project, and worsen bilateral relations while the Egyptian foreign policy orientation was shaped by the perspective of Egyptian leadership in the region.

## **2.2. BILATERAL RELATIONS AND REGIONAL ISSUES**

### **2.2.1. Bilateral Issues and Agreements in Turkish-Egyptian Relations**

The Treaty of Lausanne ratified that, Turkey renounced all of its rights and titles over Egypt and the Sudan, which took effect as of 5 November 1914.<sup>81</sup> The Treaty of Lausanne legitimized the British announcement of a protectorate over Egypt in 1914 and the unilateral declaration for the nominal independence of Egypt on 28 February 1922.<sup>82</sup> It also laid the foundation of Turkish-Egyptian relations with the legitimization of post-Ottoman status of Egypt. The first request for establishing bilateral diplomatic relations came from Egypt through the agency of Egyptian Ambassador in Rome to Turkish Ambassador in Rome, Suad Davas. On 19 February 1925, Egypt appointed its first Charge d’Affaires to Turkey, and then Turkey appointed Muhittin Pasha as its first Charge d’Affaires to Egypt. These missions were upgraded to Ambassadorial level in 1948. The first agreement between the two countries constituted as a commercial *modus vivendi*, and signed in 1926.

From 1928 to 1934, there were many minor problems that became a subject of Turkish-Egyptian bilateral relations and these minor issues were resolved and compromised within diplomatic customs and practices, before they could have

---

<sup>81</sup> **Treaty of Lausanne** (Treaty of Peace with Turkey, signed in Lausanne, July 24, 1923), article 17.

<sup>82</sup> Ritchie Owendale, **The Origins of the Arab-Israeli Wars**, New York, Longman, 1992, p.58-67.

caused further tension. The first problem in bilateral relations arose from the Turkey's request on the joint courts for jurisdictional disputes between the Egyptian government and Turkish citizens in Egypt; as French, British, Greek, Italian citizens had. The Turkish Charge d'Affaires considered this issue at the outset yet the King of Egypt did not initially give him an appointment. When he gave an appointment, the Turkish envoy reacted likewise to the disrespectful treatment of King Fuad.<sup>83</sup> This event was followed by the opium critique of Egypt on Turkey's opium production in 1930, since Egypt tried to reflect the US-led Western critics on its opium production to the Turkish one, which already had the same international pressure up to monopolize it in 1932.<sup>84</sup> Even that opium critique, this issue would not cause any escalation in bilateral relations regarding Turkish Prime Minister Inonu's interview with Al-Ahram in 1931. He referred his good intention and sought for amicable terms with Egypt by saying:

I am glad to declare our intimate relationship and friendly feelings to Egypt through its biggest newspaper, Al-Ahram. We are standing aloof from any dissenting opinion to the Egyptian national desires. On the contrary, we corroborate the realization of national desires of this friendly nation within the bounds of possibility.<sup>85</sup>

On 29<sup>th</sup> of October 1931, the attendance of the Egyptian Minister in Ankara, Hamza Bey to the Republic Day Ball caused a diplomatic affair since he wore a "fez" to the Ball, as he wore too often in public. It was already banned as a symbol of the Ottoman past and as "a sign of ignorance, fanaticism, hatred of progress and civilisation".<sup>86</sup> His "fez" habit and this last attendance with a fez was interpreted as a

---

<sup>83</sup> Semih Bulut, "Atatürk Dönemi Türkiye-Mısır İlişkileri (1926-1938)", **Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi**, Vol. XXVI, No.78, November 2010.

<sup>84</sup> Çağrı Erhan, **Beyaz Savaş Türk Amerikan İlişkilerinde Afyon Sorunu**, Ankara, Bilgi Yayınevi, 1996, p.40-41.

<sup>85</sup> Semih Bulut, **op.cit.**

<sup>86</sup> Houchang Chehabi , "Dress Codes for Men in Turkey and Iran" in Touraj Atabaki,Erik-Jan Zürcher (eds.), **Men of Order: Authoritarian Modernization Under Atatürk and Reza Shah**, New York, I.B.Tauris, 2004, p.228.

contemptuous attitude to the Kemalist reforms and directly interfered by President Mustafa Kemal, himself.<sup>87</sup> Even the media mentioned this event as “a diplomatic storm” or “quarrel over a hat”.<sup>88</sup> However it had a much deeper meaning considering bilateral relations and Turkey’s stance on Middle East and Egypt.

First of all, the propriety of wearing fez is important from the perspective of demonstrating superiority and authority, as someone takes off his fez only when he is allowed to do so by a respected elderly; which was the case here. Secondly, it was a demonstration of embracing the Kemalist reformist attitude, despite an inappropriate diplomatic behaviour in the presence of corps diplomatique. Considering the reformist policies of Reza Shah Pahlavi and the attendance of Persian Foreign Minister Muhammad Ali Foroughi Khan to the Ball, it was also an exemplary scene for him to demonstrate Turkey’s determination.<sup>89</sup> This is because the fez affair signified how Turkey advocated and performed its internal reforms, even against an envoy that was challenging them too often. Moreover, fez habit of Egyptian Minister was also a contemptuous attitude to Turkish reforms, so Mustafa Kemal’s reaction was a sign of impatience with any foreign challenge. Besides, it was also a significant illustration for how Turkey distanced itself from the Middle East, not only politically but also culturally. Lewis underlines the importance of fez as a last bastion of Muslim identification and Turkish separateness. In this regard,

---

<sup>87</sup> For the conversation between President Mustafa Kemal and Egyptian envoy Abdülmelik Hamza Bey is become varied by different interpretation and comments of the British Ambassador Sir George Clerk, the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs T.R. Aras, the French Ambassador Kont de Chambrun, the Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs Yahya Pasha via Egyptian envoy. Bilâl N. Şimşir, “Fes Olayı Türkiye-Mısır İlişkilerinde Bir Sayfa (1932-1933)”, **Bellekten**, Vol. XLVIII, No. 189-190, January-April 1984, p.6-10.

<sup>88</sup> “Mısır’da bir takım münafıklar mesele çıkardılar”, **Milliyet**, 5 December 1932; “Diplomatic Storm A Fez May Cause”, **Daily Herald**, London, 11 November 1932; “Fuss Over a Fez”, **Evening Standard**, 11 November 1932; “Nations Quarrel Over A Hat”, **The Morning Post**, London, 8 December 1932.

<sup>89</sup> “Ankara Palas’ta Verilen Ziyafet”, **Akşam**, 30 November 1932.

fez had another meaning in Mustafa Kemal's reaction to the Egyptian Minister, by standing aloof to the Muslim and Middle Eastern identities.<sup>90</sup>

The fez affair would be resolved with the cooling down of Turkey and also British involvement for reaching a mutual understanding and reducing the tension.<sup>91</sup> However, other internal circumstances of Egypt such as the mistreatment to Turkish citizens in Egyptian prisons and payment disputes regarding the income of waqf properties became main problems in bilateral relations in 1933. Turkey would take the initiative to standardize and improve its deteriorated relations with the Muslim countries as late as 1933.<sup>92</sup> In terms of Turkish-Egyptian relations, King Fuad's death on 28 April 1936 was an opportunity for détente by the respectful participation of Turkey's Minister to the funeral. Moreover, the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty was welcome in Turkey.<sup>93</sup> With King Farouk's ascent to the throne and a new era of bilateral relations, Egypt became a part of this normalization process that led to the 1937 Turkish-Egyptian Treaty of Friendship, Residency and Citizenship pact signed on 7<sup>th</sup> April 1937.<sup>94</sup> On the other side of this rapprochement, there was a significant British support for this normalization, in consequence of British concerns on Italian aggression in the Mediterranean. The plan was to confront this threat in cooperation with the countries in the region. This mutual agreement and regional orientation produced positive outcomes in a very short period.

A symbolic outcome of this rapprochement, on May 26, 1937, Egypt became the last state to join the League of Nations with the special session, which was managed by Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs T. R. Aras. However, the temperate reaction of Egypt and Turkey to these minor crises prevented them from turning into

---

<sup>90</sup> Bernard Lewis, **The Emergence of the Modern Turkey**, London, Oxford University Press, 1961, p.268.

<sup>91</sup> Şimşir, **op.cit.**, p.49-52. Melek Çolak, "Türk Mısır İlişkileri Çerçevesinde Mısır'ın Atatürk ve Türk Devrimine Bakışı (1919-1938)" **Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi**, No.6, Spring 2010, p.29-30.

<sup>92</sup> Oran (ed.), **op.cit.**, p.251.

<sup>93</sup> "Kardeş Mısır nihayet istiklaline kavuştu", **Milliyet**, 27 August 1936.

<sup>94</sup> **Kanunlar Dergisi**, Vol.17, 25.06.1937, p.1050-1056. Fahir Armaoğlu, **20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi 1919-1995**, Vol I-II, İstanbul, Alkım Yayınevi, 2005, p.347.



a comprehensive bilateral crisis or a frequent unfriendly stance. In addition to this attitude, regional and international conjuncture with the factors as Italian aggression or security concern of Britain on the Eastern Mediterranean also incited the possible reconciler effect of Britain on Turkish-Egyptian relations. During the Second World War, Cairo hosted the second meeting of Inonu and Churchill, in which Inonu accepted in principle that Turkey would enter the war.<sup>95</sup> From 1945 to 1954, the main confrontations of Egypt and Turkey were on regional level with the issues of Middle East Defense Organization or the Arab-Israeli conflict.

### 2.2.2. The Caliphate Issue

At the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the Ottoman Sultan Selim I had decisively overcome his rivals in the Islamic world. Syria, Egypt and the Holy Places of Islam were passed on to the Ottoman possession and the Ottoman sultan became an absolute ruler of the majority of the Muslim world. That conquest also assured a symbolic take-over of the Caliphate, though the title had been claimed since the period of Murad II, and *de facto* take-over of the *custodian of the Two Holy Mosques* with an Ottoman domination in the Muslim world.<sup>96</sup> However, this title was not used specifically like a divine authorization but much more like claiming the right to rule by ascending to the “throne of the caliphate” or identifying the authority and crucial function of a Muslim ruler. The important fact is that; the real power was previously based on claiming the title to officiate and fulfill its

---

<sup>95</sup> Armaoğlu, *op.cit.*, p.412-413; Ahmet Şükrü Esmer and Oral Sander, **Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası, “1939-1945 Dönemi”**, Vol.1, Ankara, AÜSBF Yayınları, 1987, p.164-178.

<sup>96</sup> That claim on custodianship could be dated back the Murad II’s action for the Surre Procession. Even some scholars interpreted that the usage of title as a tradition which dated back to the Murad I’s reign. Mehmet II the Conqueror also named himself as “the shadow of Allah on Earth” which is written at the Imperial Gate (Bab-ı Humayun) of Topkapi Palace. For more information about assuming the universal Caliphate by the Ottomans, see also Halil İnalcık, “The Ottomans and the Caliphate”, **The Cambridge History of Islam**, I, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1970, p.320-323. Azmi Özcan, “Hilâfet Osmanlı Dönemi”, **Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi**, Vol.17, Ankara, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998, p.546-549.

mission, instead of just being the Caliph, yet starting from 11<sup>st</sup>-12<sup>nd</sup> centuries since the Caliphate turned into an emblematic institution for Muslim rulers. In this regard, the Caliphate can be understood as claiming for being the emirate of all Muslim community.

Therefore, the Caliph had lost almost all of his temporal power, in political terms, as of this date.<sup>97</sup> However, the Ottoman Empire started to use the title of Sultan-Caliph<sup>98</sup> in order to establish a protectorate by possessing a shadowy spiritual hegemony over the Muslim community in Russia in accordance with the principle of reciprocity for the Russian protection of the Christian religion and its churches in the Ottoman lands since the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>99</sup> From then on, the Ottoman Caliphate was not the sovereign of all Muslims but their protector. It assumed an international protective position in interstate relations, not only by its spiritual meaning but also as a political instrument like an excuse for Muslims under colonial rule to resist some implementation of colonial rule or the exact opposite, consolidating the colonial rule and securing political obedience of their Muslim subjects.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> Richard W. Bulliet, **Religion and the State in Islam: From Medieval Caliphate to the Muslim Brotherhood**, University of Denver Center for Middle East Studies Occasional Paper Series, Paper No. 2, p.5

<sup>98</sup> Arnold underlined the difference as: “From the end of the eighteenth century onwards, it has become a common error in Europe that the Caliph is the spiritual head of all Muslims, just as the Pope is the spiritual head of all Catholics; that as Sultan he is temporal ruler over the Ottoman dominions, but as Caliph he is supreme spiritual authority over all Muslims, under whatever temporal government they may dwell; consequently, to interfere with the exercise of his spiritual authority, or to fail to respect his claim in this regard, argues an attitude of religious intolerance. There is reason to believe that this widespread error in Christian Europe has reacted upon opinion in Turkey itself.” Sir Thomas W. Arnold, **The Caliphate**, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1924, p.173.

<sup>99</sup> The Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca in 1774 ratified the Caliphate title of the Ottomans and acknowledged assertion of the Sultan’s rights over Muslims outside the Ottoman Empire, especially after the loss of the Crimea to Russia, as an international treaty. Özcan, **op.cit.**, p.546-547. Anil Chandra Banerjee, **Two Nations: The Philosophy of Muslim Nationalism**, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Company, 1981, p.142-143.

<sup>100</sup> **Ibid**, p.143. Arnold named that transformation of the Caliphate notion in foreign relations of the Ottoman Empire as use for foreign consumption because Turkish diplomats found it convenient to put it forward when dealing with Christian protectorate demands on the Christian Ottoman subjects. Arnold, **op.cit.**, p.164-165.

Keeping in mind the concept of protectorate over religious community, the indirect involvement of the Caliphate notion with its rights and involvement could be seen in the very first document of Turkish-Egyptian connection, the Treaty of Lausanne. The articles 17 and 22 specifically mentioned Egypt, the Sudan and Libya, as Turkey with having no legal or political rights over the people and property of its formal territories (for Egypt and the Sudan, it took effect as of 5 November 1914). Not only the Ottoman rights on these territories but also the Caliphate status came into question in this respect. This comprehensive cession of Ottoman legacy also included Caliphate's authority and rights on these lands, except the spiritual attributions of the Muslim religious authorities stated in the Article 27.<sup>101</sup> That was a clear decomposition of Caliphate's political and spiritual features, coming down to a worldly religious leader without any political authority.<sup>102</sup>

After the Turkish War of Independence, the Caliphate was separated from the Ottoman Sultanate, which was abolished first. The GNAT would abolish it two years later in order to abolish the final institutional remnant of the Empire, sent the last Ottoman caliph into exile and potentially possessed the power and authority.<sup>103</sup> On 3<sup>rd</sup> of March 1924, the GNAT abolished the Caliphate, by declaring and enacting the

---

<sup>101</sup> Nurullah Ardiç, **Islam and the Politics of Secularism The Caliphate and Middle Eastern Modernization in the Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century**, New York, Routledge, 2012, p.290-291. The Article 177 on sanitary questions of pilgrimage, visits and railway regulated the only Turkish involvement to ensuring complete uniformity in the execution of required measures.

<sup>102</sup> Bulliet touched on a Caliph who rightfully wielded spiritual authority could delegate his worldly power to a Sultan because of the separation of spiritual leadership mission and worldly Imam mission with political power from end of 10<sup>th</sup> century to the virtually unused period until the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Bulliet, **Religion and the State...**, p.4-5.

<sup>103</sup> The reconstruction of the institution and pragmatic perspective for this decision could be seen in Seyyid Bey's interpretation. He divided and defined the notion of the institution in terms of true nature and ostensible form into two as the perfect or true Caliphate and the formal and fictitious Caliphate. Moreover, he suggested that the Caliphate is as a contract signed between the nation and the Caliph and the basic principle of Caliphate agreement is consultation, in other words, it is election and allegiance. As a result, the specific argument of the Seyyid Bey was the Caliphate is not a religious institution but rather a political authority and administrative institution, which became an oppressive rule. He would advocate the same perception while he was speaking as the first Minister of Justice, in favour of the abolition law in 1924. Ardiç, **op.cit.**, p.290-300; Mete Tunçay, **Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek-Parti Yönetimi'nin Kurulması (1923-1931)**, İstanbul, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999, p.88-91. See also: Seyyid Bey, **Hilâfet'in Mahiyet-i Şeriyyesi**, Ankara, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Matbaası, 1923.

concept and purview that the Caliphate would be inherited by the government and republic.<sup>104</sup> This decision was welcomed by Britain because until the abolition, the discourse of Islam and potential of the Caliphate institution had an important influence on Turkish-British relations due to British avoidance of Turkey's potential usage of Caliphate power against the British rule in Egypt and India.<sup>105</sup> Despite this widely known law (No.431) and inheritance by the GNAT, this parliamentary decision was interpreted as a disappearance of Ottoman Caliphate succession, and thereupon provided an opportunity and chance for eager pretenders of the title, leading by the Fuad of Egypt, cidevant Sharif Hussein of Mecca et.al.<sup>106</sup> The unrecognized and unsupported proclamations of these leaders could not acquire a Muslim-world-wide consolidation of recognition. Eventually, the centre of Egyptian failure on this Caliphate question would be the external opposition from other Muslim countries.

From this point on, the impact of the Caliphate question brought about two main problems and assessments into the Turkish-Egyptian relations: The first one was formed by some Egyptian interpretations and second one was a subject of interstate relations. These Egyptian interpretations were shaped either by devout critics or supporters of Turkish reforms; i.e. the abolition of the Caliphate and the Sharia, inclusion of a reference to laïcité into the constitution et.al.<sup>107</sup> The abolition

---

<sup>104</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 2, Vol. 7, Session. 2, 03.03.1340 (03 March 1924), p. 27-69. On relations between the abolition of the Caliphate and reforms in Turkey, see also; Halil İnalcık, "The Caliphate and Atatürk's İnkılab", Halil İnalcık, **From Empire to Republic Essays on Ottoman and Turkish Social History**, Istanbul, Isis Press, 1995, p.161-172.

<sup>105</sup> Oran (ed.), **op.cit.**, p.267

<sup>106</sup> Joffé analysed King Fuad and King Farouk desires as "The Khedive, whether Farouk or his father Fuad, was only interested in so far as he could subvert the concept of an Arab nation into a caliphate that he would head." Joffé, **op.cit.**, p.163.

<sup>107</sup> As Jankowski and Gershoni described Egyptian reaction as "In Egypt perhaps the most widely expressed initial response to the Turkish abrupt decision for abolition was shock at the abrupt termination of such hallowed Muslim institution." The poet Ahmad Sawqi describes its effects in his poem as "India is grief-stricken and Egypt mournful, weeping over you with flowing tears." Gershoni and Jankowski, **Egypt, Islam, and the Arabs...**, p.56. In addition to that, Lewis stated the internal repercussions of the Turkish public to the official severance of the religion from the state. Bernard Lewis, "Islamic Revival in Turkey", **International Affairs**, V.21, N.1, 1952 January, p.38-48.

of the Caliphate had strong repercussions among Egyptians, and the fate of the Caliphate preoccupied not only the al-Azhar or the ulama of Egypt but also the Parliament and the Palace, in particular.<sup>108</sup> The Turkish War of Independence and the leadership of Mustafa Kemal were widely supported by religious Muslim communities worldwide because they were interpreting it as a struggle against colonial powers with the objective of redemption of the Caliph.<sup>109</sup>

As from the from general picture to the relevant topics of this thesis, Egypt's first reaction came from ulama, and political parties emphasized not the abruptness of this radical change, but the necessity and leadership function of the institution that could link all Muslims throughout the world within a single community.<sup>110</sup> From this point on, an extinction of a major symbol would hitherto led to the absence of a preeminent leader in Muslim world, at least symbolically. On the other hand, some political parties and scholars in the Arab world, especially constitutionalists, pro-secularists and nationalist ones, exemplified Turkish national struggle as a true path for independence.<sup>111</sup> In addition, Turkish reforms contradicted with this image and

---

<sup>108</sup> P. J. Vatikiotis, "Islam and the Foreign Policy of Egypt", J. Harris Proctor (ed.), **Islam and International Relations**, New York, Preager, 1965, p.129.

<sup>109</sup> The support of the Indian Muslims to the Turkish War of Independence on behalf of their support to the Caliph, see also: Oran (ed.), **Türk Dış Politikası**, p.209-212. Halil Inalcik, "Islamic Caliphate, Turkey, and Muslims in India," in Y.A. Hashmi (ed.), **Dr. I.H. Qureishi Memorial Lectures: Shari'ah, Ummah, and Khilafah**, Karachi, University of Karachi, 1987, pp. 17–21. A postcard depicting Mustafa Kemal as a Muslim hero with Sheikh Sanusi, and a heroic Muslim figure Salah ad-Din Yusuf ibn Ayyub (or commonly known as Saladin). Even after death of Mustafa Kemal, Indian Muslims mentioned him as "an inspiration to Muslims all over the world with courage, perseverance and manliness." M. Sükrü Hanioglu, **Atatürk: An Intellectual Biography**, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2011, p.130; Even the first biography of Mustafa Kemal had written in Egypt and portrayed him as "*Excellency Hero of the East and Islam*", "Atatürk'ün ilk portresi Mısır'da yazıldı", **Milliyet**, 8 February 2011.

<sup>110</sup> Although the legitimacy and rightfulness of the Ottoman Caliphate was discussing by the ideas of al-Kawakibi in the name of Arabs has to bring back the Caliphate to a leader from Quraish descent, especially; the abolition created a vacuum for a pan-Islamic institution and Muslim leadership. Adeed Dawisha, **op.cit.**, p.23-24. Even for that concern, the Shaikh of Al-Azhar officially declared on March 15 1924 that, the abolition decision of the Turkish Grand National Assembly has to be illegitimate and thus null and void. Gershoni and Jankowski, **Egypt, Islam, and the Arabs...**, p.57. These critics have reasonable points for Western trained intellectual in terms of necessity of institution, but sometimes that perspective turn into a hope for establishing a "spiritual" Caliph, like a Muslim Pope. Vatikiotis, "Islam and the Foreign Policy of Egypt", p.129-130; Elie Kedourie, "Egypt and the Caliphate 1915-1946", **op.cit.**, p.222.

<sup>111</sup> Armaoglu, **op.cit.**, p.332-333.

caused repercussions among these religious groups in the name of Islamic structure.<sup>112</sup> However, these expressions coming from Muslims outside Turkey to support the caliph or to criticize secular reforms of Turkey were interpreted as foreign interference to internal affairs by Turkish side, and paved the way for separation in Turkish-Arab relations.<sup>113</sup>

Secondly, the Caliphate tension was the subject of interstate relations since King Fuad, and later King Farouk, endeavoured to have themselves proclaimed the Caliph. Turkey did not give fair quarter to all these designation or revival efforts.<sup>114</sup> First of all, the Caliphate notion was clearly connected to the Egyptian Islamic identity building process, and the Egyptian-ruled Caliphate would be a subsidiary for the Islamic component of Egyptian nationalism or even afterwards an emphasis for a perception of Egyptian leadership in the Muslim world.<sup>115</sup> Beside the internal aspects of this discussion, a regional aspect has to be taken into account with the power struggle among Arab leaders. Egypt's leadership ideal would gain edge in inter-Arab relations with the potential reputation of the Egyptian Caliphate and even more, would reach an exalted Egyptian superiority over the Muslim world.<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, p.332.

<sup>113</sup> Kemal H. Karpat, *Ortadoğu'da Osmanlı Mirası ve Ulusçuluk*, Recep Boztemur (translate), Ankara, İmge Kitabevi, 2001, p.152. Even before the abolition, as Inalcik noted that Mustafa Kemal declared that he considered any wrong move or uprising against his reforms by the supporters of the caliphate as a conspiracy and a deadly danger against the life and existence of his nation. This was a declaration of war against those who hoped to create a movement against the reforms, even in the name of the Caliph. Confrontation was inevitable. Halil Inalcik, "Islamic Caliphate, Turkey, and Muslims in India" *op.cit.*, p.29. That was a domestic intimidation for a possible resistance against his reforms. Inevitably, foreign critics or revival efforts for the Caliphate would be regarded as an external danger and followed closely.

<sup>114</sup> For the first efforts of Egypt, see also Kedourie, *op.cit.*, p.214-215. For Turkish perspective on World Islamic Congress in Jerusalem in 1931, see also: Özlem Tür, "Türkiye ve Filistin – 1908-1948: Milliyetçilik, Ulusal Çıkar ve Batılılaşma", *SBF Dergisi*, Vol.62, No.1, p.239-242.

<sup>115</sup> Jankowski stated that the social and political basis of supra-Egyptianism also explain the vacillation of political leadership of Egypt in adopting more active regional policy. Gershoni and Jankowski, *Redefining the Egyptian Nation...*; p.165. See also: for Egyptian Islamic nationalism p.79-96. for supra Egyptianism, p.145-211. In addition to that, the prestigious role of Al-Azhar in Muslim world is another support for Egyptian caliphate claims. For an example, see also Kedourie, *op.cit.*, p.219.

<sup>116</sup> On 25<sup>th</sup> March, 1924, Al-Ahram's editorial comment on the meeting of 'ulama' was illustrated the Egyptian superiority discourse on the Caliphate question by claiming that the eyes of the Islamic

However, in the course of Cairo Caliphate Congress of 1926, the much-heralded initiative to decide on the Caliphate, each delegation hoped for the Caliph to be the ruler of their country. After all, neither King Fuad nor King Farouk achieved this Muslim-world-wide consolidation. In terms of Turkish-Egyptian relations, Turkey was just as negative as other Muslim-majority countries by not sending any representative and ignoring the Caliphate Congress.<sup>117</sup> The loss of legitimacy was the main objective of Turkish reaction to these efforts since in terms of the Turkish aspect, there was no need for a Caliphate institution which was inherited by the GNAT. Turkey also prevented probable use of Caliphate by third parties to pursue a regional influence or as a manipulative tool on behalf of colonialist purposes and dominance.

In addition to this, identity constructivism, this question has also taken part in the rivalry of Egyptian politics. The succession of Farouk, which was a change of ruling manner in parliamentary era of Egypt, was pointed out as “King Fuad had dominated Egyptian public life through a blend of constitutional position, political guile and British support; King Farouk attempted to establish royal ascendancy by an ideological basis.”<sup>118</sup> The internal endeavour to promote Palace’s authority over political parties and parliament led to criticism over the caliphate efforts of Egyptian monarch. While Egyptian public opinion was preoccupied with parliamentary elections, the Caliphate Congress could not arouse sufficient interest on Egyptian agenda and the organizational incompetence of its promoters and the unproductiveness of its sessions were criticized even by al-Ahram.<sup>119</sup> The Wafd

---

world are directed to Egypt. Gershoni and Jankowski, **Egypt, Islam and the Arabs...**, p.72. The caliphate planning of Egypt was challenged by other caliphate claims, especially the cidevant Sharif of Mecca who had named as a feasible candidate to replace the Ottoman Caliph and the Saudi’s after Ibn Saud conquered the Hejaz and became the ruler of the Holy Places. Thus, Mecca hosted the alternative Caliphate meeting one month after the Cairo Caliphate Congress.

<sup>117</sup> For more information about the Caliphate Congress in Egypt and the progress of this question in Egyptian politics, religious establishment or society see also: Gershoni and Jankowski, **Egypt, Islam and the Arabs...**, p.64-65; The attendance for the congress analysed in Arnold J. Toynbee, **Survey of International Affairs, 1925: Vol. I, The Islamic World Since the Peace Settlement**, London, Oxford University Press, 1927, p.85-86.

<sup>118</sup> Gershoni and Jankowski, **Redefining the Egyptian Nation...**, p.159.

<sup>119</sup> Gershoni and Jankowski, **Egypt, Islam and the Arabs...**, p.66-73.

Party criticized the Caliphate Congress efforts and power ambition of the King for preserving the balance of power in domestic politics of Egypt at least; as distinct from religion-oriented critics of ulama.<sup>120</sup> In this manner, a regional struggle for the caliphate and a controversial problem in Turkish-Egyptian relations were affected by the internal power struggle of Egypt, which impeded the Palace to back down that claim on account of loss of prestige.

The Caliphate question in Turkish-Egyptian relations had three results on bilateral relations and individual foreign policies of these countries. During this period, efforts for the revival of the Caliphate caused tension in bilateral relations since it became a subject of interstate relations as distinct from the critics of parties or ulama of Egypt. Moreover, it was interpreted as a venture for exposing internal reforms of Turkey to foreign intervention and critics. Turkey closely observed these critics and revival efforts but did not give a strong response to any of these objections.<sup>121</sup> To start with, the ineffective efforts of Egypt for the revival of the caliphate did not provide any regional prestige to Egypt or the Egyptian monarch; on the contrary these efforts were seen as an aggressive quest for regional influence among Muslim countries. Vatikiotis described that period with the discussion and efforts for the Egyptian Caliphate as “a miserable political issue”.<sup>122</sup> In addition to this, such stillborn claims and fruitless efforts of King Fuad and King Farouk were weakening Egypt’s position and desire for leadership in the Muslim world. In terms of domestic politics, non-recognition of Egyptian claims by the Muslim world, and yet even from inside of Egypt, were demonstrating the lack of capability and

---

<sup>120</sup> Kedourie summarized that domestic situation as; “Zaghlul was not likely to welcome the great increase in prestige and power which Fuad would obtain by becoming Caliph.” “The Liberal Constitutionalists were also opposed to an Egyptian Caliphate, just as the Wafdists. Even these strict constitutionalist arguing that the article 47 of the Constitution forbade the King of Egypt to acquire, without parliamentary authority. So, King Fuad could not accept the Caliphate without the sanction of the Parliament. Therefore, the Egyptian Parliament, a secular, non-domination body, had ultimate authority to institute and depose the Caliph.” In addition to these interpretations, the Wafdist parliament was indirectly attacking King Fuad and his ambitions through examining the budget of al-Azhar on the year of Caliphate Congress. Kedourie, **op.cit.**, p.216-223.

<sup>121</sup> Melek Çolak, “Türk Mısır İlişkileri Çerçevesinde Mısır’ın Atatürk ve Türk Devrimine Bakışı (1919-1938)” **Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi**, No.6, Spring 2010, p.26-27.

<sup>122</sup> P. J. Vatikiotis, **The Modern History of Egypt**, New York, 1969, p.299.



independence of Egyptian palace from British support, and resulted with the loss of Palace's prestige in domestic policy against the Wafd.

These results on the Egyptian side also assisted the Arab nationalist discourse as a primary objective for Egypt with the instrumentalization of Islam and pragmatic use of Islamic solidarity discourse, ever and anon.<sup>123</sup> Moreover, these failed attempts of the Palace were intended to claim regional leadership on Muslim origin and intensified its position in internal politics with popular support. The disapproval of the idea of King Farouk as Caliph and Egypt as the leader of the Muslim world by other states left Arab solidarity and cooperation option as the only applicable, realist, and convenient Egyptian regional policy.<sup>124</sup>

Secondly, the distinct involvement of Britain in Egypt's internal affairs and its significant effects on policy making process was observed, even in this caliphate struggle of Egyptian monarchy.<sup>125</sup> Starting from the reign of Abdulhamid II, Britain intended for reversion of the Caliphate from the Ottoman Sultan/Caliph to the Egyptian Khedive, then Sharif of Mecca or at least a true Arab who is Quraish-born, from the blessed tribe of the Prophet, which was legitimized by Kawakibi's doctrine because of search for a manageable Arab Caliph.<sup>126</sup> Britain could be the decisive

---

<sup>123</sup> Razi summarized that complex interrelation between religion and nationalism, as "Religion has been a major contributing factor in developing and preserving the national identities of the Arabs, the Iranians, the Israelis, and even the Turks (in Turkey) Nationalism and religion have also in many instances served as the basis for cooperation against foreign incursion." G. Hossein Razi, "Legitimacy, Religion, and Nationalism in the Middle East", **The American Political Science Review**, Vol. 84, No. 1, March 1990, p.82.

<sup>124</sup> P.J. Vatikiotis, **Arab and the Regional Politics in the Middle East**, p.37-38 in J. Haris Proctor (ed.), **Islam and International Relations**, "Islam and the Foreign Policy of Egypt", New York, Praeger, 1965.

<sup>125</sup> Bullock stated that the foreign intention to control all Muslims through the Caliphate was a lasting ambition of Great Britain to realize the dream of the first Napoléon Bonaparte. Walter F. Bullock, "The Fight for the Caliphate", **The North American Review**, Vol.181, No.585, August 1905, p.235. Britain used al-Kawakibi's critics on the Caliphate notion during the World War to loss the Ottoman Sultan/Caliph's reputation and kept Muslims in its colonies in order. On 24th April 1915, Times published an article which argues "the ruling in this question is that the Khalifa should belong to the tribe of the Prophet. It is evident that the present Sultans of Turkey are not in a position to claim this honour." **Times**, 24th April 1915, in Kedourie, **op.cit.**, p.243.

<sup>126</sup> George Antonius, **The Arab Awakening The Story of the Arab National Movement**, London, H. Hamilton, 1938, p.98 & p.416. Kemal H. Karpat, **Politicization of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State**, New York, Oxford University

supporter for this project of Egyptian Palace but its plans on that institution would affect its relations with Turkey and Egypt. As Oliver-Dee points out, their support could have been a decisive factor in the revival of any Caliphate pretender, and the fact that they took no interest in King Farooq's claim, due to an understanding that the question was simply for the Arabs themselves to consider, perhaps showing the extent to which the Indians had disengaged from the question, effectively ended the feasibility of the King's claim.<sup>127</sup>

In terms of the British control over Egypt, Britain also did not support King Farouk's efforts because of preserving the internal balance of power among the Palace, the Wafd and the British authority. The Caliphate title could give ascendancy and dignity to the Palace against the Wafd, and even against the British influence. In addition to this British project on Egypt, King Farouk's efforts affected Turkish-Egyptian relations in a bad way this should have been in opposite direction in the name of intended Middle East Defense projects on the eve of Second World War and a possible Italian aggression in the Mediterranean. The British decision on these claims was made in consequence of these internal, regional and colonial policies. The hegemon power will thwart what it did not want, eventually.

Finally, these caliphate efforts of Egypt started to deteriorate the ongoing Turkish-Egyptian bilateral relations in particular.<sup>128</sup> The caliphate decision of Turkey was demonstrated as a display of Turkish desire to alienate itself from its Middle Eastern origin and Islamic culture, especially during domestic-oriented

---

Press, 2001, p.245-257. Bullock pointed out British interpretation of the Caliphate during the Ottoman Empire as "It asserts that Great Britain is weaving a vast web of intrigue against the spiritual power of the Sultan-Caliph, with the object of transferring the Caliphate to the Khedive of Egypt, who would exercise its functions and influence in accordance with British designs... ..Khedive, on its advice, signified his readiness to accept the dignity of the Caliphate at the hands of Hamid Eddin.... From Egypt, they derived the conviction that Islam is not necessarily synonymous with backwardness in the arts and sciences of civilization. And Egypt, moreover, through the pronouncements of its High Schools and Ulama, furnished the legal foundation of their claim to the Caliphate." Walter F. Bullock, **op.cit.**, p. 236.

<sup>127</sup> Sean Oliver-Dee, **The Caliphate Question The British Government and Islamic Governance**, New York, Lexington Books, 2009, p.149.

<sup>128</sup> As expected outcomes, these caliphate efforts of Egypt have deteriorated its bilateral relations not only with Turkey, but also with Saudi's and Hashemite's.

period; but Egypt reviewed all possible outcomes.<sup>129</sup> On the Turkish side, these critics and revival efforts were evaluated as an external reaction on internal reforms of Turkey, in a sensitive manner. Turkey counteracted with either negative attitude or clear opposition for playing Egyptian efforts down by not participating or responding to any invitation.<sup>130</sup> From Turkey's limited involvement perspective, the Caliphate question kept this aspect alive in order to hold off Turkish society from this discussion in the wake of domestic reforms and renouncing all claims as part of the GNAT's enactment in 1924. Turkey did not need any enforcement against Egypt and other countries since it had no compromise on these claims, which were unable to be pursued determinedly by other countries and could not gather large scaled support and legitimacy. Besides Turkey's interference in this issue could be interpreted as another exception of limited Turkish involvement in the Middle East. Furthermore this issue was differentiated from other exceptions as being a bilateral crisis with a non-neighbour country. Egyptian-Turkish political relations remained limited to the Caliphate issue and some minor bilateral confrontations or issues during the interbellum.

---

<sup>129</sup> Even in one American despatch from Cairo in 11 March 1924 includes King Fuad's disapproval of the abolition of the caliphate and his suspicion on Mustafa Kemal of aspiring to the office, but was quite sure he would not obtain it. **Despatch from Cairo**, March 11, 1924, no.867.404/79 in Kedourie, **op.cit.**, p.214.

<sup>130</sup> Turkey and Saudi Arabia were the prominent opposition to the Egyptian caliphate claims. They were not sent any representatives to the Interparliamentary Congress in 1938 or even to voice their opposition and non-recognition to King Farouk's supporters hail to him as Caliph, immediately. Gershoni and Jankowski, **Redefining the Egyptian Nation...**, p.162-163.

### 2.2.3. From Palestine Issue to Arab-Israeli Conflict

Palestine was de facto governed by the British High Commissioner for Palestine and Transjordan until the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. Until the abolition of the Caliphate, Mandatory Palestine maintained its connection with Turkey on this spiritual basis. Even the idea of Turkish mandate was discussed due to discontent of Palestinian Arabs over British administration; Turkey interpreted the Palestine issue as an internal question of Western mandate. It was in accordance with the general concept of Turkish foreign policy, which aimed to preserve the status quo and maintain the peace and stability in the region with balance of power.<sup>131</sup> The specific Turkish involvement in Palestine was limited to the World Islamic Congress organized in Jerusalem in 1931 which also affected its interests due to the concern on the carried out plans for the Caliphate.<sup>132</sup>

However, after the Second World War, Turkey started to pursue an active foreign policy towards the Middle East. Within this framework, Palestine issue and then the Arab-Israeli Conflict gradually became the prior subject of its regional policy. In relation with the Turkish-Arab rapprochement during 1945-1947, Turkey supported the UNSCOP minority report in the UNGA voting.<sup>133</sup> However, the first sign of Turkish separation from the Arab cause could be seen in Turkish support to UNGA Resolution 194 and its participation, along with France and the USA, to the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine (UNCCP) in 1948.<sup>134</sup> For the first time, the Western countries regarded Middle Eastern identity of Turkey as an instrument to reach Middle East countries through this inner-participation. This was

---

<sup>131</sup> İlhan Uzgel, Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, “1923-1939 Batı Avrupa’yla İlişkiler”, Oran (ed.), **op.cit.**, p.271.

<sup>132</sup> Tür, **op.cit.**, p.242.

<sup>133</sup> In spite of the western countries, and even the USSR, supported the separation plan, Turkey was differentiated by voting with Arab countries. It was reasonable in terms of general concept of Turkish foreign policy until the Truman Doctrine. The main motive of Turkey was the avoidance from regional instability. Çağrı Erhan, Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, “1945-1960 Filistin Sorunu”, Oran (ed.), **op.cit.**, p.637. Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye’nin Arap Orta...**, p.22-23.

<sup>134</sup> These three countries were selected in the name of equal participation according to their different choices, which were considered as: the U.S. was pro-Israel, Turkey was pro-Arab and France was neutral. Erhan and Kürkçüoğlu, **op.cit.**, p.639-40.

the first sign of Turkey's Western-oriented attitude towards the Middle East.<sup>135</sup> On 28 March 1949, Turkey's recognition of the State of Israel was the crossroad of Turkish and Arab attitudes on Arab-Israeli conflict for 30 years, until the Egyptian recognition in 1979.

On the British side, the stability of Egypt and the Canal Zone as a crucial strategic station and peace in Palestine were considered as essential wartime needs for the British security.<sup>136</sup> This British concern was focused on the defence of Middle East mandates and the defence of strategic Suez Canal base after the Second World War. On the Egyptian side, Palestine issue was a transformer for Egyptian politics. Vatikiotis summarized this period and the effect of the Palestine issue on internal politics.<sup>137</sup> Beside its motivation for Egyptian activism, the Palestine issue and the 1948 War alienated young Egyptian officers' loyalty to the crown and accelerated their politicization.<sup>138</sup> For the regional foreign policy of Egypt, the Palestine issue would be the pattern for Egyptian involvement in regional issues, although the political leaders of Egypt had hesitated to adopt more active regional policy. Gershoni and Jankowski emphasized the role of growing interest of Egyptian public over Palestine with the effect of Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 on Egyptian foreign policy as a foreign policy incentive.<sup>139</sup> It would result with more independence in foreign policy and happened at the same time with the general strike and revolt in Palestine in 1936. These different aspects were also discussed by focusing on the role of Egypt towards Middle East, especially its role within the Arab struggle in Palestine, then within the Arab-Israeli conflict. Above all, the main factor for Egyptian involvement to Palestine's issues was the growth of public

---

<sup>135</sup> Çağrı Erhan, "Hilal ve Sion Yıldızı Türk-İsrail İlişkilerinin Dünü ve Bugününe Kısa Bir Bakış", **Mülkiyeliler Birliği Dergisi**, Vol.21, No.202, August-September 1997, 32.

<sup>136</sup> Charles D. Smith, **Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict**, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1996, p.102.

<sup>137</sup> "The rise of industry, the experience of a second World War and the unsuccessful struggle for Palestine gave rise to new political groups nibbling away at the Wafd's popularity and challenging traditional leadership." P.J. Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army....**, p.29.

<sup>138</sup> **Ibid.**, p.215.

<sup>139</sup> Gershoni and Jankowski, **Redefining the Egyptian....**, p.170.

concern on the problems of Arabs in Palestine. Therefore, successive Egyptian governments assumed a key role in both peacetime efforts as diplomatic solution for the Palestine problem and wartime struggles as the position of Egyptian Army in 1948 Arab-Israeli War.<sup>140</sup>

The key factor is that Egypt was trying to assume a leadership notion in the Arab world by aiming to use institutions such as the Caliphate, an identity construction or the symbolic leadership of the King of Egypt. However, the Arab-Israeli issue became a prominent concern in the Arab world after the Second World War. The unifying factor of the Arab Middle East was transformed from a leader or an institution to a fact and an ongoing event. Henceforth, the prestige of the Caliphate or the leadership notion in the Arab world depended on the championing Arab-Israeli cause. This issue would also be connected with the anti-colonial, anti-imperialist and other struggles of the Arab leaders to legitimize their efforts for that purpose or distract attention from internal difficulties.<sup>141</sup> An example of this instrumentalization was Egypt's struggle against British influence. Egypt, held Britain accountable for the establishment of Israel, and this accusation was another legitimization for the Egyptian unilateral abrogation of the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty on 8 October 1951.<sup>142</sup> That was a combination of Palestine issue with the struggle against colonial remnant and the Western influence in the region. The Palestine issue was an instrument for Egyptian activism in the region; it later on turned into the Arab-Israeli conflict. Henceforth, it became both instrument for internal legitimization and a nationalist regional objective for advocating the Arab cause and joining the struggle.

---

<sup>140</sup> Podeh underlined "the reverberation of the 1948 Palestine debacle were about to cause internal political upheavals in most of the confrontations states." Podeh, **The Quest for Hegemony...**, p.43-44.

<sup>141</sup> Heikal asserted the military intervention of Egypt in Palestine as "the resort to war to distract attention from internal difficulties is a common policy frequently used by dictatorial states in modern and ancient history" Muhammad Hassanein Heikal, **Mudhakkirat fi al-siyasa al-Misriyya** (memoirs on Egyptian Politics), Cairo, 1951, Matbaat Misr, Vol.II, p.332 in Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army...**, p.33.

<sup>142</sup> Ismael, **op.cit**, p.422.; Ovandale, **op.cit.**, p.269.

In this respect, the different perspectives of Turkey and Egypt on the Arab-Israeli conflict did not directly affect their bilateral relations since Turkey did not get involved in this issue as much as Egypt did in this period. Turkish policy towards the Middle East in general and towards Palestine issue in particular was neutral until the Turkish activism started in the Middle East after the World War II.<sup>143</sup> This active policy was recognized until Turkey's participation to the UNCCP in 1948. Nevertheless, the main rupture was the recognition of the state of Israel in 1949. This recognition had a long-time deteriorating effect on Turkey's reputation in the Arab Middle East. In this context, Arab countries and Egypt interpreted the shift of Turkish decisions as a betrayal to the Arab cause in Palestine and a break-up of "Muslim Solidarity".<sup>144</sup> It would cause an emotional rupture in Turkish-Arab relations.

While Turkey pursued parallel policies with Western countries in the Middle East, this would accelerate Turkish-Arab and so Turkish-Egyptian divergence. More significantly, this had already started to affect Turkey's voting pattern in the UN organs.<sup>145</sup> On the Egyptian side, Turkey's Western-oriented policies towards the region strengthened its image as an agent of the West and an ally of Israel. While Turkey considered that, its close relation with Israel would be a contribution to its relation with the United States. Furthermore, these labels would be used for a long period to diminish Turkey's reputation, especially in the time of Turkish approach with Western-oriented projects on the region or bilateral confrontations of Turkey and Egypt. Finally, these different orientations were the outcomes of Turkish and Egyptian perceptions of threat in this period. While Turkey was focused on the Soviet demands and its own security concerns after the Second

---

<sup>143</sup> Kemal H. Karpat, "Turkey's and Arab-Israeli Relations", Kemal H. Karpat (ed.), **Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition: 1950-1974**, Leiden, E.J.Brill, 1975, p.114.

<sup>144</sup> Gürün, **op.cit.**, p.345. Some western publications were interpreted Turkey's voting with Arab countries as a reflection of "Muslim Brotherhood". Oran (ed.), **op.cit.**, p.637. Al Misri newspaper of Egypt harshly criticize the Turkish member of the UNCCP, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, because "helping Jews and be in favour of Jewish advantage to overshooting the mark than the Israeli envoy." Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye'nin Arap Orta...**, p.30.

<sup>145</sup> Mehmet Gönlübol and Türkkaya Ataöv, **Turkey in the United Nations, A Legal and Political Appraisal**, Ankara, Ajans Türk Press, 1960, p.41-42.

World War, Egypt was focused on Israel after its establishment and the disastrous defeat in 1948. The difference of perceptions of threat contrasted with each other on the subject of regional defence projects in an evident manner.<sup>146</sup>

#### 2.2.4. The Middle East Defence Projects

After the Second World War, due to the displacement of the economic and military dominance of Europe, concerns on loss of control over strategic routes and regions with the systemic factor of regional/international order and ongoing colonial resistance were raised by Europe, which sought true independence. Elliott Roosevelt already marked the gradual replacement of the mantle of leadership from British shoulders to American.<sup>147</sup> During this period, the critics on British policies in the Middle East were focusing on its failure to prevent the flood of nationalist uprising in the Middle East and also underlined the difference of American approach towards the region.<sup>148</sup> Within this framework, the Suez Canal base, the largest military base during this period, was the most important asset and Great Britain's jugular vein for the continual supply of oil and international trade.<sup>149</sup> Darby noted that, the Middle

---

<sup>146</sup> Gürün, *op.cit.*, p.311.

<sup>147</sup> "Gradually, very gradually, and very quietly, the mantle of leadership was slipping from British shoulders to American." Elliott Roosevelt, **As He Saw It**, New York, Greenwood Press, 1974, p.41.

<sup>148</sup> In 1954, N. Saifpour Fatemi marked those different policies of the US and Britain by accusing British concessions by being too little and too late to bring about the solution of flood of nationalism: "Britain did not understand the seriousness of the nationalist movement in the Middle East. ...So far the people of the Middle East had experienced exploitations, concessions, domination of their countries by foreign loans and military pressures. ...She did not heed the warnings and the advice of the Americans. The Iranian nationalized the property of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, and the Egyptians pressed hard for the evacuation of the Canal Zone. ...On the one hand the people of the Middle East blamed its for failing to help them against Britain and on the other, the British censured American diplomats for interference in their area of influences." N. Saifpour Fatemi, "The United States in the Changing Middle East", **Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science**, V. 294, America and a New Asia, July 1954, p. 155.

<sup>149</sup> Nicholas J. White, **Decolonization: The British Experience Since 1945**, New York, Routledge, 2013, p.77. Michael J. Cohen, **Strategy and Politics in the Middle East, 1954-1960: Defending the Northern Tier**, London, Frank Cass, 2005, p.24-25. David R. Devereux, "Britain, the Commonwealth and the Defence of the Middle East 1948-56", **Journal of Contemporary History**, Vol. 24, No. 2, Studies on War, April 1989, p.329.



East replaced it as the centrepiece of British military strategy after the loss of India.<sup>150</sup>

After Egypt's demand to modify the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936, which provided a vital assurance for British domination and strategic requirements as seen during the North African Campaign of the Second World War, the question of the Middle East security was the primary concern for the Western powers over the region.<sup>151</sup> The idea of defence organization for the Middle East region had a long history since Britain had already understood the necessity of regional security in consequence of changing regional/international conjuncture, before the Second World War.<sup>152</sup> In addition to that, the necessity also originated from increasing economic burden on British economy for the sustainability of British military presence in its colony. Thus, as Devereux noted, attaining USA's support for the British position in the Middle East was the main goal of British policy in the immediate post-war Middle East.<sup>153</sup> The main rationale of this defence project was the British concern on maintaining its strategic military presence, especially the Suez base, without encountering reactions and avoidance from the Soviet Union for filling its power vacuum.<sup>154</sup>

Britain hoped to maintain its influence and secure its strategic needs through a regional security system against Russian influence, while King Farouk criticized

---

<sup>150</sup> Phillip Darby, **British Defence Policy East of Suez 1947-1968**, London, Oxford University Press for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1973, p.9-17. cited in David R. Devereux, "Britain, the Commonwealth and the Defence of the Middle East 1948-56" **Journal of Contemporary History**, Vol. 24, No. 2, April, 1989, p.330.

<sup>151</sup> During this period, Egypt abrogated the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty and also declared King Farouk as the King of Egypt and the Sudan by the abrogation of the Sudan Condominium Agreement of 1899.

<sup>152</sup> Michael Doran, **Pan-Arabism before Nasser Egyptian Power Politics and the Palestine Question**, New York, Oxford University Press, 1999, p.83-84.

<sup>153</sup> David R. Devereux, "Britain, the Commonwealth and the Defence of the Middle East 1948-56" **Journal of Contemporary History**, Vol. 24, No. 2, April, 1989, p.327.

<sup>154</sup> Anne Deighton, "Britain and the Cold War, 1945-1955", Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds.), **The Cambridge History of the Cold War (Volume 1: Origins)**, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2010, p.114. Doran stated that British obsession on Soviet expansion into the Middle East was dated back to the Second World War, during the period 1944-1945. Michael Doran, **op.cit.**, p.26. Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye'nin Arap Orta...**, p.33.

this project between Britain and the Middle Eastern states as an “imperious necessity”.<sup>155</sup> However, Britain hoped to break this “Western domination” image of the defence organization by including Turkey as a Middle Eastern party. However, the key factor was the inclusion of Egypt into this project to reach the Arab Middle East. As Doran summarized correctly, the success of Britain’s strategy required keeping Iran, Turkey and Egypt sympathetic to the British security system so as to be followed by minor countries as a major leading figures.<sup>156</sup> That was the main difference of British and American approach towards the Middle East defence.

The differentiation was based on this regional defence organization, which would be a frontier against the Soviet Union through containment or integrated with the region-oriented British demands. Either way, Turkey was seen as an essential participant but the controversial one was Egypt, in particular. Thus, it could not presume that the US understood the tension of the relation between Egypt and Great Britain correctly; but the US Administration chose a short but reliable step for the containment in the Middle East by attaching importance to its trusted “Northern Tier” allies. Eisenhower underlined that diversity between Turkish and Egyptian necessities and also claimed that US policy, after the ineffective British one, had to bring in the Arab world to the American side.<sup>157</sup> Ironically, Egyptian-Western relations started to deteriorate with the credit decision for Aswan High Dam building during his presidency.

For Turkey’s case, the Soviet demands and Turkey’s willingness to be included into the Western bloc would be beneficial for the assistance to the British defence policy in the Middle East. Moreover, Karpat underlined the Turkish policy as a continuation of mandate practices that included solving Middle East’s problems

---

<sup>155</sup> Podeh, *The Quest for Hegemony...*, p.44.

<sup>156</sup> Doran, *op.cit.*, p.39.

<sup>157</sup> In August 1951, Eisenhower told the Senate’s Armed Services Committee: “Turkey is only part of the great Middle Eastern problem—we should try to bring in the Arab world on our side. As far as the sheer value of territory is concerned, there is no more strategically important area in the world than the Middle East. This area is tremendously important in terms of what it could contribute for our whole effort. We should use our resources, our power, our organizational ability and above all, our leadership—to get some kind of organization that would rally all of them to go in with us.” Fatemi, *op.cit.*, p.151.

via France and Britain since even “Turkey was strongly in favour of Arab independence, nevertheless, Turkey assumed erroneously that the Arabs will follow after World War II a pro-Western policy in opposing the Soviet expansion, and somehow accept the British and France as their foreign policy tutors.”<sup>158</sup> The fact that Egypt refused the MEC and the MEDO proposals demonstrated the misimpression of Turkish interpretation on Arab attitudes and also crystallized the contending security approaches as Arab national security and Middle Eastern security.<sup>159</sup> Turkey seemed to be moving away from the sympathy of the Middle East countries while implementing the Western-oriented foreign policy. Furthermore, after 1945, Turkey started to use its Middle East policy as an instrument for its broad foreign policy objectives that include the joining the Western alliance.<sup>160</sup> Kürkçüoğlu highlighted the Middle East Command as a milestone for Turkish foreign policy towards the Arab Middle East due to its representation of the complete coherence of Turkish foreign policy towards the region with the Turkish foreign policy on a global scale.<sup>161</sup>

On behalf of the Egyptian case, the discussion is much more complicated in terms of Egypt’s relation with Britain and shaken British domination over the Middle East. Egypt was considered as the main wartime base; however, the main obstacle to the implementation of British plan was precisely at this point because Egypt had insisted upon the evacuation of all British forces from its soil.<sup>162</sup> The results of that defence organization projection in the region were the Middle East Command and then the Middle East Defence Organization, which were rejected by Egypt due to Britain’s presence in Egypt. Nevertheless, the main rejection point was a possible result of this pact that would turn the Suez base into an international one

---

<sup>158</sup> Karpaz, “Turkey’s and Arab-Israeli Relations”, **op.cit.**, p.115.

<sup>159</sup> Pınar Bilgin, **Regional Security in the Middle East: A Critical Perspective**, New York, Routledge, 2005, p.96-98.

<sup>160</sup> Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye’nin Arap Orta...**, p.37.

<sup>161</sup> **Ibid.**, p.48.

<sup>162</sup> Pödeh, **The Quest for Hegemony...**, p.41.

and also would complicate permanent withdrawal of foreign troops.<sup>163</sup> In addition to this, Egypt opposed the formation of the Northern bloc since Ankara was the only serious rival to Cairo.<sup>164</sup>

Turkey had a political influence over the Arab region through the new Middle East orientation in its foreign policy, which could provide a possible Turco-Hashemite bloc and international pressure for British military presence in the Middle East. Therefore, Egypt had to convince Western powers to treat Egypt and not Turkey as the keystone in the arch which would raise Egypt's importance as being a bridge between the Middle East and the Western powers. Thus, Egypt would increase its influence over the region and its importance on the eyes of the international community, which would gain favour in terms of its relation with Britain and other issues on an international level. Doran stated the result of this prospect as "the structure of power in the region, and the fundamental interests of the British Empire gave London no choice, in the light of Egyptian policy, but to circumvent Cairo altogether and to adopt a northern, Turco-Hashimite orientation regarding the Egyptian fear for the possible reorganization of the Sa'adabad Pact."<sup>165</sup>

The discussion on the Middle East Defense Organization proceeded alongside with the discussion on the modification of 1936 Treaty in Egyptian case and finally abrogation of the Agreement in 1951. Gürün noted that the main reasons of Egyptian rejection to this regional pact as a founding member alongside with the US, UK, France and Turkey, were King Farouk's ineffectiveness on this subject and Nahhas Pasha's effort for abrogation.<sup>166</sup> In this respect, Turkey's participation to the formal invitation on 13 October 1951 with France, Britain and the US to Egypt for

---

<sup>163</sup> John C. Campbell, **Defense of The Middle East, The Problems of American Policy**, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1958, p.40.

<sup>164</sup> Doran, **op.cit.**, p.82-83.

<sup>165</sup> **Ibid.**, p.85.

<sup>166</sup> Gürün, **op.cit.**,p.348.

joining the Middle East Command was interpreted negatively in Egyptian politics.<sup>167</sup> The first proposal for the Middle East Command (MEC) in 1951 was rejected by Egypt. After that, it was reformed as the Middle East Defence Organization (MEDO) however, Egyptian government refused it in two days and these efforts on Egypt failed and did not find enough consideration from the Egyptian side.<sup>168</sup> This issue was also affected by the regional activism of Turkey in line with Western-oriented intentions, giving us the cue of oncoming regional confrontation between Turkey and Egypt.

The results of defence project efforts were drawing the framework of this period in relation with the Cold War, end of colonialism and priorities of the Middle East countries. First of all, securing the Middle East, and especially the Suez Canal, was the primary objective of these Britain-oriented efforts, considering as important as protecting from Soviet intervention. Egypt is a bridgehead for reaching the Arab Middle East, but its rejection disabled the expected vital factor of this project and also the main British argument and Turkish prediction. Secondly, the resistance and rejection of Egypt provided self-confidence against colonial presence and influence. That was the first step towards an anti-colonial, anti-Western and anti-Baghdad Pact attitude and paved the way for the 1954 Agreement, and even nationalization of the Suez Canal Company.

The Turkish foreign policy was formed on the basis of these three main objectives: national security, regional activism and image of regional importance for achieving economic and military assistance after the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan were implemented. In this context, Turkey instrumentalized its Middle East identity to strengthen its relations with the West, especially the US, as being a valuable partner, not only in the Korean War but also in helping to set up a regional security organization in the Middle East. The main motivation of Turkey was inclusion in the Western alliance by its primary military organization, NATO. There was a discussion about the role of MEC and MEDO policy of Turkey on its NATO

---

<sup>167</sup> **Idem.**

<sup>168</sup> Campbell, **op.cit.**, p.43.

membership, both in a positive or negative way.<sup>169</sup> Moreover, some foreign news were discussed in the GNAT in the context of, would MEDO efforts complicate Turkey's NATO membership or put Turkey out of NATO's military zone, but inside of MEDO military zone.<sup>170</sup>

Until Turkey's NATO alliance and establishment of the Baghdad Pact, this general understanding, which was focused on Turkey's efficiency and uniqueness for the Western alliance did not change much. This instrumentalization of its Middle Eastern identity affected its choices on the regional defence project through constructing a coherent prospect on the Middle East with the West. Turkey faced up to tense Turkish-Arab relations in return for inclusion in the Western alliance, either as a party of MEDO efforts or as an anticipated NATO member. Turkey missed the fact that many newly-independent Middle East countries could not interpret the Western connection at regional politics without considering their own fresh memories, which included exploitations, concessions, and domination of their countries by Western loans and military pressure.

Finally, the effects on Turkish-Egyptian relations, the MEC and the MEDO projects were the first signs for the oncoming diversification of Turkish and Egyptian policies on the role of Middle East during the Cold War and their role in the region. Firstly, the general stance of Arab countries considered that Turkish policy was suspicious due to its ambiguous decision, such as the one on the Arab-Israeli conflict. Hale pointed out the effects of historical background as "the formal master of the Arab lands" and also a troubled Turkey image on account of Turkish-Syrian tension on Hatay (Sanjak) issue during this period.<sup>171</sup> Secondly, Turkish support on this issue was interpreted as Turkish collaboration and assistance to the

---

<sup>169</sup> For instance, Gürün suggested that Turkey would not refuse such an invitation from Western countries that would be a pre-condition for NATO choice. Gürün, *op.cit.*, p.347-348. Bilgin pointed that "Turkish policy-makers were also keen in participating in the formation of MEDO not so much because they believed such an organisation would help maintain regional security, but rather because they wished to strengthen their relations with the West (the United States in particular)", Bilgin, *op.cit.*, p..95.

<sup>170</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 9, Vol. 12, Session 2, 07.01.1952, p.7-8.

<sup>171</sup> Hale, *op.cit.*, p.125-126.

West and that resulted with Turkey's position as a Western agent in the region. Furthermore, these efforts were the first disappointment of Egypt on Turkey's general regional policy, after the disappointment of Turkish-Israeli relations. From the Egyptian side, Turkish attitude and policies on the Arab-Israeli conflict after 1948-1949 were interpreted as an emotional rupture whereas the regional defence pact confrontation was a political one.

## CHAPTER 3

### TURKEY'S AND EGYPT'S FOREIGN POLICIES AFTER 1952

In 1950s, major political developments took place for Turkey and Egypt that affected their contemporary history. In Turkey, Democrat Party won a decisive victory over the Republican People's Party in 1950. However, there was no essential difference between their foreign policies. Both major sides of the parliament supported close political and economic relations with the West, and particularly to the United States. In this regard, Turkey joined NATO in 1952, and conducted a pro-West policy in the Middle East affairs. This period was evaluated as a clear change of foreign policy understanding from the previous periods by getting overly involved in the Middle East affairs, adopting an active role in the region, and advocating Western choices for regional issues despite its worsening relations with many Arab states.<sup>172</sup>

The Free Officers Movement staged a bloodless coup d'état in 23<sup>rd</sup> of July, 1952. Since then, the Egyptian history has witnessed different domestic and foreign policies including land reforms, proclamation of the republic, the neutralist stance in foreign relations, impact of Three Circles Theory and Nasser's struggle for leadership in these regions et.al. For this reason, this part of the thesis will present the Turkish activism in early 1950s, the features of the Free Officers Movement in brief, and its impact on Egyptian politics throughout the consolidation period. The specific foreign affairs of the new Egyptian regime will be analysed after searching the impact of Nasser on Egyptian politics through his objectives, the consolidation of his leadership and personification of the revolution. Therefore, we will present the regional policy perceptions of these countries in this era and understand the

---

<sup>172</sup> Mustafa Aydın, "Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy: Changing Patterns and Conjunctures during the Cold War", **Middle Eastern Studies**, Vol.36, No.1, January 2000, p.111-112. Oral Sander, "Türkiye ve Ortadoğu", **Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası**, Ankara, 2013, p.228-229. Oran, **op.cit.**, p.496-498.



domestic determinants of their foreign policies, especially the impact of the revolution on Egypt's politics.

### **3.1. DETERMINANTS OF TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY DURING THE 1950s**

#### **3.1.1. The Cold War Conjuncture and Turkey under the Democrat Party**

After the end of the Second World War, the East-West rivalry, possible threats for world peace and security concerns have constituted the Cold War international relations paradigm. It had been a significant determinant not only for Turkey but also all actors in international system. It resulted in establishment of a bipolar structure that the US and the USSR were the major bloc leaders. Besides, there were some resistance rising from non-bloc states to that challenge such as the formation of non-aligned movement, while conjuncture was forcing other states to place themselves within one of these groups. Turkey placed itself in the West by the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and consolidating its position with such efforts as membership to the OECD, the Council of Europe, and NATO in early stage of the Cold War. Turkey's Western orientation and modernizing features were already consolidated during the Ataturk's presidency and also there were some other changes in domestic and regional policy, besides mentioned changing conjuncture after the Second World War.

The most determinative concern was the Soviet Union's subsequent demands upon Turkey, which referred as Soviet demands or Soviet threat. In fact, the Soviet's territorial claims on North-Eastern Anatolia combined with Turkey's vulnerable stance and single-handed foreign policy after the Second World War conjuncture. In the wake of the Second World War, Turkey isolated itself by its protracted neutrality. It accelerated the Turkey's approach to Western bloc and even Gürün

stated that, that Soviet threat was the main reason to join NATO.<sup>173</sup> Besides, there was mostly a missing part of that Turkey's security concern, which was occurred from the Middle East and seen as a regional instability in its southern border. This concern based on the Arab-Israeli conflict which leading up to many wars, Iranian crisis of 1946, rising Arab nationalism, instability of newly independent countries and their effects on regional instability.

While the international conjuncture was changing rapidly, the domestic politics in Turkey was also changed by the transition to a multi-party system. Despite the criticisms from the RPP, İsmet İnönü declared himself in his opening speech of the Parliament on 1 November 1945, in favour of having an opposition party and more room for democracy.<sup>174</sup> After that declaration of allowance, Celal Bayar, a leading political figure and former Prime Minister led a new opposition party. On 4 December 1945, the meeting of İsmet İnönü and Celal Bayar drew the line of democracy with three subjects which were not being against secularism, protecting educational reforms and village institutes and not having any difference in foreign policy.<sup>175</sup> Democrat Party won a decisive victory over the Republican People's Party in 1950. As we found in the formation of the opposition party, there was no essential difference between their foreign policies. Both major sides of the parliament supported to establish closer political and economic ties with the Western countries, and particularly to the United States. The only difference between ruling party and the main opposition party on the matters of foreign policy were about the enacting and implementation rather than content of decision. The clearest example of this criticism could be found in sending Turkish troops to Korea War. Menderes neither consulted the GNAT nor the opposition party but the decision was taken by a small group.

---

<sup>173</sup> Gürün, *op.cit.*, p.206.

<sup>174</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 7, Vol. 20, Session. 3, 01 November 1945, p.7-9.

<sup>175</sup> “İnönü: ‘Does your party program have an article which said we will obey the faith of the religion, like Progressive’s?’ Bayar: ‘No, it has not, Pasha. It says secularism is not irreligiousness.’ İnönü: ‘It doesn’t matter. Do you argue on village institutes and campaign of primary education? I mean, are you against them?’ Bayar: ‘No.’ İnönü: ‘Does any differentiation about foreign policy?’ Bayar: ‘No.’ İnönü: ‘All right then.’ ” Mehmet Ali Birand, et.al., **Demirkırat: Bir Demokrasinin Doğuşu**, İstanbul, Doğan Kitap, 2007, p.24-25.

Apart from the fact that the US was assuming the leadership and protectorship of the Western democracies during the Cold War, it was the only country capable of lending money which Turkey's economy badly needed at the time. Besides these economical needs, there were also a democratization process had started in Turkey. As Aydın suggested, Turkey's post-war policy goals, at least in part, affected this change in its domestic politics which in turn had an effect on Turkish foreign policy.<sup>176</sup> Lewis also states the change the form of government did not only choose to please foreign states by looking Turkey's long experience in the constitutional efforts.<sup>177</sup> This pattern of economic dependency had already started with receiving American aids through the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan and continued under the Democrat Party. Therefore, Turkey's need for foreign aid became an integral part of its foreign as well as domestic policy.<sup>178</sup>

In the meantime, Turkey's main foreign policy objective was to be an ally of the Western countries, not only receiving economic or military aid but also being a full member of NATO. It did not merely ensure Turkey's security, moreover hoped to strengthen the liberal economy, as well as protect new-born democracy in Turkey. As a result, Turkey and Greece became NATO member by the NATO's first enlargement on 18 February 1952.<sup>179</sup> Turkish media had welcomed that inclusion and underlined the membership as an equal member of this alliance.<sup>180</sup> Celal Bayar, the President of Turkey, addressing the Parliament on 1 November 1945, welcomed Turkey's NATO membership and congratulated the government for their

---

<sup>176</sup> Aydın, **op.cit.**, p.109.

<sup>177</sup> Lewis, **The Emergence of...**, p.306-309.

<sup>178</sup> Aydın, **op.cit.**, p.110.

<sup>179</sup> For the process of Turkey's inclusion into NATO and its impact on Turkish foreign policy, see also, George McGhee, **The US-Turkish-NATO Middle East Connection, How the Truman Doctrine Contained the Soviets in the Middle East**, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990, p.72-113.

<sup>180</sup> For discussion in GNAT about NATO on 18 February 1952, see also **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, IX/3, V.13, Ankara, 18 February 1952, p.313-340. Some headlines from Turkish media: "Atlantik Paktına eşit haklarla iltihakımız" **Cumhuriyet**, 18 February 1952; Abidin Daver, "Hükümetimizin Kazandığı Zafer," **Cumhuriyet**, 18 February 1952, "Meclis, Kuzey Atlantik Paktına İltihakımızı İttifakla tasvip etti", **Milliyet**, 19 February 1952; "Kuzey Atlantik Paktına Resmen Girdik", **Ulus**, 19 February 1952; Mümtaz Faik Fenik, "Yepyeni Bir Devre Giriyoruz", **Zafer**, 18 February 1952.

achievement.<sup>181</sup> Since then, Turkish foreign policy was literally became an extension of its Western dependent foreign policy orientation, which was turning into that perception since the late 1940s.

### 3.1.2. Turkish Foreign Policy towards the Middle East

Turkey's political and intellectual elites do not generally regard themselves as Middle Eastern gave much more priority to the Western identity but their identities was a result of their combination as Turkish foreign policy choices. Turkey's Middle East policy was an inseparable part of its western policy and adversely affected by its total identification with Western perceptions.<sup>182</sup> After the Second World War, the Western-oriented foreign policy became a primary determinant in Turkish foreign policy and had a divisive influence on Turkish and Arab perceptions. This activism in Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East started for reasons of regional insecurity and also to improve Turkey's position in the eyes of Western countries as an extension of Turkey's Western orientation.<sup>183</sup> Even before the Democrat Party came to power, the Republican People's Party had started an initiative of activism and rapprochement with the Arab Middle East.<sup>184</sup> Bağcı also pointed the Democrat Party's criticism on RPP for not having an active

---

<sup>181</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 9, Vol. 17, 1 November 1952, p.19.

<sup>182</sup> Laçiner, **op.cit.**, p.134.

<sup>183</sup> Melek Fırat, Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "1945-1960 Ortadoğu'yla İlişkiler", Oran (ed.), **op.cit.**, p.615. Sander pointed out the reasons of that change in foreign policy towards the Middle East by the Soviet demands, establishment of parliamentary system, security concerns of Turkey based on regional instability and economic necessity for modernization. Oral Sander, **Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası**, p.228-233.

<sup>184</sup> In this period, Turkey recognized the independence of Syria and Lebanon in 1946. In 1945 Regent of the King Faisal II, the Crown Prince Abdel Ilah of Iraq; in 1946 first post-independence President of Lebanon Bishara Al Khoury, in 1947 King Abdullah of Jordan visited Turkey and Treaty of Friendship and Neighbourly Relations between Turkey and Iraq signed in 1946; Treaty of Friendship between Jordan and Turkey signed in 1947.

policy towards the Middle East.<sup>185</sup> On the basis of this activism, the effect of the Western-oriented foreign policy choice of Turkey, which was more limited between 1945 and 1947 than the following years, was the primary determinant until the 1960s.

This activism and Turkey's new positioning in the region could be observed in regional issues such as regional defence pact projects. However, as Robins suggested, Turkey seemed to approach the Middle East affairs with a sense of moral and political superiority as Bağcı evaluated that "Big Brother" policy over weak Islamic nations.<sup>186</sup> Therefore, Arab states looked upon Turkey's political choices as choices of a pawn of the West. This perception was gradually become real but the motivation of Turkey was not being a Western proxy in the region. In the course of events, Turkey appeared to see itself as the NATO vehicle in the region however, did not take into account the interests, priorities and perceptions of the Arab states. Indeed, Turkey had a real desire to secure its southern borders as well as prove its worth to its allies in NATO by advocating Western-oriented political choices towards the region as well as supporting their perceptions as seen in Bandung Conference or the Algerian question. However, these were further strained its relations with not only Arab states but also the Third World countries.

After Turkish entry into NATO, Turkey assumed its Western alliance responsibilities. The most significant one was about the Middle East that already supported by Turkey to accelerate its entry into the main Western defence. President Bayar told Dulles that Turkey could not ally with any of the present governments in the region due to past experiences. Besides, he evaluated Turkey's role in MEDO efforts as McGhee quoted: "If that were the policy of Turkey's allies, Bayar pledged to go forwards with efforts to build MEDO; despite he believed that would be a wasted effort."<sup>187</sup> On the Egyptian side, Egypt had no intentions to join such a

---

<sup>185</sup> Bağcı, *op.cit.*, p.40-41.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, p.42-44. Philip Robins, *Turkey and the Middle East*, New York, Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1991, p.25.

<sup>187</sup> McGhee, *op.cit.*, p.156.

regional pact and so there were some mockery about countries that had a desire for such a pact and through the acronym of MEDO as another “me too” pact.<sup>188</sup> After Egyptian rejection to ant Western oriented regional pact, the concept of the organization was transformed from British perception to the American. In this context, Turkey was a cornerstone of the American approach, “the Northern Tier”.<sup>189</sup> Britain insisted on a regional pact with Arab Middle East countries where its influence presumed strong. On the other hand, American approach, which would realize its foresight with the Baghdad Pact, would underline the “Northern Tier” as an essential part of that project.<sup>190</sup>

Turkey’s efforts and support for the Western influence in the region was regarded as a new form of imperialism, combined Turkish and Western ones. In this regard, Turkey’s efforts to establish MEDO and MEC, and Arab states offence against these Western-oriented regional organization proposals worsened Turkish-Arab relations. Since Turkey constantly failed to understand the Arab struggle to achieve true independence against the old colonial powers, which were Ankara’s ally after 1952. Moreover, as Robins suggested that, Turkey also failed to understand the US was seen as the protector of Israel along with Britain and it was becoming increasingly unpopular by replacing British influence in the Middle East.<sup>191</sup>

Therefore, the role of Turkey in regional affairs was significantly increased and Turkey adopted a leadership role along with Iraq to pursue other Arab states into that regional organization. By this reason, Turkey had a bad assumption that, Turkish national interest was identical with the Western ones. Even Western countries did not share that perception; Turkey risked its national interest for trying to prove its worth to the alliance by its exaggerated advocating the Western perception in the region. In 1953, Prime Minister Menderes referred Turkey’s role

---

<sup>188</sup> Heykel, *op.cit.*, p.18.

<sup>189</sup> The Northern Tier referred Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and Iraq.

<sup>190</sup> Hale, *op.cit.*, p.125.

<sup>191</sup> Robins, *op.cit.*, p.25.

on regional defence and emphasized Turkey and its neighbours were sharing a common fate, which had a unifying impact.<sup>192</sup> In the context of the Turkey's position in the Middle East, the Cold War conjuncture had constituted a deprecating factor for Turkish foreign policy toward the Middle East. These political and ideological polarizations separated all countries as we could find in the results of the Baghdad Pact. It divided the region into three parts; member countries of the Pact, hostile countries to such a pro-West pact led by Nasser's Egypt and neutral countries such as Jordan and Lebanon which were torn between Nasser's critics and Menderes's insistence and impatience. After 1954, the primary goal of the Menderes government in the Middle East was to persuade as many countries as possible to join the regional defence organization, which would form as the Baghdad Pact.

### **3.2. EGYPT'S FOREIGN POLICY AFTER THE FREE OFFICERS REVOLUTION**

#### **3.2.1. The Free Officers Movement and the July Revolution**

The era from the nominal independence to the Free Officers coup d'état is named as "the liberal era of Egypt" which was based on the main character of the regime.<sup>193</sup> The Egyptian politics had been dominated by the struggle of three main pillars, as the Palace, the British influence, and the parliament led by the Wafd Party during this period. After the Second World War, the Wafd Party and the parliament lost their notable reputations and became Britain's plaything in the eyes of public.<sup>194</sup> On the other hand, King Farouk already lost his reputation and his legacy still brings

---

<sup>192</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 9, Vol. 20, Session 3, 18 February 1953, p.424.

<sup>193</sup> Afaf Lutfi Al-Sayyid Marsot, **Egypt's Liberal Experiment 1922-1936**, Berkeley, 1977, *passim*.

<sup>194</sup> Güler, *op.cit.*, p.84.

debauchery and self-indulgence to minds.<sup>195</sup> By the end of 1940s, it was evident that Egypt got stuck in multicentre power relations between the Palace, the parliament and Britain's imperial policies. At the same time, Egypt became a self-mobilizing society to express national interests instead of the position the King, the aristocracy, the foreign intervention to Egyptian politics. These ideology-based groups provided an opportunity to mobilize low and middle classes to criticize the worsening socioeconomic conditions, instable political environment, and the gap between different socioeconomic groups in the society.<sup>196</sup>

There were two major developments that paved the way for the formation of the Free Officers Movement and its coup d'état in 1952. The Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of Alliance of 1936 is the first one of these developments.<sup>197</sup> The enrolment of lower-or middle- class into the Military Academy and then the Egyptian Army was enabled by this treaty and some following decrees.<sup>198</sup> Keeping in mind that the motto of Arabi Uprising, "Egypt belongs to Egypt (or Egypt for the Egyptians)"; the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty had the same reflection on the army and it made "Egyptian Army for the Egyptians". The members of the Free Officers Movement would join the Egyptian army thanks to this opportunity. The Egyptianization of Egyptian Army by these young officers from the lower-or middle- class was an underlying reason for the success of the Free Officers Movement.<sup>199</sup> Besides, British

---

<sup>195</sup> After King Farouk had overthrown, the enthronement rite and Coronation Oath of baby Prince Ahmed Fuad as Fuad II caricatured in Daily Express (London) as "Repeat after me: 'I, Ahmed Fuad, son of Farouk, do solemnly swear, no dice, no roulette, no late nights...'" **Daily Express**, London, July 29, 1952. In **Britannica Book of the Year 1953**, London, Encyclopaedia Britannica Ltd., 1953, p.193. Paul Crompton, "Egypt's King Farouk: philanderer of family man?", **Al-Arabiya**, 28 January 2014. Paul Crompton, "King Farouk's fabulous wealth", **Al-Arabiya**, 30 January 2014.

<sup>196</sup> Tareq Y. Ismael, **Middle East Politics Today Government and Civil Society**, Gainesville, University Press of Florida, 2001, p.420-423.

<sup>197</sup> **Treaty Series No.6 (1937) Treaty of Alliance**, London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1937, p.5.

<sup>198</sup> James V. DeFronzo (ed.), **Revolutionary Movements in World History From 1750 to the Present Vol.I.**, California, ABC-CLIO, 2006, p.249.

<sup>199</sup> As Vatikiotis compared Nasser and Arabi Pasha; both were "underdogs", men delivered from the "people" and they rallied native Egyptian army officers against those persons identifies with the ruling institutions or monarch. In addition to that, Vatikiotis underlined the Egyptianization of army, which was a result of the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty, in greater degree as for an advantage of



Ambassador Lampson, evaluated the future of Egypt under three scenarios in July 1938. He prophetically remarked the forthcoming situation in his third scenario as: “There could be a military revolt against Farouk on Arabi lines with a view to installing a military dictatorship and expelling the House of Muhammad Ali.”<sup>200</sup>

The second factor is the 1948/1949 Arab-Israeli War and the disastrous defeat of Arab states. The Arab defeat in Palestine in 1948 was a milestone for all Arab societies to criticize their governments, and raise the importance of army in politics.<sup>201</sup> In other respects, the 1948 defeat strengthened the Egyptian Army’s position as being the only reliable institution for struggle against British influence and presence and defending Egyptian interest beside the Palace and the Egyptian parliament. In addition, the conduct of the war in 1948 was the basis of the idea that, the Egyptian rulers had to be replaced.<sup>202</sup> Nasser blamed the Egyptian rulers by saying:

The decision taken by the government was the correct one but the method of its implementation was catastrophic. There was no coordination between the Arab armies while leadership on the highest level was almost non-existing. It proved that our arms were defective and in the middle of the battle orders were issued to the Engineers Corps to build a bathing hut for King Farouk in Gaza.<sup>203</sup>

Moreover, Arab nationalism became more and more a predominant standpoint for Egyptian officers after the war experience against newly established Israel. The Arab defeat in 1948 War paved the way for the Arab-Israeli conflict to transform into an instrumental discourse in the name of Arab nationalism or even Pan-Arabism. Tibi stated that, the critical impact of this war on the Free Officers

---

Nasser’s time. Moreover, Egyptian army became more experienced by Arab national struggle for Palestine in addition to rising nationalism since Urabi’s attempt. Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army...**, p.68.

<sup>200</sup> 23 July 1938, FO 371/19076; from P. J. Vatikiotis, **Nasser and His Generation**, London, Croom Helm, 1978, p.40.

<sup>201</sup> Güler, **op.cit.**, p.85.

<sup>202</sup> Ritchie Owendale, **The Origins of the Arab-Israeli Wars**, New York, Longman, 1992, p.148.

<sup>203</sup> **President Gamal Abdel Nasser**, Cairo, Information Department, p.6.

Movement was deepening their Pan-Arab consciousness, to such an extent that they were determined to act.<sup>204</sup> However, the 1948 Arab-Israeli War did not unify the Arab countries for the sake of Pan-Arabism as they were already distrustful of one another and divided into countries by not only their borders but also their ambitions for power and influence.<sup>205</sup>

The Free Officers Movement (*Harekat al-Dzubbat ul-Ahrar*) was a clandestine group of patriotic and idealist young Egyptian officers with the intentions of maintaining order, securing unity and endeavouring to build a better future for Egypt. Nasser pointed out that the period of the aftermath of 1948 War was the time for taking action to overthrow King Farouk on their minds.<sup>206</sup> He legitimized the role of army of mission for the realizing the historical circumstances of Egypt.<sup>207</sup> Many members of the Free Officers Movement came from lower-class and poor families and joined the army as per the 1936 Treaty.<sup>208</sup> Even Gamal Abdel Nasser, the true leader of this movement, came from a poor farmer (*fellah*) family from Beni Murr village in the Upper Nile, a suburban district of Alexandria as well. However, there were ideological differences among these officers. Abdel Hakim Amr, Kamaledin Hussein, Gamal Abdel Nasser (also Wafd Party), Anwar Sadat had already attended the political activities of the Muslim Brotherhood; just as Khaled Mohieddin to the Communist Party, Gamal Salem to the Egyptian Socialist

---

<sup>204</sup> Tibi, **op.cit.**, p.183.

<sup>205</sup> Charles D. Smith, **Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict**, New York, St.Martin's Press, 1996, p.145-147. Eugene L. Rogan, "The Emergence of the Middle East into the Modern State System", Louise Fawcett (ed.), **International Relations of the Middle East**, New York, Oxford University Press, 2005, p.36-37. Moreover, these Arab countries involved the Arab-Israeli conflict in Palestine for the purpose of their national interests since the beginning of this conflict. Adeed Dawisha, **op.cit.**, p.116-134. For a historical assessment of nationalism and Palestine, see also: Abdelaziz A. Ayyad, **Arab Nationalism and Palestinians 1850-1939**, Jerusalem, PASSIA, 1999.

<sup>206</sup> **President Gamal Abdel Nasser**, Cairo..., p.7.

<sup>207</sup> Nasser, **Egypt's Liberation...**, p.42-43.

<sup>208</sup> Many significant friends of Nasser and other members of the Free Officers like mostly come from lower-class and poor families and joined army with that opportunity, too. Salah Salem, Abdel Hakim Amr, Zakaria Mohieddin, Sarwat Ukasha were the closest insider of the group since the very beginning. They met in the Military Academy and Nasser described this generation as "after that came a new class of officers who regarded their future in the army as part of the struggle to liberate their people." **President Gamal Abdel Nasser**, Cairo, Information Department Press, 1965, p.4.

Union or Hasan Ibrahim to the Misr el-Fatat.<sup>209</sup> These differences were eliminated during the transition and consolidation period for the sake of a patriotic, nationalist, pragmatic and authoritarian regime.

The power struggle within Egyptian politics came out at in late 1951. King Farouk collaborated with the British authority against the Wafd Party and Prime Minister Nahhas Pasha. Nevertheless, the Cairo Fire also was a sign for the loss of faith in Egyptian authorities and demonstrated that the government lacked the power to control such unrest of masses. These events in the wake of Cairo Fire could only be suppressed by a military involvement. This was a sign for Free Officers to show the power of the army, which would be the only reliable and capable institution to restore order in the course of revolution. The Egyptian Army was the only national institution in Egypt to provide law and order, and a potential element of Egypt to assume the role of political arbiter.<sup>210</sup>

The unrest and demonstrations brought Egypt on the edge of revolutionary atmosphere in 1952. King Farouk was keeping track of the secret and organized insurrection in Egyptian Army, and called the members of this threatening disapproval “pack of dogs”.<sup>211</sup> However, the Free Officers already realized that King Farouk might be preparing to move against their movement, just as he eliminated the leadership of Nahhas Pasha. At last, the Free Officers Movement staged a bloodless coup d’état on July 23, 1952. The Free Officers took control of Cairo, which had a synonym to Egypt itself among Egyptians, entirely on the very first day. While the government and King Farouk stayed in Summer Palace (Kasr Ras el-Tin) in Alexandria, the palace was surrounded by troops. King Farouk was ordered to abdicate and clear out on 26 July. It was rumoured that when General Neguib first met King Farouk after the revolution, he reach out to him politely. The ousted monarch said him, “I am going to do same the things to you just as what you’ve

---

<sup>209</sup> Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army...**, p.45-51.

<sup>210</sup> **Ibid.**, p.71.

<sup>211</sup> Dikerdem, **op.cit.**, p.40.

done to me.”<sup>212</sup> After this short speech, he was forced to abdicate in the name of his six-month baby son, Ahmed Fuad, who was proclaimed as King Fuad II.

The regency council appointed to rule the country until King Fuad II came of age. Prince Muhammad Abdel Moneim, a respected member of the royal family, Baha al-Din Barakat Pasha, a respected statesman and former minister of education and Rashad Mehanna, an army officer were the members of Council of Egyptian Regency.<sup>213</sup> Prince Abdel Moneim would serve as the Chairman of the Council and the Regent for King Fuad II after the Council of Egyptian Regency was abolished.<sup>214</sup> This regency period continued until the RCC abolished the monarchy and proclaimed the republic.

### 3.2.2. Consolidation of Power and Personification of the Revolution

By the end of 1954, the Revolutionary Command Council had consolidated its position as well as Nasser had secured his regime and leadership authority. During this period, the revolutionary junta eliminated or gradually marginalized other Egyptian political figures and groups, especially the Wafd Party and the Muslim Brotherhood while it was transforming itself from a conspiratorial group to the most influential ruling elite in the Arab Middle East.<sup>215</sup> The coup d'état gradually transformed into a revolution with the proclamation of the republic,

---

<sup>212</sup> Dikerdem, *op.cit.*, p.47.

<sup>213</sup> Marsot, **A History of Egypt...**, p.126.

<sup>214</sup> Prince Abdel Moneim was husband of Neslishah Sultan, Princess Imperial of the Ottoman Empire and Princess of Egypt. She was a paternal granddaughter of the last Ottoman Caliph Abdulmecid II and maternal granddaughter of the last Ottoman Sultan and Caliph Mehmed VI. After he appointed to the Regency for King Fuad II, he became the most powerful man in Egypt, nominally. Because of he was a son in-law of the Ottoman dynasty, his wife Neslishah Sultan, a member of the Ottoman dynasty, became the first-lady of Egypt nominally and remembered Al-Amira Neslishah, the nation's glamorous first lady of 1952-1953. Murat Bardakçı, **Neslişah Cumhuriyet Devrinde Bir Osmanlı Prensesi**, İstanbul, Everest Yayınları, 2011, p.243-246. Samir Raafat, “Neslishah Sultan 1921-2012”, **Al-Ahram Weekly**, 10 May 2012.

<sup>215</sup> James Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt, Arab Nationalism, and The United Arab Republic**, Colorado, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002, p.19. Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army...**, p.71.

reforms in domestic politics, consolidation of power and a new foreign policy. Nasser described the legacy that they took over as “a ruined treasury, an unbalanced budget, corrupt governments, graft, favouritism, party conflict, personal interest and abuse of influence by Government officials were rife.”<sup>216</sup>

A few months after the revolution, in September 1952, the Revolutionary Command Council started the land reform as its fundamental economical and socio-political reform. The land reform aimed to break the influence of wealthy landowners by limiting land ownership to 200 *feddans*.<sup>217</sup> The limitation on landownership had already been discussed but this implemented land reform would gradually reduce the limits of individual land ownership from 200 feddans in 1952 to 100 feddans in 1961, and so 50 feddans in 1969.<sup>218</sup> Ikram summarized this reform as a limitation of individual ownership to break the power of old ruling oligarchy, with its roots in big estates.<sup>219</sup> The land reform of the Free Officers was an attempt towards the abolition of feudalism, removal of existing oligarchy and an intention to gain a popular support from the Egyptian society. This popular support and reactions from the Egyptians would be a key factor in Nasser’s charismatic leadership and being the kind of an omnipotent figure who builds up great tensions, achievements and expectations.

The most important change of the RCC was the abolition of the monarchy. On June 18, 1953, the revolutionary government abolished the monarchy and

---

<sup>216</sup> Morroe Berger, **Bureaucracy and Society in Modern Egypt**, New York, Russell & Russell, 1957, p.123.

<sup>217</sup> *Feddan* is a unit of measure that uses in Egypt, Sudan and Syria. Feddan means an area that can plow by two oxen. 1 feddan equals to 4.200.883 square meters, slightly more than one acre (1.038 acres). Philip Matar (ed.), **The Encyclopedia of the Modern Middle East and North Africa Volumes 1-2-3-4**, USA, Thomson Gale, 2004, p.2622.

<sup>218</sup> It had already discussed to impose a limitation on landownership and even a member of Egyptian parliament, Ibrahim Shukri, proposed a limitation of 50 feddan in 1949. John Waterbury, **The Egypt of Nasser and Sadat The Political Economy of Two Regimes**, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1983, p.264. **Ibid.**, p. 1371-1372.; Ray Bush, “Consolidations for Dispossession and Networks of Resistance? Land, Politics and Agrarian Reform in Egypt”, **British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies**, Vol.38, No.3, (December 2011), p. 395-396.

<sup>219</sup> Khalid Ikram, **The Egyptian Economy, 1952-2000 Performance, Policies, and Issues**, New York, Routledge, 2006, p.2-3.

proclaimed the Republic of Egypt. That was a formal ending to 150 years of Muhammad Ali dynasty's rule. General Neguib became the first President of the Republic of Egypt. In his presidency, Abd al-Hakim Amr, a close friend of Nasser within the Free Officers, was appointed as commander of armed forces with an increasingly free rein to manage military affairs.<sup>220</sup> This marked the fact that the Free Officers was realizing an effective domination of the Egyptian Army by its own members.<sup>221</sup> Therefore, the first priority of consolidation, taking control of the armed forces would secure Nasser with the assignment of a loyal friend. From the resignation of Ali Maher to the Presidency of Muhammad Neguib, the consolidation of regime continued with Nasser and his friends who appointed themselves or their closest men to the highest positions.

The main struggle between Neguib and Nasser was to control the RCC and the government until Nasser-prevailed with the resignation of Neguib in 1954. While Neguib was in favour of to send the army back to the barracks for restoring order and re-establishing a parliamentary system, Nasser opposed to entrust the revolution to old political actors and returning to the old regime.<sup>222</sup> However, the abolition of the monarchy and suppression of old politicians and officers signed the predominance of Nasser's perception in the RCC. In November 1952, U.S. diplomatic reports underlined Nasser's situation as the "strongest member" of the RCC. On March 1953, these reports were also mentioned him as "the real possessive of power who clearly dominates the committee".<sup>223</sup> In addition to these reports, Cyrus L. Sulzberger, who was a journalist at The New York Times and among the

---

<sup>220</sup> Roger Owen, **State, Power and Politics in the Making of the Modern Middle East**, London, Routledge, 2004, p.181.

<sup>221</sup> Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt...**, p.20.

<sup>222</sup> Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army...**, p.72-75. Steven A. Cook, **Ruling but not Governing, The Military and Political Development in Egypt, Algeria, and Turkey**, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004, p.64.

<sup>223</sup> Memo of conversation between Nasser and William C. Lakeland, November 18, 1952, US/State,774.00/11-1852; dispatch from Caffery, March 26, 1953, US/State, 774.00/3-2653. From Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt...**, p.24.

closest to the CIA since its founding,<sup>224</sup> named General Neguib as “Kerensky with a Fez” and emphasized Nasser’s leadership and rising dominance instead of Neguib; like Lenin’s influence and leadership during the Bolshevik Revolution.<sup>225</sup>

The next phase of consolidation entailed the neutralization and eventual destruction of other existing political groups; the monarchy, political parties, senior officers, members of the old ruling class.<sup>226</sup> This phase included the elimination of inner-RCC and inner Free Officers clash of ideas, especially against General Neguib. It also included other revolutionary alliances with political parties, including the leftist movement, the Muslim Brotherhood and their followers among the Free Officers. Therefore, Rashad Mehanna, a member of Council of Egyptian Regency from the Free Officers was arrested of serving the Muslim Brotherhood and plotting against the regime as an example of that process among officers.<sup>227</sup> The Kafr al-Dawar incident on August 12, 1952, was the first sign of RCC’s oppression on the first demonstration of the leftist movement after the coup, and intolerance to any demonstration against the regime.<sup>228</sup>

After the pro-Nasser group among the RCC members tussling with Neguib in the RCC meeting on February 24, 1954, Neguib resigned from his position in the first place. Nasser took action against Neguib immediately since the Tugay Affair also encouraged, besides his other significant gains in the army and government, by demonstrating his influence and reputation, even caused a bilateral crisis. Some army officers showed their displeasure for Neguib’s resignation and the pro-Neguib

---

<sup>224</sup> William Blum, **Killing Hope, US military & CIA Interventions since World War II**, London, Zed Books, 2004, p.150.

<sup>225</sup> Cyrus L. Sulzberger, “Foreign Affairs”, **New York Times**, 17 November 1954.

<sup>226</sup> P. J. Vatikiotis, **Nasser and His...**, p.127.

<sup>227</sup> “Egypt Ex-Regent Gets Prison Term; Col. Mehanna and 13 Others Found Guilty of Plot to Upset Army Regime” **New York Times**, 31 March 1953.

<sup>228</sup> It was the strike of textile workers in Kafr Al-Dawar who were protesting for increasing wages and bonuses and deposing a mean manager of factory. Army and police force oppressed workers and there in which nine people, including a policeman and two soldiers were killed. In the end, the leader of workers, Mustafa Hamis and his friend Muhammed al- Baqri sentenced to be hanged after they were found guilty of being one of the principal instigators of the recent strike and riots. For the Kafr al-dawar incident and the Nasser’s stance on leftist movement, see also: Dikerdem, **op.cit.**, p.59-60.

demonstrations shouted as “Long live Neguib! Down with Nasser! Down with the RCC!”<sup>229</sup> Neguib was reinstated to presidency after these developments but he appointed Nasser as vice-president, and later as the Prime Minister of Egypt. This event was also a sign for Nasser to overcome this power struggle by more powerful authority on the Egyptian army and influential position on the Egyptian society. Therefore, the Egyptian Army, the foremost base of Nasser’s power received his earliest attention and turned into a protector of the regime for decades.<sup>230</sup> Consequently, Neguib resigned on November 14, 1954 and would allege the collaboration on the conspiracy of the Muslim Brotherhood against the regime.<sup>231</sup> Even though he had the most influential man in the country; he did not need to take the presidency officially until the 1956 Referendum for the Egyptian Constitution and Plebiscite for his presidency on June 23, 1956.

The era between 1953 and 1956 was an era for the elimination of Nasser’s political opponents and neutralization of potential rivals within the military cohort and Free Officers.<sup>232</sup> While Nasser and Neguib were struggling for power, the RCC and Nasser had already moved against other political groups and political alliances during the revolution to eliminate or suppress them. Nasser would also eliminate other threats to his political leadership. The Muslim Brotherhood, the remnants of the Wafd and the leftist movement were significant groups and his main targets, as well. The Kafr al-Dawar incident was mentioned as an example of his treatment towards the leftist opposition. Khaled Moheddine, as a leftist officer exiled to Switzerland, paid the price of both his ideological priority and his support for Neguib during the quarrel between Neguib and Nasser. The land reforms, the abolition of the monarchy and mainly Nasser’s stance of not leaving country to the old and corrupt figures of the ancient regime were targeting the Wafd Party and its politicians, supporters and economic fundamentals. The most challenging opponent

---

<sup>229</sup> **Ibid.**, p.52.

<sup>230</sup> Vatikiotis, **Nasser and His...**, p.158.

<sup>231</sup> “General Necib dün vazifesinden azledildi”, **Milliyet**, 15 November 1954.

<sup>232</sup> Jankowski, **Nasser’s Egypt...**, p.67.



was the Muslim Brotherhood. The Muslim Brotherhood made a huge misinterpretation and expected that revolutionary officers would return to their barracks once a decent civilian government was constituted. The Ikhwan leaders believed that its extensive organization would force the military junta to request its assistance in governing the country as Vatikiotis noted.<sup>233</sup> On the contrary, Nasser was eliminating all groups that attempted to interfere in the RCC, securing their loyalty to his leadership and new regime. The final move against the Muslim Brotherhood was made after their controversial assassination attempt to Nasser in 1954.

Nasser targeted these opposition groups and political parties during the consolidation of power process. The RCC weakened the solidarity network of these groups and repressed their members when the new regime was in its most vulnerable time.<sup>234</sup> Nasser criticized their political perspectives and especially, mockingly told his encounters with the Muslim Brotherhood in the next few years. As Vatikiotis summarized this period “With the dissolution and proscription of the Ikhwan, the elimination of General Neguib and the virtual suppression of all organised party opposition, the RCC emerged, at the end of 1954, as the undisputed ruling élite –the political directorate- of Egypt.”<sup>235</sup> In late 1954, Nasser concentrated power pre-eminently in his own hands in consequence of his struggle for power and influence

---

<sup>233</sup> Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army...**, p.73.

<sup>234</sup> The revolutionary alliance by the group or individual network could be seen in the relation of the Free Officers and these political groups. Even Nasser’s successor Anwar Sadat was described by Muslim Brotherhood as “a pivotal role in bringing together the Brotherhood and members of the Free Officers”. Their alliance based on the uniting Ikhwan and Free Officers under the banner of Egyptian self-rule which would be more constructive and lead to a quicker revolution than a purely Islamist one in Brotherhood perspective. But, Nasser was suspicious that the Brotherhood only wanted to exploit the officers for its own interest. Although many members of Free Officers connected with these groups, movements or parties like Abdel Hakim Amr, Kemaleddin Hussein connected with Muslim Brotherhood, Gamal Salem with Egyptian Socialist Party, Abdel Latif al-Baghdadi with anti-British sabotages or Nasser himself connected with Wafd and also Muslim Brotherhood. Free Officers chose to consolidate their power and rule the country instead of toppling down the King Farouk and gave that new beginning to the Wafd or the Muslim Brotherhood, as major political powers against a child King and British suppression. Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army...**, p.48-49; DeFronzo (ed.), **op.cit.**, p.252-253; Youssef H. Aboul-Enein, “Al-Ikhwan Al-Muslimeen: the Muslim Brotherhood”, **Military Review**, Vol.83, No.4, (July-August 2003), p.28.; Khaled Mohieldin, **Memories of the Revolution: Egypt 1952**, Cairo, AUC Press, 1995 from “Nasser, Myself and the Muslim Brotherhood”, **Al-Ahram**, 23 July 2013.

<sup>235</sup> Vatikiotis, **Nasser and His.....**, p.158.

during from the abolition of the monarchy to the elimination of political opponents. Therefore, he achieved the important ground by entailing neutralization and eventual destruction of other existing political groups.

The fundamental factor for building his charismatic leadership and self-made image of the hero/saviour of the Arab nation through the consolidation period and personification process must be touched upon. It is the personification of the revolution and Egypt, which should be considered as an outcome of domestic and foreign policies and would be an effective instrument of authoritarian leadership image, as well. As Carr pointed out, we should not place great men outside history and see them as imposing themselves on history in virtue of their greatness.<sup>236</sup> Nasser could be named as the great man of Egypt to some extent within the contemporary history of Egypt. The role of leader is a social phenomenon and contentious theoretical debate.<sup>237</sup> However, Nasser was the leader that fit to that role to a certain extent, which Hegel explains: “The great man who tells the time what it wills and means, and then brings it to completion, is the great man of the time”<sup>238</sup> He put the will of his age, his movement and Egyptian and other Arab societies into words. Under Nasser’s leadership, Arab nationalism and pro-Nasserite stance became a revolutionary apparatus. Thus, Heikal praised Nasser’s leadership and distinguished Egypt as a state and as a revolution that should carry its message beyond the borders in order to initiate its revolutionary mission for a unitary Arab future.<sup>239</sup> If so, one has to contact with Nasser’s mind and understanding in order to explain his ways of power-grabbing and personification of the revolution; not only through domestic politics but also foreign policy.

Nasser wanted to change Egypt towards a patriotic, Arab nationalist, independent path through his policies in practice and sets of ideas in his guideline

---

<sup>236</sup> Edward Hallett Carr, **What is History?**, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2001, p.48.

<sup>237</sup> For the theoretical debate over the role of leader, see also: Snyder, Bruck and Sapin, **op.cit.**; Hermann, **op.cit.**; Valerie M. Hudson, “Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations”, **Foreign Policy Analysis**, Vol.1 No.1, March 2005, p.1-21.

<sup>238</sup> Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, **Philosophy of Right**, Kitchener, Batoche Books, 2001, p.254.

<sup>239</sup> Dawisha, **op.cit.**, p.153.

book. He mentioned the need for a hero to realize these objectives in line with the centralized authority understanding, thus he adopted an omnipotent leadership style. He was a pragmatic tactician that would eliminate domestic and inner-RCC opponents, and use balance of power during the conjuncture of the Cold War.<sup>240</sup> Thus, leader's role in the decision-making process and Nasser's impact on Egyptian politics were unconstrained by these eliminated opposition groups. Furthermore, Nasser has a leader's charisma that would affect all Arab nations, in the Third World beyond. Lacouture defined him as influential rather than imposing, respected by his friends and considered as a rank-and-file leader, not a boss.<sup>241</sup> He could be defined as *primus inter pares*, a primer member among equal young officers.<sup>242</sup> This leadership among other young officers was the key factor to win his struggle against General Neguib.

The personification of the revolution needed a large-scale social acceptance for building a charismatic leadership. For this reason, the revolutionary officers imposed their perspective on Egyptian society initially by reconstructing the official history, manipulating the Egyptian press, fabricating the glorified takeover of their movement and besmirching defiant actors' reputations.<sup>243</sup> Besides, Nasser had to achieve certain major successes without sharing the gain, charisma and popularity with anyone on leadership scale or at least demonstrating them as they should be. There are five main developments which have to be considered in this personification process: proclamation of the republic, the Tugay Affair, resignation of President Neguib, failed assassination attempt on Nasser after the evacuation agreement in 1954 and the Bandung Conference. First one is the proclamation of the Republic on June 18, 1953. Lacouture pointed that the declaration by his voice was

---

<sup>240</sup> There were some exceptions among the members of Free Officers who did not support Nasser's leadership and even supported Neguib or had some ideological differences such as Abdel Moneim Amin or Youssef Seddiq. These were eliminated in this process, gradually like Salah Salem and Gamal Salem. "All the revolution's men", **Al-Ahram Weekly**, Issue No. 595, 18 - 24 July 2002. Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt...**, p.67.

<sup>241</sup> Lacouture, **op.cit.**, p.92.

<sup>242</sup> Dekmejian, **Patterns of ...**, p.180.

<sup>243</sup> Joel Gordon, **Nasser's Blessed Movement Egypt's Free Officers and the July Revolution**, Cairo, The American University of Cairo Press, 1996, p.9.

his first contact with public, and his first step towards the personification of the revolution with one of its major outcome.<sup>244</sup> From the proclamation of the Republic to the date that Nasser ineffectively tried to force Neguib to resign his posts in February 1954, the Tugay Affair was the most important event in Nasser's personification and consolidation process.

Second one is the Tugay Affair, which has a direct connection with the core of this thesis, and Turkish-Egyptian bilateral relations. Turkish Ambassador was declared *persona non grata* in return for his quarrel with Nasser in January 1954. Since Turkish Ambassador Tugay, who had a bad relation with revolutionary officers from the very beginning, insulted Nasser in reaction to government-led press attacks on his wife. Nasser took this attitude as an insult on both himself and the Egyptian state. Even though he compromised with the peaceful departure of Ambassador Tugay within two days for the prevention of deterioration in Turkish-Egyptian bilateral relations; Nasser broke his words and expelled him by declaring him *persona non grata*.<sup>245</sup> This was an unexpected reaction from the Turkish Ambassador, yet Nasser used it to personify the revolution by making that reproach look like a result of Turkey's anti-regime stance, and Ambassador's personal critics and family bonds. However, this overreaction for defending the dignity of Egypt was not observed against the US Ambassador Byroade's comments; although Nasser had consolidated his power over the time of the Tugay Affair. After Egyptian people beat up American attaché in Suez region, Ambassador Byroade complained about this event to Nasser: "We regret to consider that we are living in a civilized country."<sup>246</sup> Heikal commented on Nasser's appeasement saying that there was no vengeance in return to that conversation, from the time on he left.<sup>247</sup> Therefore, from the viewpoint of Heikal's evaluation on this issue, the escalation in the Tugay Affair

---

<sup>244</sup> Lacouture, *op.cit.*, p.99.

<sup>245</sup> Dikerdem, *op.cit.*, p.81-84.

<sup>246</sup> Heykel, *op.cit.*, p.36. Dikerdem, *op.cit.*, p.93-94.

<sup>247</sup> Heykel, *op.cit.*, p.37.

should be considered as vengeance, alongside with his instrumentalization of this affair.

The elimination of other political groups and consolidation of power within the government was another phase of personification of the revolution. The difference between Nasser and Neguib started from naming this whole process and transition. While Neguib referred to this uprising and transition aftermath as *inqilab* (overthrown, an accidental occurrence), Nasser left his mark on by referring to it as *thawra* (revolution, a lasting event).<sup>248</sup> This was a clear difference of understanding between these two figures since the very first day of coup d'état. On 15 January 1954, Nasser clarified his perspective to Lacouture as:

If the right to vote were now restored, the same landowners would be elected - the feudal interests. We do not want the capitalists and the wealthy back in power. If we open the government to them now, the revolution might just as well be forgotten.<sup>249</sup>

On the other hand, an article published in Newsweek pointed out that Nasser was among the chief insiders of the Free Officers Movement, underlying the importance of the inner circle and labelled him as: “a hero of the Palestine War”. However, the important fact was that the article mentioned Neguib with a possibility that he may not be within the inner circle and his position could be a figurehead.<sup>250</sup> The quarrel between Nasser and Neguib, especially from February 1954 to Neguib’s resignation was the clear outcome of this power struggle and confrontation for leadership. Thus, this struggle paved the way for creating a cult of personality through personification of the revolution with the support of his movement and without any other possible candidate for leadership. Furthermore, he could also secure his position to identify himself with some major gains and populist achievements of the revolutionary regime, particularly land reform, welfare

---

<sup>248</sup> Lacouture, *op.cit.*, p.95.

<sup>249</sup> *Ibid.*, p.105.

<sup>250</sup> “Key to Middle East Future: What Happens Next in Egypt”, *Newsweek*, 25 August 1952, p.36.

programs and state employment.<sup>251</sup> After Neguib resigned from the presidency, he secured his position and did not need an immediate election or even a plebiscite for his presidency.

The fourth development in chronological order was about the Anglo-Egyptian Agreement in 1954, the celebrations for the evacuation and assassination attempts on Nasser. The evacuation agreement was a major foreign policy success of Nasser's regime in the eyes of Egyptian society. This long-awaited victory against the colonial ruler was one of his major successes to build up his charisma and influence in domestic and regional policy. Nasser was the first Arab leader who used national celebrations as a tool for communicating with the masses. The celebration of the evacuation was a pre-planned tool to praise his leadership. Therefore, his public rallies were tantamount to daily plebiscites and approval from people, as Podeh stated incisively.<sup>252</sup> From the point on Nasser was called "the Evacuation Hero" despite all critics against the agreement. It was a very significant title and used in domestic and foreign policy to promote his leadership as being a "liberator of the homeland from imperialism". For instance on 18 June 1956, few days before the referendum for constitution and plebiscite for his presidency, Al-Ahram published a drawing that pictured Nasser as the Evacuation Hero, alongside with other national figures including Muhammad Ali, 'Arabi Pasha, Mustafa Kamil and Sa'ad Zaghlul. They were watching Nasser to raise the Liberation flag.<sup>253</sup> This means of the propaganda demonstrated the logic behind that and the instrumentalization of this event.

The assassination attempt on Nasser while he was celebrating that event in Alexandria on 26 October 1954, instrumentalized both his leadership and the elimination of the Muslim Brotherhood. A member of the Muslim Brotherhood,

---

<sup>251</sup> Raymond Hinnebusch, "The Foreign Policy of Egypt", Raymond Hinnebusch and Anoushiravan Ehteshami (eds.), **The Foreign Policies of the Middle East States**, Colorado, Lynne Rienner, 2002, p.97.

<sup>252</sup> Elie Podeh, **The Politics of National Celebrations in the Arab Middle East**, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2011, p.293.

<sup>253</sup> **Ibid.**, p.82.

Muhammad Abdel Latif, attempted to assassinate Nasser while he was delivering a speech in Alexandria to celebrate the British military withdrawal. He immediately addressed the crowd of supporters with the squeal of anger and fear, eight times in return to those eight bullets as: “O men! (O freemen!) All of you remain at your place!” And then, he thrust himself to the forefront and correlated this assassination attempt among his leadership, Egyptian masses and the revolution by shouting and saying:

Here is Gamal Abdel Nasser, among you!

Go ahead and kill Gamal! The Egyptian people have hundreds of Gamal who will rise up and show you that a red revolution is worth more than a dead one!

My countrymen, my blood spills for you and for Egypt. I will live for your sake; die for the sake of your freedom and honour. Let them kill me; it does not concern me so long as I have instilled pride, honour, and freedom in you.

Even if Gamal Abdel Nasser die, each of you shall be Gamal Abdel Nasser!<sup>254</sup>

This sentence (Each of you shall be Gamal Abdel Nasser) turned into his catchphrase, and was used by Egyptians as “We are all Gamal!” slogan alongside his pictures.<sup>255</sup> As a result, thousands of members and supporters of the Brotherhood were arrested; six men were hanged. Even General Neguib allegedly implicated in this conspiracy to destroy his reputation as being a collaborator against Nasser. Thus, at the end of 1954, Nasser was secured concentration and consolidation of power having eliminated other competitors. He gained main basis to build his charismatic leadership and potent leader image by using all revolutionary gains such as land reforms, evacuation agreement et.al. By bringing the Tugay Affair or the

---

<sup>254</sup> Lacouture, **op.cit.**, p.103.; Gordon, **op.cit.**, p.179. The speech given by President Gamal Abdel Nasser in Manshia Square in Alexandria celebrating the evacuation, <<http://nasser.org/Speeches/browser.aspx?SID=263> > (Access on: 15.06.2014)

<sup>255</sup> Podeh, **The Politics of National...**, p.77.

assassination attempt to the fore, Nasser built a leadership that was identical to Egypt itself and spread his charisma throughout the region and the Third World<sup>256</sup>

The Bandung Conference (the Asian-African Conference) brought Nasser forward on the world stage, and here he gained reputation for being not only an issue for Britain, the US or the USSR but also as a promising, enthusiastic, and neutralist leader for the Third World. The Free Officers adopted a neutralist foreign policy after the revolution. It was also a pragmatic move of Nasser trying to get as much as economic aid from both sides of the Cold War. According to Ampiah, adopting a neutralist foreign policy served the interests of many Asian-African states; thus India and Egypt especially using this neutralist position to gain greater advantage from both sides of the Cold War.<sup>257</sup>

Nasser noticed the power of neutralism to establish close ties with the Asian-African states, and use it as a tool for Egyptian foreign policy. The Asian-African group was another tool for Nasser's foreign policy to make his voice heard and also reach Arab states, not just Arab nationalist and Pan-Arabist discourse. Therefore, Nasser attended the conference personally as head of the Egyptian delegation and had the biggest delegation (50 members), even bigger than the host country Indonesia's (41 members).<sup>258</sup> The conference was a major success for his foreign policy perceptions in terms of the resolution of conference or preventing Israeli participation. Lacouture claimed that when he returned from Bandung to Cairo, people convinced that he was not an outcome of a Western plot or intrigue. In other

---

<sup>256</sup> Even this assassination attempt was considered as a designed plot of Nasser to promote his leadership and conducted to eliminate the Muslim Brotherhood. However the 4<sup>th</sup> General Guide of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood Muhammad Hamid Abu al-Nasr who was also charged to being among ringleaders of this failed attempt, admitted that, they were only take up arms to defend themselves against Nasser. Murat Bardakçı, "Müslüman Kardeşler'in liderinin bundan 26 sene önceki öngörüsü", **Habertürk**, 18 August 2013.

<sup>257</sup> Kweku Ampiah, **The Political and Moral Imperatives of the Bandung Conference of 1955**, Folkestone, Global Oriental, 2007, p.27-28.

<sup>258</sup> According to Hassouna, Egypt had the most crowded delegation among the participant countries with 50 member. On the other side, some other delegations as follows: host Indonesia (41) , Japan (37), China (26), India (26), Saudi Arabia (13), Lebanon (8), Turkey (6) and Jordan (3). Mohamed Abdel Khalek Hassouna, **League of Arab States The First Asian-African Conference held at Bandung, Indonesia (April 18-24, 1955)**, Cairo, Imprimerie Mısr S.A.E, 1955, p.181-223.



respects, Jankowski suggested that, his attendance to the conference broadened his horizon, and changed his perception of his own role in Egyptian leadership. On the other hand, his portrait was flanked by Nehru and Chou En-lai and welcomed by an enthusiastic crowd.<sup>259</sup> The US Ambassador to Egypt, Henry A. Byroade similarly emphasized that:

The new position of primacy that Nasser has assumed since returning from Bandung... Nasser shared none of the glory with his colleagues and when delegations and individuals called upon him at the Presidency to extend their congratulations on his success at Bandung, it has been reported that in subtle ways the Prime minister made it very clear that a new relationship now existed between himself and his callers. According to these reports, the atmosphere prevailing was no longer that of the first of equals greeting his associates, but rather that of subordinates paying their respects to the Nation's leader.<sup>260</sup>

In these aspects, the Bandung conference was the first popular appearance of Nasser on an international stage, where he was welcomed by the Asian-African countries and their leaders. His personification of the revolution reached another step since he was treated as the leading representative of the Arab countries and became one of the most popular figures at the summit. From that moment on, the image of Nasser started to personify not only their revolution but Egypt itself. In this respect, these words of Anthony Eden were a disappointing effort to persuade regional and international communities in 1956:

Our quarrel is not with Egypt, still less with the Arab world; it is with Colonel Nasser. He has shown that he is not a man who can be trusted to keep an agreement. The pattern is familiar to many of us, my friends. We all know this is how fascist governments behave and we all remember only too well, what the cost can be in giving in to fascism...<sup>261</sup>

---

<sup>259</sup> Lacouture, **op.cit.**, p.108.

<sup>260</sup> Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt...**, p.66.

<sup>261</sup> Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden's broadcast to the Nation on 8 August 1956.

Nasser's political agenda was dominated by foreign affairs and Hinnebusch exemplified the significance of personal choice with the transition from Nasser's consulting with his fellow Free Officers to the point that he took the crucial decision to nationalize the Suez Canal Company by himself.<sup>262</sup> That was a clear example for both the completed transition from the consolidation process to an omnipotent leadership and the unquestioned role of leader in the decision-making process. Furthermore, the impact of Nasser on Egyptian politics and foreign policy choices was not only the ideological or theoretical guidance but became a main determinant. Heikal quoted André Malraux, saying "Regardless of everything, regardless of success or failure, victory or defeat, Nasser will go down in history as the embodiment of Egypt, just as Napoleon became the embodiment of France."<sup>263</sup> Consequently, he was not Gamal any more, even for his most fellow associates in the RCC; henceforth Gamal Abdel Nasser was *the Raïs*.<sup>264</sup>

### 3.2.3. Three Circles Theory and Nasser's Foreign Policy Objectives

The Free Officers had no ideological goals or a political programme, besides their nationalist feelings and justification to topple down the "Despot" of Egypt by means of the Egyptian army. Many of them had a connection with different political groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood or Marxist groups. Nevertheless, their main cause was based on getting rid of corrupt politicians, eliminating the power of landlords and the monarch and finally overcoming the foreign influence, especially the British influence and its presence.<sup>265</sup> Vatikiotis described their position as "One finds few indicators of any political program or plan of action" before they took

---

<sup>262</sup> Hinnebusch, *op.cit.*, p.98-99.

<sup>263</sup> Heykel, *op.cit.*, p.379.

<sup>264</sup> The term *the Raïs* is an Arabic word, which means the person who leads or commands a group, organization, or country. In this regard, it refers the leader, the president or the chief.

<sup>265</sup> Peter Mansfield, *A History of the Middle East*, London, Penguin Books, 2003, p.244.; Nasser, *Egypt's Liberation...*, p.74-75.

action to come into power.<sup>266</sup> Roussillon pointed out more critically that, "...officers forming the RCC had no program, almost no ideology, and barely any 'philosophy'."<sup>267</sup> In his evaluation, the "philosophy" element pointed out Nasser's famous guideline book which was composed of three sub-parts. These parts were simply summarized as the background of revolutionary ideas, the process of revolution and the objectives of new era. These objectives on Egypt's foreign policy were named as the Three Circles Theory. Considering the fact that the Philosophy of Revolution was a manifestation of the process and a constitutive book of following objectives of the Free Officers revolution; the Three Circles Theory was the foreign policy part of this declaration. In this regard, the definition of "circle" in this theory could translate as an area of influence. These three circles are Arab, Africa and Islam circles, which construct the Egyptian identity. This theory argues the competence of the leadership notion, moreover, an obligation for Egypt in these circles. The Three Circles Theory, which turned Egypt into both the centre and vanguard of Arab, Africa, and Islamic spheres, was a creation of a set of foreign policy objectives. This theory was the main determinant of Nasser's decision and was a long-lasting effect of Nasser on the Egyptian foreign policy perception.

The theory had two important factors for Egypt, the geographical limits of these circles and the "hero" role for a potential Egyptian leadership. Nasser describes these "circles" as Arab, Africa and Islam that claimed competence of leadership in the name of geography, history and identity of Egypt. Yet more, an Egyptian diplomat, Tahsin Basheer, popularized this leadership notion by arguing that "Egypt was the only nation-state in the Arab world; the rest are just tribes with flags."<sup>268</sup> The main determinant of these circles was the definition of country's geographical limits, in Nasser's perspective.<sup>269</sup> Firstly, he described the Arab circle

---

<sup>266</sup> Vatikiotis, **The Egyptian Army...**, p.67-68.

<sup>267</sup> Alain Roussillon, "Republican Egypt interpreted: revolution and beyond", **Cambridge History of Egypt Volume II, Modern Egypt, from 1517 to the End of the Twentieth Century**, M.W.Daly (ed.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p.338.

<sup>268</sup> "Tahseen Bashir, Urbane Egyptian Diplomat, Dies at 77", **The New York Times**, 14 June 2002.

<sup>269</sup> Nasser, **Egypt's Liberation...**, p.83-87.

as a part of Egypt and Egypt as a part of it; since the Arab circle is surrounding Egypt. In this regard, the struggle for leadership in the Arab circle or even Arab nationalism and Pan-Arabism were not a choice for Egypt but an obligation. Therefore, Nasser emphasized the Arab circle as the nucleus one as Egyptians were most closely linked.<sup>270</sup> He based his interpretation of Egypt-Arab circle relation on a common religion, language, sufferings and solid geographical framework. As a matter of fact, the Arab circle was the most valuable asset for Nasser to seek regional leadership while the Arab nationalism was in vogue. In addition, it was challenging yet attainable vis-à-vis other circles by eliminating Islamic or Africa but non-Arab countries, like Turkey, Iran or Pakistan.

In the context of the Africa circle, Nasser described Egypt as a vanguard of Africa's northern gate. The main priorities within the Africa circle were the Nile Valley and the Maghreb, while he was trying to spread his influence on all newly independent Africa states by means of anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist claims or the mission of spreading enlightenment and civilization. Secondly, the Africa Circle within the Three Circles Theory would bring superiority to Egypt over other Africa states through the assumed Egyptian mission called "spreading civilization and enlightenment to the remotest depths of the jungle of Africa".<sup>271</sup> Thirdly, the Africa circle was another step forward towards emphasizing the uniqueness of Egypt to take on this mission altogether as the only responsible and capable country. By this means, Egypt became the only country that, could bring these three circles together and achieve success as the only leader of this mission. In other words, it provided a unique mission for Egypt, not to compete with any other Arab or Muslim country to fulfill the leadership obligation of three circles altogether.

Finally, the Islam circle was the last constituent of this theory. Nasser legitimized the presence of Islam circle by revisiting Egypt's history. The central role of Egypt was to be exemplified as being a permanent centre for Islamic learning, a historical shelter for the Caliph in Cairo under the patronage of

---

<sup>270</sup> **Ibid.**, p.88-89.

<sup>271</sup> **Ibid.**, p.109-111.

Mameluks in Egypt. Thanks to this Islam circle, Nasser had three main gains for his policy. First of all, religion is the most prominent component of Middle East societies. The inclusion of leadership notion in the Islamic world within this foreign policy objective both gained supporters for Egypt's foreign policy and prevented any religious-based criticism on Nasser's policies, especially with respect to Arab nationalism. Secondly, it was the reconciliation of Egyptian Arab and Egyptian Islamic identities, which had caused a continual discussion on Egyptian nationalism, by means of a set of ideas on foreign policy aims and objectives. Lastly, this circle was the re-evaluation of the Caliphate efforts. Nasser transformed the Caliphate initiative of ancient regime into a new objective within his circles theory by both breaking with the past yet still seeking the leadership on Muslim community.

However, the pattern of this intersection of the three complementary spheres of influences into one foreign policy vision did not belong to Nasser himself. In the Conservative Mass Meeting on October 9, 1948, Winston Churchill already spoke of his perception about being taken for British foreign policy through the intersection of three spheres as the British Commonwealth and Empire; the Anglo-Saxon partnership as the closest possible unity; and close links with continental Western European neighbours for an effective defence in order, to unite them in peace.<sup>272</sup> If Churchill's and Nasser's Three Circles were mutually assessed, an analogy of their components could be found, especially the co-existence of these three inter-linked circles and role of their countries which had a great part in every one of them and belonged to only one country, altogether.<sup>273</sup> At least, the methods of these three circles theory on foreign relations belonged to an iconic British political leader and also to an Egyptian leader who wanted to be an iconic Arab leader by criticizing the British domination and pursuing an anti-colonial policy.

---

<sup>272</sup> Winston S. Churchill, **Europe Unite Speeches 1947 and 1948 by Winston S. Churchill**, Randolph S. Churchill (ed.), London, Cassell, 1950, p.417.

<sup>273</sup> The European relations and Africa circle were continental requirements and the British Commonwealth and Islam circle were outcomes of communities' belief on the requirement for its civilization and heritage. The Anglo-Saxon partnership and Arab circle were racial identities, zeitgeists of different regions and an indicator of vital worldwide interest of Britain and region wide interest of Egypt, which were the most prominent constituent of both perceptions.

Consequently, Nasser was seeking areas of influence for Egyptian leadership. His foreign policy perception, the Three Circles Theory, was an outcome of this quest. In addition to this struggle for leadership, his theory was also an effort to emphasize the pivotal role of Egypt on regional politics, economy, culture and foreign relations. The Three Circles Theory was not only a set of foreign policy objectives of a revolutionary leader, but also a reconciliation of efforts for all Egyptian identities to be unified into a lofty aim; the Egyptian leadership in all these regions. This motive could explain the inclusion of Islam and Africa circles on this formulation with the preclusion of other Arab states from laying claims on this leadership notion. In this respect, he would also integrate different features of Egyptian identity by putting Arab, Islam and Africa ones into the same set of objectives. These were also subsidiaries for the main priority of this theory, the Egyptian leadership on the Arab nation by promoting the uniqueness of Egypt to combine all of these regions' spirits, and historical or contemporary leadership responsibility. This would bring Egypt and Nasser to the fore in the context of Arab nationalism and Pan-Arabism against other Arab states and leaders. Therefore, the Three Circles theory corresponded to a required constituent; the necessity of motivation to create a common struggle. Nasser emphasized the need for influence and others' support on these claims, either by filling the vacuum of sense of leadership or the role in search of a hero in the field of battle.<sup>274</sup>

Nasserism is a political ideology based on the political thinking and policies of Gamal Abdel Nasser. The most prominent sign of Nasser's dominant in Egypt was this ideological phenomenon. It constituted Arab socialism, the Third World solidarity, anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism that derived from the practices of Egyptian policies during the Nasser era. Since Nasserism was a pragmatic ideology responding to political and economic conditions and developments, as Choueiri stated, Nasser had priority on Egyptian affairs with no particular Pan-Arabism dimension in the early period of revolution.<sup>275</sup>

---

<sup>274</sup> Nasser, **Egypt's Liberation...**, p.87-98.

<sup>275</sup> Youssef M. Choueiri, **Arab Nationalism A History**, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 2000, p.179.

Therefore, this ideology was a summary of policies during the Nasser era, which firstly prioritized Egypt's national security, national prosperity and regional/international leadership notion. In addition, it included anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-Israeli stance on behalf of the championship of the Arabs in Palestine, Arab socialism, republicanism, the neutral stance in foreign policy, Arab nationalism, Pan-Arabism and mainly Egypt's/Nasser's leadership in all "three circles" to reach these vital aims for Egypt.<sup>276</sup> Nasserism also pointed to the transformation of Egypt during the era of Nasser into an active state, by not only through its internal reforms, shaping of Egyptian identity or revolutionary changes in socio-economic relations but also the regional and international foreign relations of country.<sup>277</sup>

In fact, leader-oriented ideologies were in vogue in the Third World, especially the future non-aligned countries, considering the political philosophies of charismatic politicians such as Nehruism, Nkrumahism, Mobutism or Titoism. These were significant brands belonging to the ideologies of iconic leaders. Many of these Third World leader-oriented ideologies possessed a strong anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist component with socialist roots or brought together various nationalist, patriotic or regional sentiments with a non-aligned stance. Arab nationalism, Pan-Arabism and Arab socialism were the core of the ideology in the Egyptian case, on behalf of Egyptian influence and interests. On the other hand, these ideologies, which were identified with the charismatic leader, did not pertain to the Third World. It could found similar charismatic leaders, both in the Eastern bloc and in the Western bloc, and the policies that were identified with their names during the Cold War. Gaullism, Maoism, Khrushchevism were the other examples of leader-oriented ideologies, aside from the Third World.

The components of Nasserism, as summarized by Sela, were struggle for national liberation from Western domination, building a strong army, modernized

---

<sup>276</sup> For the political and social aspects of Nasserism and its stance on foreign policy, culture and socio-economic position of Egypt, see also: Elie Podeh, Onn Winckler (eds.), **Rethinking Nasserism Revolution and Historical Memory in Modern Egypt**, Gainesville, University Press of Florida, 2004.

<sup>277</sup> Karawan, *op.cit.*, p.156-157.

and independent state, promoting Arab national unity and becoming a leading figure for the support of national liberations and decolonization.<sup>278</sup> If nationalism was not just considered as an idea, but an impetus for definition of identity, social and economic changes in the Arab world and a vital determinant on political choices; Nasserism would have become a set of apparatus for being a political force, promoting its components in politics, intensifying the socio-cultural relations in inter-Arab relations and re-establishing the economic relations and role of the state.

On the other hand, Nasserism was the main outcome of Nasser's populist and charismatic leadership. Besides, it served as an ideological background of this period in identification with him. Tibi stated that with the rise of Nasserism after the struggle for Arab unity of two houses, the Muhammad Ali's and the Saud's, the regional system assumed a populist character, and that unification efforts marked the transformation of Pan-Arabism from royalism to populism.<sup>279</sup> This populist character was the premier feature of this set of objectives along with military-based, authoritarian, plebeian and secular ones. Moreover, as Lacouture also pointed out:

His power was developing a style, but it had no doctrine... Nasserism was as yet only Nasser's power. Its essence can be summarized briefly: the army, being at least corrupt and most reform-minded organization, should furnish the new regime's elite; democracy does not require representative government but involves a concerted governmental effort to improve the people's existence; power was once the domain of the rich, and therefore the transformation of Egyptian society must entail the divorce of authority from wealth. This is perhaps the strongest argument in favour of Egypt's land reform, which does not enrich the peasant so much as it destroys feudal landholding.<sup>280</sup>

---

<sup>278</sup> Avraham Sela, " 'Abd al-Nasser's Regional Politics A Reassessment'", Podedh and Winckler (eds.), **op.cit.**, p.181-182.

<sup>279</sup> Bassam Tibi, **Arab Nationalism: Between Islam and the Nation State**, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1997, p.203.

<sup>280</sup> Jean Lacouture, **The Demigods: Charismatic Leadership in the Third World**, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1970, p.102-103.



Every success or reformist attitude was a gain for Nasserism and his charisma, which turned into a beacon for the Arab Middle East in the name of Arab nationalism, and Nasser was named as “Saladin of the Arab nationalism”.<sup>281</sup> His choices dominated the policy-making process of Egypt, also shaping the ideology itself.<sup>282</sup> This can be illustrated by Egypt’s attendance at the Bandung Conference like a tub-thumper and Nasser’s embracement in the conference and later on the Non-Aligned Movement. Thus, Nasserism was a collective outcome of his charisma and political choices, just as being a tool for reproducing the symbolic leadership and charisma of Nasser, even today.

Consequently, after the death of Nasser and erode his charisma, other Arab states and politicians, besides Nasserist parties, which split into a number of factions, attempted to fill the vacuum of charismatic leadership.<sup>283</sup> In conclusion, the determinants of Egyptian foreign policy were presented by emphasizing the set of objectives, the Three Circles Theory and the ideology of the decision-maker. It provided a way to understand the relation between Nasser’s powerful leadership and foreign policy choices in Egypt. These choices both strengthened the leader’s determination with his guideline, and shaped the period of Egypt in a Nasserite way. The impact of Nasser on Egyptian politics made Egypt the most prominent country in the Middle East affairs, as well as making Nasser an international statesman, a hero of Arab nationalism, a champion of Arab cause in Palestine and a “beloved of millions”.<sup>284</sup>

---

<sup>281</sup> Emile Bustani, “The Arab World and Britain”, **International Affairs**, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Oct., 1959), p.432.

<sup>282</sup> For the evaluation of Nasser’s anti-Western propaganda and the Egyptian politics in bipolar world of Cold War, see also; Range, **op.cit.**, p.1014-1015.

<sup>283</sup> Choueiri, **Arab Nationalism...**, p.205.

<sup>284</sup> Abdel Halim Hafez sang this song for the first Revolution Day celebration after the formation of the United Arab Republic in July 1958.

“Oh Gamal! Beloved of millions – Oh Gamal!  
We are marching in your footsteps, – marching – Oh Gamal!  
We’re rising toward the light – we are advancing toward the good.  
We are with you, beloved of millions! We are the millions!”  
[Ya Gamal! Ya habibi al-malayeen! (Oh Gamal! Beloved of Millions!)]

#### 3.2.4. Egypt's Foreign Relations after the Revolution

The new regime of the Free Officers prioritized domestic politics, internal reforms and consolidation of power during its first months. The main concerns of the Free Officers Movement were primarily about domestic issues rather than foreign policy. Regarding this, the new Egyptian regime had a foreign policy agenda which was closely connected with domestic political expectations or objectives such as the evacuation of British troops from the Egyptian soil, compromised on the future of Anglo-Egyptian Sudan or constituted a potent regional foreign policy after the disastrous 1948 defeat. Moreover, the RCC and then Nasser adopted pragmatic responses in foreign policy by considering balance of power and conjuncture of the Cold War to reach legitimacy for the new regime and potent regional foreign policy. Nasser's Three Circles Theory and neutralist stance in foreign policy were adopted during his leadership. However, this pragmatic understanding in foreign policy affected Egypt's neutralist stance. It was named as pro-Western neutralism, positive neutralism, independent neutralism and pro-Soviet neutralism in the Middle East. It would also point to the period of consolidation of power and first years of Nasser's leadership.

When the Free Officers Movement seized control in Egypt, they had three main issues in their foreign policy agenda that were all connected to Egypt's domestic policy and the consolidation of power process. First one was the recognition of other countries, especially the hegemon powers during the conjuncture of the Cold War and also Britain in the Egyptian example. The legitimacy and recognition from other states were the most essential desideratum for all coup d'état governments to legitimize their rule outwards and strengthened their authority over the state and society to implement their objectives, and carry out reforms inwards without any foreign criticism or intervention.

The second one was providing required means for an ascendant regional foreign policy that would transform into a struggle for regional leadership after Nasser secured his control over the new regime. That could be possible with economic and military aid for the improvement of Egyptian economy and army to strengthen the new regime's position in the eyes of Egyptians and Arab nation against Israel and other rival Arab regimes. Last but not least, the Anglo-Egyptian relation was the third one of these foreign policy priorities with regard to the Sudan dispute and primarily the evacuation of the British troops from Egypt. These factors would shape Egyptian foreign policy vis-à-vis the need for legitimacy, resolving issues in Anglo-Egyptian relations and neutrality in foreign policy and cooperation for foreign aids during this consolidation period.

The Free Officers regime could have patriotic or nationalist objectives during the first months of the coup d'état but the constitution of a comprehensive regional foreign policy lasted for more than a year. During the first 18 months of the coup d'état, the revolutionary regime adopted a pro-Western neutralism.<sup>285</sup> Jankowski defined Egypt's independent neutralist stance as based on the formal declaration of neutrality, efforts to persuade other Arab states to follow the same line, and an attempt to strengthen Egyptian ties with Asian-African states.<sup>286</sup> After Nasser secured his leadership, foreign policy came to be dominated by Nasser as a result of centralized and personalized foreign policy making process.<sup>287</sup>

---

<sup>285</sup> Rami Ginat and Meir Noema, "The Egyptian Jewel in the British Imperialist Crown An Overview (1882-1956)", Zach Levey and Elie Podeh (eds.), **Britain and the Middle East: From Imperial Power to Junior Partner**, Portland, Sussex Academic Press, 2008, p.193.

<sup>286</sup> Jankowski, "'Nasserism' and Egyptian State Policy, 1952-1958", Jankowski and Gershoni (eds.), **Redefining Nationalism...**, p.158.

<sup>287</sup> Ali E. Hillal Dessouki, "Regional Leadership: Balancing off Costs and Dividends in the Foreign Policy of Egypt", Bahgat Korany and Ali E. Hillal Dessouki, **The Foreign Policies of Arab States: The Challenge of Globalization**, Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2008, p.182.

### 3.2.4.1 Egypt-Soviet Union Relations

The Soviet Union interpreted the July Revolution as a Western plot and did not change its critical stance until the resignation of Prime Minister Ali Maher, who was named as another pro-Western politician in Egypt. Moreover, the Soviet Union also criticized decisions of the RCC on the Kafr al-Dawar incident and the suppression of the communist movements during the consolidation period.<sup>288</sup> Nasser would continue to emphasize his anti-communist principle and practices such as arresting the communists and putting them on trial, even after he was invited to Moscow in August 1955.<sup>289</sup> During this period, the Egyptian-Soviet relations had ups and downs based on the Egypt's relation with the West. When Egypt pursued a compromising stance towards the West, the Soviet Union raised unpleasant reactions; or when the Egyptian government had a dispute with Western countries over some critical issues, Soviet attitude turned into a friendly mood for a while.<sup>290</sup>

The Soviet-Egyptian approach had already been promoted by Nasser's search for independent neutralist stance in foreign policy after the reconciliation with Britain. However, the Soviet Union did not change its critical stance against the new Egyptian regime until it adopted a new discourse in its Soviet foreign policy. The Soviet Union also took account of the negative impact of Egyptian-West talks on arms and credit deal and Egyptian opposition to the pro-West military organization. Egypt was seeking a loan from the West for Aswan High Dam and demanding an Egyptian-American arms deal, both of which were at a dead end and would be substituted by the Egyptian-Czech arms deal and Soviet funding on dam construction.<sup>291</sup> In addition, the change in Soviet Union's foreign policy through the adoption of peaceful coexistence theory would contribute to the gradual Egyptian-Soviet rapprochement. Nasser's neutralist stance, which would lead to Egypt's

---

<sup>288</sup> Rami Ginat, **The Soviet Union and Egypt 1945-1955**, Portland, Frank Cass, 1993, p.156-158.

<sup>289</sup> Walter Laqueur, **The Soviet Union and the Middle East**, New York, Praeger, 1959, p.219-220.

<sup>290</sup> Walter Laqueur, **The Soviet Union and...**, p.195.

<sup>291</sup> Daly, **op.cit.**, p.339.

participation in the Asian-African Conference, encouraged his policy to have a better relation with the Soviet Union. On the other side, the new Soviet policy was in accordance with Egypt's neutralist perception in the regional affair. Besides, the Soviet Union had no colonial background in the region, and the Soviet leaders intended to have closer political collaboration with them, which was eventually followed by an ideological rapprochement.<sup>292</sup>

Laqueur defined this new course in Egyptian foreign policy as based on not coming out in favour of one camp or the other, but showing willingness to collaborate with everybody.<sup>293</sup> Yet, the neutralist stance was turning into a counterbalance of the Western influence in the region, promoting the Soviet-Egyptian relations. For example, Nasser did not interpret the Egyptian-Czech arm deal as an indication of Soviet hegemony in the region. On the contrary, the only intention of this agreement was to put an end to foreign domination, just as, he was seeking to free Egypt from the restriction of Western arms monopoly in order to be free to use these arms as his will. Change in the Soviet Union's policy in the Cold War towards peaceful coexistence coincided with the time when Egypt harshly opposed Western defence organization in the Middle East, which changed focus of these efforts on the "Northern Tier" for the creation of the Middle East regional pact. It was a common ground for both sides to oppose the formation of a pro-Western regional defence organization. Their criticism on the Baghdad Pact might have different motivations and different perceptions on the future of the Middle East, yet their common rival brought them together.

---

<sup>292</sup> Walter Laqueur, **The Struggle for the Middle East**, London, The Macmillan Company, 1969, p.63.

<sup>293</sup> Walter Laqueur, **The Soviet Union and...**, p.220.

### 3.2.4.2. Egypt-US Relations

After the Atlantic Charter was released to public in 1941, the mantle of leadership gradually passed on British shoulders to Americans'. While the USSR and the US were filling the vacuum created by the British and French decline in the Middle East; the transition from remnants mandate rule to the American containment was witnessed in the Middle East during Truman's and Eisenhower's presidency.<sup>294</sup> It is pointed out that the Suez Crisis was the decisive end of British era in the Middle East and the beginning of the American one.<sup>295</sup> This transition had already started ever since Roosevelt adopted an anti-colonialist policy by setting an example with Philippine's independence in the wake of the Second World War. The US government wanted to see the same transition in the Middle East. Therefore, the US welcomed the Free Officers coup d'état as a regional opposition to continued British and French influence.<sup>296</sup> During the Free Officers' pro-Western neutralism period, the U.S. government encouraged these young, progressive, and forward-looking officers in Egypt to pursue a reformist period in their country. Likewise, some scholars interpreted the Egyptian Revolution in the Middle East as significant as the French Revolution in Europe; or compared Nasser with Napoleon after his death vis-à-vis the embodiment and personification of his country.<sup>297</sup> Yet, the Egyptian Revolution of 1952 triggered the radicalization of anti-colonialist and anti-West ideas within the Arab Middle East.<sup>298</sup> Thus, these praising analogies gave way to pejorative ones in the Western countries, including comments of a French

---

<sup>294</sup> Elie Kedourie, "The Transition from a British to an American Era in the Middle East", Haim Shaked and Itamar Rabinovich (eds.), **The Middle East and the United States Perceptions and Policies**, New Jersey, Transaction Books, 1980, p.3-9.

<sup>295</sup> Martin Woollacott, **After Suez: Adrift in the American Century**, New York, I.B. Tauris, 2006, p.18.

<sup>296</sup> Barry Rubin, **The Tragedy of the Middle East**, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2002, p.228.

<sup>297</sup> John Marlowe, **Arab Nationalism and British Imperialism: A Study in Power Politics**, London, Crescent Press, 1961, p.119-121.

<sup>298</sup> Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye'nin Arap Orta...**, p.50.

strategist and French Ministry of Defence, who regarded Nasser's the Philosophy of Revolution as a revised edition of Hitler's Mein Kampf along with his rising influence over the Maghreb.<sup>299</sup>

The 1952 Revolution appeared as a neutral movement to West in its early years with its moderate decisions, such as sending King Farouk to exile instead of giving him a death sentence or revolutionary officers' sending word to inform the US Embassy in Cairo.<sup>300</sup> It is clear that, the US was much quicker in cultivating and reinsuring with the new military regime than the British, even though Britain was among the oldest mandatory powers in the Middle East and had influence on Egyptian politics more than any other country.<sup>301</sup> Moreover, the 1952 coup d'état was evaluated by the US Ambassador to Egypt, Jefferson Caffery as a shield against the spread of communism.<sup>302</sup> As long as the Free Officers constituted a strong leadership, the new Egyptian regime could provide authority and stability in Egypt, avoiding any communist takeover during this turmoil.<sup>303</sup>

In another respect, Western countries welcomed Egyptian regime's reasonable transition when they considered these mass movements in Egypt. They had already started to chant in favour of a treaty of cooperation with the USSR alongside with anti-British and anti-American slogans as well, after the abrogation of 1936 Treaty signed by the ancient regime.<sup>304</sup> Thus, the US government appeared

---

<sup>299</sup> Owendale, **op.cit.**, p.149.

<sup>300</sup> Muhammed Hasaneyn Heykel, **Kahire Dosyası**, Ankara, Bilgi Yayınevi, 1974, p.14.

<sup>301</sup> Simon C. Smith, **Ending Empire in the Middle East Britain, the United States and post-War Decolonization 1945-1973**, New York, Routledge, 2012, p.21.

<sup>302</sup> This Western concern on spread of communism in Egypt was reflected in the British press, too. It was even presented with a presumptive Soviet desire to arise another Korean War in the Middle East. A very first argument on these concerns based on Neguib was supported by both the Muslim Brotherhood and the Soviets and he was an ostensible leader of revolution. "Make no mistake...", **Empire News**, 12 October 1952.

<sup>303</sup> Dikerdem, **op.cit.**, p.56.

<sup>304</sup> Ismael, **op.cit.**, p.424.

Britain, which was already losing its influence and benefits in Egypt.<sup>305</sup> Even the US Ambassador Caffery trusted these revolutionary officers and mentioned them as “My Boys” to his colleagues among corps diplomatique.<sup>306</sup> In return for his reliance, Neguib described him as “one of the few foreign diplomats whom we believed we could trust”.<sup>307</sup> Even before the coup d’état till the beginning of 1953, American officials tried to stabilize Egypt and the Middle East by establishing a defense organization in Egypt, supporting a resolution of Anglo-Egyptian disputes, and curbing the growth of Egyptian nationalism.<sup>308</sup> However, the Free Officers expected more from the U.S. government, besides its recognition of new regime and support on Anglo-Egyptian reconciliation in the short term, but they also wanted the US to supply Egypt with military and economic aids in the long run.

Although two parties got off to a good start in bilateral relations, they had different expectations from each other. During the first years of the revolution, the primary reason for establishing good relations with the US was not replacing British ties with American ties but looking for an American mediation between Egypt and Britain on evacuation. Egypt desired to break free of all these dependencies and terminate foreign military presence especially after British evacuation along with the 1954 Agreement while seeking economic and military aids from the West. Although Egypt’s demands related to arms and economic aid were not provided since Egypt was not a member of regional organization under Western leadership; the Secretary of State Acheson asserted that Egypt was an active friend of the US and a food aid programme to Egypt was an important support for internal stability of Egypt, which lasted from 1954 to 1966.<sup>309</sup> However, the US was trying to reinforce military bonds between Egypt and the Western bloc, while Britain continued its efforts on Egypt for

---

<sup>305</sup> Dikerdem, *op.cit.*, p.61.

<sup>306</sup> Dikerdem, *op.cit.*, p.98.

<sup>307</sup> Smith, S.C., *op.cit.*, p.21.

<sup>308</sup> Peter L. Hahn, **United States, Great Britain, and Egypt, 1945-1956: Strategy And Diplomacy In The Early Cold War**, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2004, p.153.

<sup>309</sup> Daly, *op.cit.*, p.354-355.



its inclusion into a pro-West regional defence pact. This was the main contradiction in the perspectives both sides on Egyptian-West relations.

There was some divergence between Britain's and US' attitude towards Egyptian demand for military and economic aid. While Britain emphasized the importance of economic aid to this new regime, US State Department and Secretary of State Acheson were convinced that military aid would stabilize Neguib's government, provide an incentive for settling the Suez Canal zone dispute, and would encourage Egypt to participate in MEDO.<sup>310</sup> Egypt's expectation from the American side on Anglo-Egyptian negotiation resulted with American efforts to settle these disputes between two sides by these means.

Besides, there was a transition from the British aspect on Middle East defence organization to the American one after failed Britain-led initiatives on MEC and MEDO. These efforts caused Egyptian opposition to such pro-West military alliances in the region, before and after the coup d'état, and would be the basis of Nasser's critics on the establishment of the Baghdad Pact.<sup>311</sup> Even if the American aspect on regional pact still regarded Egypt's strategic position in the Middle East; the US-led efforts would primarily prioritize the Northern Tier, which referred to the closest countries to the Soviet Union in the Middle East to build a regional defence pact.<sup>312</sup> The linchpin role of Egypt was starting to change within the Middle East defence proposals of Eisenhower administration.

The four powers, Great Britain, France, Turkey and the US, had plans for defence organization (with possible inclusion of Saudi Arabia) in the Middle East; however it would nevertheless proceed in the case of continual insistence on Egyptian participation. The main determinants of this decision were Egypt's continual rejections before and after the revolution, and secondly the comprehensive tour of the US Secretary of State Dulles in the Middle East countries in March 1953.

---

<sup>310</sup> Smith, S.C., **op.cit.**, p.22.

<sup>311</sup> "Mısır, bir Orta Doğu paktına girmeyecek", **Milliyet**, 1 March 1953.

<sup>312</sup> Behçet Kemal Yeşilbursa, **The Baghdad Pact Anglo-American Defence Policies in the Middle East, 1950-1959**, London, Frank Cass, 2005, p.9-24.

The importance of Dulles in foreign policy making in Eisenhower administrations was considered even more than the President himself except the time of crisis, and his interpretations would be a decisive factor on the US foreign policy directions.<sup>313</sup> He drew the conclusion about Egypt after his tour as “we must abandon our preconceived ideas of making Egypt the key country in building the foundations for a military defense of the Middle East.”<sup>314</sup>

Thereby, his tour shifted the US stance towards the Northern Tier, the southern border of the Soviets, decisively due to Egypt’s persistent refusal to cooperate with the West.<sup>315</sup> This contradiction on the future of Egyptian-West military relation conduced to criticism on Egyptian stance with respect to its relation with the West. Egypt’s opposition to the expansion of containment policy, as part of Pactomania during Eisenhower presidential terms, was regarded as a divergence between Western projection and Nasser’s objectives in the Middle East. Moreover, these critics on Nasser’s stance gave way to criticism over Egypt for turning into a pro-Soviet state.

#### 3.2.4.3. Anglo-Egyptian Relations

After the Free Officers took control in Egypt, the relation between Egypt and UK was in a tug of war, which reached a peak and eventually turned into an armed conflict with the Suez Crisis in 1956. The Anglo-Egyptian relation were among the main preoccupations of the new regime vis-à-vis both domestic and foreign policy of Egypt. This concern was initially based on the threat of British military intervention to the Free Officers coup, and also regional pact efforts, future of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and negotiations over the 1954 Agreement for the

---

<sup>313</sup> Salim Yaqub, **Containing Arab Nationalism The Eisenhower Doctrine and the Middle East**, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 2004, p.28.

<sup>314</sup> Smith, S.C., **op.cit.**, p.37.

<sup>315</sup> Podeh, **The Quest for Hegemony...**, p.34.

evacuation of British troops from the Suez Canal. To start with, the primary concern of the Free Officers was the potential intervention of British forces against their coup d'état on behalf of King Farouk or the old regime, as the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of Alliance of 1936 was still in effect at the time. Based on the provisions of the treaty, Britain could decide a military intervention against coup d'état with its stationed forces in the Suez Canal zone. In fact, any British intervention to the Egyptian coup compelled British forces to clash against the Egyptian revolutionary group and also would reoccupy Egypt on several counts along with a war weary British public and army. It could be a contradiction to the decolonization process after the Second World War while Britain was also under financial pressure on the maintenance of a huge military presence in the Suez Canal.

After the Free Officers Movement secured its revolution in the eyes of other countries, the primary foreign policy objectives of the new regime were in relation with domestic politics as well. These issues were closely connected to the Anglo-Egyptian relations based on the evacuation of British troops from the Suez Canal, and the unconditional evacuation of foreign troops from the Nile Valley for the future of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.<sup>316</sup> These objectives were not just related to the young officers' objectives. Since, for example, former Prime Minister before the coup d'état Hussein Sirri Pasha counted the same objectives. His government objectives were Anglo-Egyptian negotiation, evacuation of British troops from Suez and unification of Egypt and the Sudan under the crown of King Farouk, which were the primary issues of his government program.

The Anglo-Egyptian rule over the Sudan lasted for more than a half-century and the Anglo-Egyptian Condominium, was established in 1899 in name only, while Britain ruled the Sudan as a British dependency.<sup>317</sup> The glorified Pharaonic past and

---

<sup>316</sup> Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt...**, p.41. At the same time, these issues were interrelated with each other by Egyptian demand for the British recognition of Egypt's claim of sovereignty over the Sudan as a precondition to discuss the Canal base, since the unilateral abrogation of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936, in 1951. Gordon, **op.cit.**, p.158.

<sup>317</sup> Jacob Coleman Hurewitz, **Middle East Politics: The Military Dimension**, Colorado, Westview Press, 1982, p.164.

the importance of the Nile Valley would lead to the “Unity of the Nile Valley” slogan which fit well with pharaonism and had no Arab or Islamic reference, across the Egyptian political spectrum in the 1940s and 1950s, as mentioned in the previous chapter.<sup>318</sup> Reid emphasized this appeal as Egyptians feared Britain’s intentions for the Sudan with its vital Nile waters, moreover they were motivated by not Arabic or Islamic appeal but pharaonism.<sup>319</sup> It was a continual hope for Egyptians since the King Farouk worked for the unification of two countries. Even the usage of “the” definite article before the name of Sudan designated a territory or an area that belongs to Egypt, rather than a separate country. However, Britain had already rejected Egypt’s demand for changing the Sudan’s status and recognition of Egyptian claims over the Sudan in 1946. Britain legitimized its rejection on the grounds that Sudanese had to be consulted through constitutional channels and that they should decide their political future for themselves but not before a stable and disinterested government was maintained.<sup>320</sup>

The new Egyptian regime regarded the impasse over the Sudan as a primary issue in its foreign relations, making it recognized as Egyptian sovereignty over the Sudan by the hand of the British government. The importance of the Sudan affairs in Egyptian political agenda could be exemplified with the appointment of Salah Salim, a major figure in the RCC, as Minister of National Guidance and Minister of State for Sudan Affairs. The Egyptian side considered the integration and unification of Egypt with the Sudan, as a domestic issue that aimed the unity of the Nile valley.<sup>321</sup> Therefore, the Anglo-Egyptian dispute over the future of Sudan was reconciled with an agreement in February 1953 on a self-government statute for the

---

<sup>318</sup> Donald M. Reid, “Nationalizing the Pharaonic Past: Egypt 1922-1952”, Jankowski and Gershoni, **Rethinking Nationalism....**, p.144.

<sup>319</sup> **Ibid.** p.145.

<sup>320</sup> Smith S.C., **op.cit.**, p.13. J.A. Hail, **Britain's Foreign Policy in Egypt and Sudan, 1947-1956**, Reading, Ithaca Press, 1996, p.28.

<sup>321</sup> Adeed Dawisha, **op.cit.**, p.138. See also: Sir Harold MacMichael, “Egyptian-Sudanese Relations”, **Middle Eastern Affairs**, Vol. X, No.3, (March 1959), pp.102-108.

Sudan and assurance of independence within three years.<sup>322</sup> This reconciliation fit well with the insisted British reservation in 1946 for changing the Sudan's status through self-determination. The Free Officers also agreed to these terms in order to reach an agreement for the future of Sudan. Another aspect of this process was the abolition of Egyptian monarchy. The Anglo-Egyptian Condominium Agreements in 1899 and then the Egyptian monarch who was titled as the King of Egypt and the Sudan were two main legitimate reference of Egyptian claims over the Sudan besides nationalist objectives of the Free Officers or geographical, historical, cultural connections between Egypt and the Sudan.

Therefore, the Egyptian monarchy was abolished almost a year later after the coup d'état since during this period, the Egyptian monarch was still focused on strengthening and forming the basis for Egypt's sovereignty claims on the Sudan. Besides the revolutionary officers' other considerations about the Palace like keeping a moderate attitude over the Egyptian monarch on the eyes of other countries or the gradual consolidation of power in domestic politics, they had to consider keeping the Sudanese-Egyptian connection over the Egyptian monarchy; even though it was represented by the Regency for the King Fuad II. Therefore, the existence of "King of Egypt and the Sudan" was a supportive factor in negotiations over the future of Sudan and Egyptian sovereignty claims against the British government until they were compromised. After Britain and Egypt accorded a treaty for the Sudan impasse, the Egyptian monarch was no longer a functional institution on the subject of the Sudan. To sum up, the Sudan negotiations and sovereignty claim of the Egyptian monarch over the Sudan were among the factors that sustained 11-month long rule of King Fuad II.

The Free Officers hoped that the intended Sudanese referendum would be result in favour of unification with Egypt, but Sudanese rejected to unite with Egypt, and chose independent Sudan by landslide. Lacouture summarized this break between the two countries under five reasons: the British policy for hastening this

---

<sup>322</sup> Hurewitz, *op.cit.*, p.165. Robert McNamara, **Britain, Nasser and the Balance of Power in the Middle East 1952-1967 From the Egyptian Revolution to the Six Day War**, London, Frank Cass, 2003, p.31-36.

divorce, dismissal of General Neguib who was born in Khartoum and regarded as one of their own among Egyptian revolutionaries by Sudanese, the failure of Salah Salem who was the Egyptian Minister of State and his interference to the Sudan internal Affairs, unending dispute over sharing the Nile Waters especially about the Aswan Dam, and finally the underlying desire for the independence of the Sudan, which depended on London or Cairo.<sup>323</sup>

The second important issue in Anglo-Egyptian relations was the evacuation of British military presence in Egypt and the Suez Canal base. As it was proved during the Second World War II, the Suez Canal base was the most important asset of Britain as the largest military base in the world at the time. It was an emblem of the British Empire especially after the independence of the British Raj and a jugular vein of the British Empire for the continual supply of oil and international trade. However after the Second World War, British presence was no longer welcome after 70 years of occupation and became a target of nationalist sentiments. After his visits to the Middle East countries in 1953, the US Secretary of State Dulles also stated that “the maintenance of British troops in the region was ‘more a factor of instability than stability... The days when the Middle East used to relax under the presence of British protection are gone.’”<sup>324</sup>

Even before the Free Officers Movement seized power, the Egyptian government had abrogated the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 on October 8, 1951 but British and American governments considered this decision as null and void. Therefore, the presence of British troops in the Suez Canal zone became problematic along with the unilateral abrogation of the Treaty. As a matter of fact, Egyptians had already formally requested talks between Egypt and Britain on the revision of the

---

<sup>323</sup> Jean Lacouture and Simone Lacouture, **Egypt in Transition**, London, Methuen & Co, 1958, p.201-202. Glen Balfour-Paul, **The End of Empire in the Middle East: Britain' relinquishment of power in her last three Arab dependencies**, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1994, p.36-47.

<sup>324</sup> Smith, S.C., **op.cit.**, p.37.

1936 Treaty and evacuation of the British forces from the Suez Canal on 20 December 1945.<sup>325</sup>

On the other hand, Britain was ready to exchange the abrogation of the treaty with the Egyptian acceptance of Four Powers (Britain, the U.S., Turkey and France) proposal calling for the establishment of the MEC, and resolve the British presence in the Canal Zone by mutual understanding.<sup>326</sup> Egypt rejected all these proposals, before and after the coup d'état, for its inclusion into a pro-Western regional defence organization. The Free Officers Movement and then the RCC considered the British presence in the Egyptian soil as their main preoccupation and prime concern on their way to reach complete independence.<sup>327</sup> The rejection of these proposals and Nasser's opposition to the Baghdad Pact resulted with Egyptian opposition and denouncement of any military alliance or cooperation with the West after Nasser concluded negotiations with Britain on the Sudan and the evacuation.<sup>328</sup> Smith suggested that the Evacuation Agreement also aroused a general desire among younger Arab generation to break military bonds with the Western countries, while they were trying to reinforce such links.<sup>329</sup> Therefore, the Anglo-Egyptian compromise after the negotiations and the concluded Evacuation Agreement could be considered another strong point for Egypt to resist regional pact proposals.

On the other hand, Britain was also changing its perspective on Egypt, which had been considered as a political strategic base for the Empire and a primary base

---

<sup>325</sup> Simon C. Smith, **Ending Empire in the Middle East Britain, the United states and post-War Decolonization 1945-1973**, New York, Routledge, 2012, p.13.

<sup>326</sup> Ginat and Noema, **op.cit.**, p.192. Before the Free Officers took control, Herbert Morrison, the Deputy Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, had already stated about that interrelation between the Suez Base, the MEC efforts and British policy on Egypt to Dean Acheson, United States Secretary of State as "If the Egyptians agree to participate in the Middle East Command (MEC) well and good and the base will become an Allies base. But if there is no agreement with Egypt we still intend to hold the base so that it may be available for us by the Allies." Smith, Simon C., **op.cit.**, p.16.

<sup>327</sup> Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt...**, p.45.

<sup>328</sup> Ginat and Noema, **op.cit.**, p.193.

<sup>329</sup> Smith, C.D., **op.cit.**, p.162.

in the Middle East for British interests until the World War II.<sup>330</sup> Therefore the Anglo-Egyptian relations depended on reconciliation over the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty, which would be a framework of bilateral relations in this new period. It would mostly satisfy Egypt's demands about the evacuation of the British presence over Egyptian soil. The Egyptian demand for the British recognition of Egypt's claim of sovereignty over the Sudan was a precondition to discuss the Suez Canal base, since the unilateral abrogation of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936, in 1951.<sup>331</sup> The Free Officers Movement adopted the same attitude in Anglo-Egyptian negotiations. The formal negotiations between Egypt and Britain began on April 1954, after the Anglo-Egyptian Agreement of February 1953 regarding the Sudan's clearing the way for direct negotiations between two countries over the evacuation issue.<sup>332</sup> In spring 1953, the US Secretary of State Dulles already emphasized the interrelation with military aid to Egyptian regime and the management of this strategic base after the British evacuation:

The heart of the trouble is not so much the presence of British troops, for both sides agreed that they should be withdrawn, but the subsequent authority over and management of this gigantic base... Experienced administrative and technical personnel are needed to keep the base in operating efficiency and the provision of this personnel causes difficulty. The matter has an importance which goes beyond Egypt, for the base serves all Near Eastern and indeed Western security.<sup>333</sup>

The gradual evacuation of British troops and the efficient operation of the Suez Canal for the security of the Western alliance were the main issues in Anglo-Egyptian negotiations over the Suez Canal. The political crisis in Egypt on February-March 1954 promoted Egypt's compromising attitude in searching for an evacuation agreement as Nasser urgently needed to secure his position within the

---

<sup>330</sup> Ginat and Noema, **op.cit.**, p.194.

<sup>331</sup> Gordon, **op.cit.**, p.158.

<sup>332</sup> Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt...**, p.45-46.

<sup>333</sup> Hurewitz, **op.cit.**, p.87.



RCC and in domestic politics against other political groups and President Neguib. The Evacuation Agreement was signed between Egypt and Great Britain on October 19, 1954.<sup>334</sup>

Britain secured a safeguard of the Western position in the Middle East by reaching an agreement. The Evacuation Agreement regulated gradual evacuation of British troops; and issues such as keeping military facilities in the Suez Canal zone in order; permitting to maintain vital installations by British technicians, respecting the terms of the 1888 Constantinople Convention and above all, British right to re-entry to the Suez Canal base in the case of a military crisis in the region such as an attack against Turkey or any Arab state by outside powers for a seven-year period.<sup>335</sup> The US Ambassador Caffery summarized Nasser's significance in reaching an agreement between Egypt and Great Britain as "Nasser is the only man in Egypt with strength enough and guts enough to put over an agreement with the British."<sup>336</sup>

Thus, while Nasser reached an agreement with Britain on toilsome issues like evacuation and some regulations, he also secured his position in Egyptian politics and brought prestige, which made him an "evacuation hero". On the other hand, the interrelation of Egyptian domestic policy and foreign policy during the consolidation period reappeared both in Nasser's domestic struggle and in the Anglo-Egyptian relations during its most delicate time. By reaching an agreement with Great Britain; the RCC regained public confidence and Nasser consolidated his position and maintained his leadership by stabilizing Egypt's internal situation and foreign relation after the dispute with Neguib.

---

<sup>334</sup> Selak Jr., Charles B., "The Suez Canal Base Agreement of 1954 Its Background and Implications", *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol.49, No.4, October 1955, p.487-505.

<sup>335</sup> Gordon, *op.cit.*, p.171.

<sup>336</sup> *Idem.*

#### 3.2.4.4. Egyptian-Israeli Contact

The last example on the foreign policy of revolutionary regime was Egyptian-Israeli negotiations during this consolidation period. The dialogue with the “negotiable” Israel was a clear example of the Free Officers’ priority, avoiding any quarrel with other countries and focusing on internal issues, reforms and consolidation of power. One of the first reactions from Israel to the Free Officers coup d’état came from Israel’s Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion in his Knesset speech on 18 August. He commented on the Free Officers’ takeover in Egypt and congratulated the movement and expressing his hope of a new beginning in bilateral relations.<sup>337</sup> He underlined that, there were no grounds for any quarrel between two countries which was in parallel with the Free Officers’s decision to avoid quarrels with other countries in the first months of the new regime.

Nasser played a double game in Egyptian-Israeli relations during this consolidation of power period. While some messages of goodwill were conveyed by Egyptian diplomats, Egypt’s position on Arab-Israeli conflict did not change on international grounds, as Egyptian representative in the UN General Assembly continued to criticize Israel. Shlaim interpreted that Egypt’s stance was an effort to show Egypt’s new regime as a negotiable and moderate one while avoiding any concrete steps toward a settlement with Israel.<sup>338</sup> Furthermore, the Egyptian-Israeli negotiations had another significance in the minds of the new regime to reach hegemon powers and especially, the U.S., by avoiding any hostile attitude to enable Egypt to obtain arms and economic aid.

Although the new regime had good intentions and kept in touch with Israel, the Egyptian-Israeli frontier was relatively silent during the time Nasser consolidated his power, the RCC conducted important reforms and solved primer issues in foreign policy agenda. When Nasser took full control of the new regime

---

<sup>337</sup> Shlaim, *op.cit.*, p.77.

<sup>338</sup> *Ibid.*, p.78.

and oppressed other political groups, the need of Egyptian-Israeli negotiations was tied only to Nasser's expectation of arms and economic aid from the Western countries. However, the established sub rosa dialogue between Egypt and Israel lasted until the Operation Black Arrow, known as the Gaza raid on February 28, 1955.<sup>339</sup> Even some scholars pointed this operation as a turning point for Nasser's stance on Israel; Nasser had already outlined his plans on Palestine in his book. Nasser also represented his impressions on the field of battle in Palestine and pointed out that the mandate rule in Palestine, Zionist activity and the imperialism were the reasons behind this conflict.<sup>340</sup> In fact, he was referring to the struggle against Israel in Palestine as a target for common struggle on the battlefield, literally and ideologically. On the other side, Nasser was pursuing Arab nationalist policy and advocating the Arab cause in Palestine had to reach all Arab societies. The combination of the rising Arab nationalism, struggle against Israel and radicalization of the anti-colonial struggle laid the foundations of Nasser's era.<sup>341</sup> Moreover, it was a chosen trauma for Egyptians as both a source of threat and motivation for common objectives as the success of Muhammad Ali, exploits of Ibrahim Pasha or Arabi Pasha's revolt were too far in the history but the Palestine drama was too tragic and fresh.<sup>342</sup>

Nevertheless, this incident was a clear turning point for Nasser in taking concrete steps against this aggression and changing his policy radically towards Israel by considering this raid as a grim reminder of Egypt's defeat in 1948 Arab-Israeli War which was the spark for these young officers to take control. Moreover, it was a leading determinant for Nasser to acquire arms for the Egyptian army and

---

<sup>339</sup> For Operation Black Arrow, known as the Gaza raid, see also: Benny Morris, **Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881-2001**, New York, Vintage Books, 2001, p.282-284; Michael B. Oren, **The Origins Of The Second Arab-Israeli War: Egypt, Israel and the Great Powers, 1952-56**, New York, Frank Cass, 1992, p.24-26.

<sup>340</sup> Nasser, **Egypt's Liberation...**, p.94-102.

<sup>341</sup> That was a clear example of an undeveloped country's nationalism formula and intellectuals' and elites' political, economic and cultural endeavours which emerged through anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist bases. Bülent Daver, "Az Gelişmiş Ülkede Siyasi Elit (Seçkinler)", **SBF Dergisi**, V.20, N.1, 1965, p.531.

<sup>342</sup> Lacouture, **op.cit.**, p.95.

counterbalance Egyptian force against Israel, considering Israel's rising militancy.<sup>343</sup> This process was accelerated by the return of Ben-Gurion to the Prime Minister office, who regarded rise of Nasser as a serious potential threat against Israel. The Anglo-American attempts to establish a substantive peace talk between the two sides collapsed just few months before the Suez Crisis and the 1956 Referendum in Egypt.

---

<sup>343</sup> Smith, C.D., *op.cit.*, p.165.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **POST-REVOLUTION RELATIONS BETWEEN TURKEY AND EGYPT: 1952-1956**

This last chapter will focus on Turkish-Egyptian bilateral relations after 1952. It will try to answer the questions on Nasser's impact on Egyptian foreign policy, then on Turkish-Egyptian relations. This period included an important bilateral crisis and clear confrontations in regional/international stage during the Cold War. This last will expand on the Tugay Affair and separate the period from revolution to the crisis (1952-1953) and starting from the crisis until Nasser's presidency (1954-1956). It is important to correct a general misunderstanding that the Free Officers Revolution did not worsen bilateral relations; on the contrary it caused a short-term rapprochement between the two countries. However, Turkish-Egyptian relations were deteriorated by the Tugay Affair and Nasser's instrumentalization of Turkey in regional politics. From this point on, there was a rupture in bilateral relations for almost a year. Turkish-Egyptian relations have to be examined through the regional and international confrontations such as the Baghdad Pact and the Bandung Conference.

#### **4.1 TURKISH-EGYPTIAN BILATERAL RELATIONS: 1952-1956**

##### **4.1.1. Turkey's Response to the July Revolution**

The transfer of power from the ancient regime to revolutionary young officers was an unforeseen development in Egypt. Even prominent countries in two

blocs or countries in the region acted with deliberation and hoped for a mutual understanding with this new regime. However, the internal interpretation of coup d'état differed from these foreign aspects. Before the coup d'état was carried out, King Farouk had already lost his reputation in the eyes of the Egyptians who relied on the nationalist Wafd Party and its leader Nahhas Pasha. Therefore, Egyptian politicians considered army's accession power after a bloodless coup as nothing more than a simple military uprising against the state apparatus. Yet, the unforeseen coup d'état in Egypt caused a wave of excitement, confusion and expectation in the Middle East. NATO allies supported the changes in Egypt and did not criticize the new regime's demands, transition and reactions at the outset. Although Turkey was initially skeptical towards the Free Officers coup d'état, it did not take any critical attitude in line with its allies. Turkey gradually became the voice of the West and NATO in the Middle East after the Second World War and generally did not act without consulting the US and Britain.<sup>344</sup>

The July coup d'état led by the Free Officers Movement did not receive any criticism from Turkey and did not deteriorate the bilateral relations in the first months; on contrary caused a short-term rapprochement between two countries. On the other hand, it primarily had a broad repercussion in the Turkish press. News on coup d'état hit the headlines but the interest of Turkish media was divided between the achievement of these young and lowly enlisted officers and the establishment of new government in the grip of the army. The first news about Egypt included the resignation of day-old government of Ahmad Najib al-Hilali Pasha on behalf of the new government of Ali Mahir Pasha.<sup>345</sup> Some newspapers touched upon General Neguib's decision to assume the presidency of general staff but not seeking a political position in the new government and formation of a new government, which might have included the members of the Muslim Brotherhood or leftist

---

<sup>344</sup> Sedat Laçiner, "The Democratic Foreign Policy Approach (1950-1960)", **USAK Yearbook**, Vol.4, 2011, p.134.

<sup>345</sup> **Cumhuriyet**, "Mısır'da General Necib hükümet darbesi yaptı", 24 July 1952.

movement.<sup>346</sup> After the dust of coup d'état settled, the second consideration of Turkish media was to direct its attention on the abdication of King Farouk, Britain's reactions on these developments and the support of different Egyptian parties on the revolutionaries.<sup>347</sup>

While Turkish newspapers followed these developments, Turkish politicians made no comprehensive comments on Egyptian events. Furthermore, Celal Bayar, the President of Turkey, gave his inaugural speech of Grand National Assembly of Turkey on November 1, 1952 and mentioned only the independence of Libya within scope of events taking place in the Middle East. This speech was a sign for the ongoing suggestion of collective defence efforts in the Middle East, even though the region was shaking with developments in Iran and Egypt. He did not include the Free Officers Revolution in his speech but he touched indirectly upon Egypt through the regional defence of the Middle East:

We strongly affiliate with collective defence system in our foreign policy. Since the last February, we have been a member of the most developed type of that system, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. ... We hope that the Middle Eastern countries, which we have historical bonds of friendship and hopes for them to reach progress with sincerely longed-for true independence and welfare we them, are going to join the mutual assistance and collective defense. ... I am glad to note a milestone in international relations; Libya gained its independence in last year.<sup>348</sup>

The most comprehensive statement in parliament belonged to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Fuad Köprülü, in a budget meeting of the Ministry. He underlined "his comfort and content" for the situation in Egypt; also the collocator of his tributes and goodwill was the Prime Minister General Neguib:

---

<sup>346</sup> **Milliyet**, "Mısır'da dün ordu iktidarı ele aldı", 24 July 1952.; **Akşam**, "Mısır'da hükümet darbesi", 24 July 1952.

<sup>347</sup> **Cumhuriyet**, "Mısır Kralı Faruk tahttan feragat etti" 27 July 1952.; Mümtaz Faik Fenik, "Mısır'daki Darbenin İçyüzü", **Zafer**, 26 July 1952.; **Cumhuriyet**, "İngiltere, Süveyş Kanalı'na yeni kuvvetler yığıyor" 29 July 1952. **Milliyet**, "İngiltere, Mısır'ın iç işlerine müdahalede bulunmayacak", 29 July 1952.

<sup>348</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, IX/4, Vol.17, Ankara, 1 November 1952, p.19.

We were curiously following up the recent developments in our friendly nation Egypt, which we always welcome its moves for progress and growth. We gladly observe the efforts of the Egyptian Prime Minister General Neguib who is astute and strong minded, with the aspiration to realize his country's rightful intentions and to bring welfare to Egyptian nation through peace and stability.<sup>349</sup>

Furthermore, the leader of the Peasant's Party of Turkey, Remzi Oğuz Arık congratulated and wished good luck to the friendly revolutionaries of the neighbour country, hoping them to adhere to democracy and do politics *bona fide* for the nation and common peace.<sup>350</sup> In this respect, the Egyptian Revolution of 1952 was met with wary stance of official authorities at first and then welcomed in a friendly mood. Nevertheless, Turkey underlined its good will, and pursued a friendly mood with Egypt to reach its regional policy based on the need for security and a regional defence organization. Moreover, Turkey's approach on Egyptian revolution was closely connected in regard to interests of its NATO allies, especially the British interests in the Egyptian case. Köprülü also stated this commitment and connection in his speech as:

We are pleased that; our friend and sister country Egypt, and our ally England have already solved one of their problems among themselves and tried to solve the other one with *bona fide* and sobriety. By virtue of this fortunate affair, we hope to get closer to our common purpose for ensuring the security of our region in cooperation with them. Nowadays, all Middle East countries hang by a thread of the same great danger as is known to all.<sup>351</sup>

In conclusion, Turkey's stance on the Egyptian coup d'état was primarily neutral in its first days. As the revolutionaries made eulogistic statements about Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and laudatory evaluations on the Turkish War of Independence, Turkish press turned into a positive climax and compared the Free Officers Movement with to CUP, and Egyptian revolutionaries to Atatürk and his

---

<sup>349</sup> TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, IX/4, Vol.20, Ankara, 23 February 1953, p.828.

<sup>350</sup> TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, IX/4, Vol.20, Ankara, 23 February 1953, p.835.

<sup>351</sup> TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, IX/4, Vol.20, Ankara, 23 February 1953, p.828



comrades.<sup>352</sup> After all, the Turkish media and opposition deputies in the Parliament already welcomed these young officers and this would be an internal part for assuming a positive attitude. After the Western countries, especially NATO members, improved their relations with this new regime, Turkey's moderation was turned a positive attitude. The value of being a NATO member and Turkey-West relations to which Ankara attached a huge importance, were increasingly decisive in Turkish foreign policy, and especially its decisions on issues related to the Middle East were paralleled beyond all questions. Harris indicates that it was the Middle East that formed a major testing ground for the Turkish-American alliance in the first decade of Turkey's NATO membership.<sup>353</sup>

Moreover, the positive attitude towards the revolution was another effort to gain sympathy from the region, considering its enthusiastic and hopeful responds to Arab societies and even Israel. This positive attitude had another purpose of encouraging these revolutionaries to follow the same modernization and progression path as Turkey, so to liken new Egypt to Turkey. Therefore, the revolutionary Egyptian regime would be open to cooperation and more positive than the ancient one with respect to the efforts of Turkey and Western alliance. Thus, the revolutionary officers were met with the possibility of change in Egypt's attitude towards the Middle East defence proposals, as well. To sum up, Turkey's aspect to the Free Officers Revolution was a deliberate attitude that would change into a positive one, in common with domestic sympathy and the attitudes of NATO countries. However, the false deduction in Turkey's stance was due to overlooking the revolutionary mood of these young officers. This would lead up to some minor problems in bilateral relations and in the end, the Tugay Affair which will be examined in the following part.

---

<sup>352</sup> Nadir Nadi, "O'nun İzinde", **Cumhuriyet**, 17 August 1952, p.1-3.; Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, "Bir Benzeyiş", **Ulus**, 7 August 1952, p.1-5.

<sup>353</sup> George S. Harris, "Turkey and the U.S.", in Karpat (ed.), **Turkey's Foreign Policy...**, p.54.

#### 4.1.2. New Egyptian Regime's Stance on Turkey

The members of the Free Officers Movement grew up with anti-colonialist struggles of founding fathers of nations like M. K. Gandhi or M. K. Atatürk. They underlined the anti-colonialist ideals of these struggles and made analogies with theirs against monarchy and remnants of British mandate. Turkey's the reformist period and its limited involvement to Middle East issues were seen as a *Turkish wataniya* and some scholars even called for Egypt's withdrawal from Arab League as well. Therefore, Egypt focused on its internal affairs after the 1948 defeat just in the example of post-World War I experience of Turkey.<sup>354</sup>

This analogy was not limited to Turkey's struggle for true independence and new Egyptian quest; but also between two leaders, Mustafa Kemal and General Neguib. These comparisons, especially between Neguib and Mustafa Kemal were welcomed by the Egyptian side, because it was interpreted as a friendly and hopeful attitude from Turkish press towards Egyptian revolutionaries. Egyptian revolutionary officers and Egyptian press also used same comparison between two leaders in the early stages of the post-revolution era. Even Karpat suggested that the National Struggle and the leadership of Mustafa Kemal were admired by the young generations and even Nasser and Mujibur Rahman acknowledged his leadership as the symbol of "enlightened leadership".<sup>355</sup> However, other foreign comments compared two leaders and societies but the outcomes found a middle ground: It was a promising achievement for Egypt but they had to work very hard to come close to Turkish example. For instance, the very first comments from Newsweek evaluated Egyptian path by comparing Turkey and Egypt in two different articles as:

The outlook has suddenly brightened General Neguib, the new strong man who tossed out King Farouk, is no Kemal Ataturk and the

---

<sup>354</sup> Adeed Dawisha, *op.cit.*, p.132-133.

<sup>355</sup> Karpat, *Turkish Foreign Policy...*, p.111.

Egyptians are no Turks, but has done a lot to clear the air situation under control.<sup>356</sup>

These, working in the Officers Club in Cairo, made an intensive study of military coups in all parts of the world, especially those of Kemal Atatürk in Turkey and of Colonel Adib Shishakli in Syria.<sup>357</sup>

During the first months of the revolution, General Neguib's statement about their negotiation with Britain to a Turkish journalist, Tunç Yalman, was an exemplary comment for making this analogy. Yalman asked, "If Britain refused to evacuate its troops from the Canal Zone, what would you do?" and General Neguib replied "We would do the same thing as you Turks did; rough them up!"<sup>358</sup> General Neguib was praising the achievements of Atatürk as the founder of Republic of Turkey by saying that "I hope, Egyptian army will achieve the same success achievement as the Turkish army."<sup>359</sup> However, these praising comments from the RCC would turn into criticism on Turkish experience along with the end of transition and consolidation period. For example, while the RCC members were drafting new a constitution, various members of the government and the RCC proclaimed Atatürk's statism was a failure, along with denouncing Soviet communism and condemning fascist Germany and Italy.<sup>360</sup>

The evaluation of this positive attitude of revolutionary officers to Turkey could be significant in consideration of three factors. First of all, the main foreign policy objective of Egyptian regime during the first months of the revolution was legitimization of their regime and recognition of their takeover without any foreign criticism or intervention. That could be seen as a pragmatic move for weathering the transition and consolidation storm without any external tension. Turkey became an

---

<sup>356</sup> "Washington Trends", **Newsweek**, 25 August 1952, p.17.

<sup>357</sup> "Key to Middle East Future: What Happens Next in Egypt", **Newsweek**, 25 August 1952, p.36-37.

<sup>358</sup> Dikerdem, **op.cit.**, p.66-67.

<sup>359</sup> **Cumhuriyet**, 11 August 1952.

<sup>360</sup> Gordon, **op.cit.**, p.147.

important piece of this quest, thinking over both the West and the Middle East pillars of this consideration. It was important to have good relations with Turkey, both a NATO member and a prominent Middle East country, by using sympathetic statements towards it. Secondly, the pragmatic usage of comparison between the Turkish example and new Egyptian ambiguity would serve the purpose of improving Egypt's image. That would serve to both improve Egypt-West relations and also give time to the new regime in order to put off other matters like having a favourable response to MEDO proposals or hesitations like preventing any communist conversion in Egypt.

Finally, the Egyptian-Turkish relations would be exemplary for new Egypt's perception. Turkey was neither too powerful to handle within the Western bloc nor too insignificant in the Middle East to ignore its influence. Therefore, Nasser accepted the invitation of Turkish Embassy, as his first participation to corps diplomatique in Cairo. Turkish Ambassador Tugay invited all members of the Revolutionary Command Council to dinner with the help of Egyptian Military Attaché to Turkey. However, the result of this meeting was a disaster in terms of the ambassador's impression on them. Since Ambassador Tugay gave an advice on the matter of reconciling with Britain for not having a powerful opponent by remembering a possible intimidation of British troops in Suez and instead finding a solution for the present economic burden. Even though his expressions were approved by the Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dikerdem interpreted this night as the first negative mark of Ambassador Tugay in the eyes of Nasser and other RCC members and moreover as the beginning of making negative impressions.<sup>361</sup>

---

<sup>361</sup> Dikerdem, *op.cit.*, p.68-69.

#### 4.1.3. Rupture in Diplomatic Relations: The Tugay Affair

The Tugay Affair was the first diplomatic crisis in the history of Republic of Turkey which resulted with a declaration of persona non grata for an ambassador of Turkey. On the night of 2<sup>nd</sup> January 1954, Turkish Ambassador Tugay had a quarrel with Deputy Prime Minister Nasser in front of the corps diplomatique. In consequence of this event, the RCC declared him persona non grata by removing his diplomatic privileges and forced him to leave the country on 5<sup>th</sup> of January 1954. The Tugay Affair, as it came to be known and referred, was a dramatic final of the Turkish-Egyptian rapprochement after the revolution. It caused a rupture in Turkish-Egyptian relations for almost a year. This also prevented any diplomatic measure to avoid the acceleration of dissent and confrontation between the two countries over regional politics for the next years, even Menderes's efforts to avoid Egyptian opposition.

Hulusi Fuad Tugay, a reputable envoy in the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was appointed as the Ambassador of Turkey to Cairo. His wife, Princess Emine Tugay was the cousin of King Farouk and niece of King Fuad I, therefore she had many fertile and precious lands in Egypt. Therefore, Fuad Tugay had concerns about his appointment to Cairo due to of his wife's blood ties to Muhammad Ali dynasty and her estates in Egypt.<sup>362</sup> However Fuad Köprülü, the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, disregarded these and relieved Tugay by saying: "Your wife's benefits could not thwart the *raison d'état*."<sup>363</sup> It could be considered as a good idea to send a respectable diplomat, whose wife is one of the closest relatives of the Egyptian monarch in order to improve the relations. Thus, the Tugays fit in the corps diplomatique in Cairo as reputable diplomatic agents but their connection to the

---

<sup>362</sup> Princess Nimetullah was the youngest child of the Khidive Ismael and Princess Emine Düriye was a granddaughter of him. Her mother was a cousin of King Ahmed Fuad I and she was a cousin of King Farouk. Emine Fuat Tugay, **Bir Aile Üç Asır**, İstanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2013, p.329 and Family Tree No.3.

<sup>363</sup> Dikerdem, **op.cit.**, p.18-19.

Egyptian dynasty affect Tugay's decisions after the 1952 Revolution.<sup>364</sup> Moreover, on the day of the proclamation of republic, June 18, 1953, his dialogue with a RCC member Hussein el-Shafei was another ill effect on his reputation.<sup>365</sup>

Almost two months after these unfortunate dialogues and meetings, a smear campaign started against Ambassador Tugay, first insinuatingly and then straightforwardly. Firstly, the Minister of National Guidance, Salah Salem who is known for his fiery moods and sharp tongue, insinuatingly pointed to the Turkish Embassy as a collaborator in conspiracies against the RCC government and then these critics combined with Turkey's insistence on MEDO proposals. All these insinuating interpretations were openly expressed by the most significant journalist Muhammad Hassanein Heikal who had close links to Colonel Nasser. In his article "This Ambassador Must Go" published in *Akhbar el-Yom* on 22<sup>nd</sup> of November, he made some harsh comments on Ambassador Tugay, accusing him of interfering in the internal affairs of Egypt and Turkish Embassy became a core of anti-regime conspiracies.<sup>366</sup> These Egyptian news and articles had a repercussion in the Turkish press, which interpreted these news and comments as a deliberate attack and even with the permission of General Neguib.<sup>367</sup>

During this period, the Egyptian Ambassador in Ankara implied Egyptian concerns about Ambassador Tugay. That implied concern would start the idea to transfer him from Egypt to the United Kingdom; however that would not hint the Egyptian authorities to defuse tension. In December 1953, Tugay was informed that

---

<sup>364</sup> For example Ambassador Tugay considered visiting Regent Prince Abdel Moneim to commiserate him because of dissolving the Regency Council instead of greeting new and first President, General Neguib. *Ibid.*, p.21-22.

<sup>365</sup> El-Shafei asked him "What do you think about our new republic?" Ambassador Tugay replied as: "I replied with a word of Napoleon's mother: 'Pourvu que ça dure (Long as it lasts)'. It was a condescending comment on an important political transition of the revolution besides referring Napoleon's ephemeral presence in Egypt. *Ibid.*, p.69.

<sup>366</sup> *Ibid.*, p.74.

<sup>367</sup> 'They were made anti-Turkey publications with the permission of General Neguib': "Kahire Büyükelçimiz ve Mısır basını", *Cumhuriyet*, 25 November 1953, p.1&6; "Mısır basını Fuat Hulusi'ye hücum ediyor", *Milliyet*, 25 November 1953, p.1&7.

he would be appointed to another Embassy, but that was a delayed decision of Ankara for two and a half years.<sup>368</sup> While Ankara decided to assign Ambassador Tugay to another country; there were two developments that affected Mrs. Tugay's reputation and assets, eliminating that smooth transition.<sup>369</sup> All these developments were replied once and for all from Ankara to advising him to hold his peace against all these press attacks. Despite Ankara's counsel for prudent behaviour, the impending crisis arose on the night of 2<sup>nd</sup> January 1954 by Tugay's abasing and slighting remarks on Deputy Prime Minister Gamal Abdel Nasser in front of corps diplomatique in the Khedivial Cairo Opera House. As the Counsellor of Turkish Embassy, Mehmet Dikerdem cited this event and narrated the Ambassador's telegraph about this event to Ankara, which he prepared with him:

While I am talking to other diplomats at the private lounge of the Cairo Opera last night, Deputy Prime Minister Nasser came in and came next to us to greet and ask about. I told him exactly these words: 'I am an outspoken person. I have to tell you that, it is not gentlemanlike to incite press for turning them against us. We had known Egyptians as our friend.' Abdel Nasser replied: 'I believed that we are friends.' Thereupon I said: 'No, you proved that you are not a friend but an enemy by your behaviour; I do not accept this kind of friendship.' Then I went away.<sup>370</sup>

However, the scene from Nasser and other members of corps diplomatique was not as polite as Ambassador's narration. While Nasser approached to shake hands, Ambassador Tugay did not respond but shook his finger to Nasser's face and said: "You did not behave like a gentleman with your press attacks." Nasser was furious enough to smack his face but turn around and left at once. Moreover, he

---

<sup>368</sup> Murat Bardakçı, "Kahire'deki Unutulmuş Skandal", **Habertürk**, 23 September 2011.

<sup>369</sup> First one was the the confiscation law in November 1953, that confiscated of all properties of the former royal family, including Mrs. Tugay's. Second one was a press campaign to discredit Mrs. Tugay because of being a close member of former royal family to King Farouk. Nevertheless, all these developments in few months intensified personal rigidness of Ambassador Tugay through his perspective, which considered them as not only a personal insulting but also attacks to Turkey's reputation.

<sup>370</sup> Dikerdem, **op.cit.**, p.77-78.

called the RCC for a meeting at short notice immediately that night.<sup>371</sup> No matter how this dialogue happened, the Ambassador's speech and behavior were undiplomatic and caused the first declaration of persona non grata on 4<sup>th</sup> January 1954 in the history of the Republic of Turkey.<sup>372</sup>

The Counsellor wanted to meet Nasser in order to prevent any harsh repercussion. He made that negotiation indirectly and after all was said and done, Nasser was convinced for Tugay's departure without any decision to expel him. Instead, he was going to leave by a recall from Turkish government. They also negotiated on the removal of 24 hour limitation for his departure. It was extended until the 5<sup>th</sup> January at midnight. The most important point was that the Egyptian side had not leaked any information about the event or decision to any journalist until that time. On 4<sup>th</sup> January, there was not any news or rumours about that event or decisions, and Turkish government immediately recalled the Ambassador, as well. Not only Counsellor Dikerdem narrated that reconciliation but also Minister of Foreign Affairs, Fuad Köprülü confirmed this meeting in his parliament speech, as an answer to that event.<sup>373</sup>

Yet, on 5<sup>th</sup> of January, all newspapers and news agencies had all the details about Egypt's declaration of persona non grata and Ambassador's departure. The most prestigious Egyptian newspaper Al-Ahram gave this news above the fold as "The Ambassador of Turkey expelled from Egypt".<sup>374</sup> Although Nasser had compromised with the Turkish side on Ambassador's leaving, the Egyptian government notified the media at midnight on 4<sup>th</sup> of January about the declaration of persona non grata. It is the first persona non grata declaration about any Turkish diplomats in the history of Republic of Turkey. Egyptian government also waived

---

<sup>371</sup> **Ibid.**, p.78-79.

<sup>372</sup> Persona non grata is a diplomatic term for describing an individual who is unacceptable or unwelcome by the host government.

<sup>373</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 9, Vol. 27, Session. 1, 06 January 1954, p.63.

<sup>374</sup> **Al-Ahram**, "T̄arada sefir Turkiya min Maşr (Ambassador of Turkey expelled from Egypt)", 05 January 1954.



his diplomatic immunity which was unacceptable within customs and practices.<sup>375</sup> The Ambassador was treated like an ordinary tourist, and they picked shreds of his valise while they were taking photos of this impoliteness, as well. These degrading scenes would be published in the newspapers the next day.<sup>376</sup>

Ambassador Tugay had the leading role in this crisis; even though he was under pressure in terms of familial matters, press attacks on his wife and implicit critics on Turkey; his behaviour was not acceptable for a diplomat. In fact he had made a point of his kinship since the very beginning of his assignment to Egypt and he persistently warned the Ministry about his situation against the Egyptian press. There was no doubt that the ambassador had the major responsibility in this affair. However, all responsibility laid burden on him after his expulsion; and the negligence of the Turkish Ministry, the ungracious articles in the Egyptian press and provocation of the Egyptian government were shelved by both sides. They did not overrate this crisis as a matter of interstate relations, but took it as Tugay's personal error. Yet, the crisis on bilateral level was an early warning for more troubled times ahead towards struggle for leadership in the region.

The position of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey constituted another factor of the Tugay Affair. Ambassador Tugay's assignment to Egypt was considered as a good idea in order to improve the relations through his wife's affinity with King Farouk. When the regime changed and the Free Officers took power, it caused a disaster in relations as Turkey did not recall its ambassador. Even though the Egyptian side implied that they would welcome Ambassador Tugay's appointment to another country, Turkey did not change its position and the tension

---

<sup>375</sup> Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations in 1961 would codify these immunities and rights nearly a decade later as: "The person of a diplomatic agent shall be inviolable. He shall not be liable to any form of arrest or detention. The receiving State shall treat him with due respect and shall take all appropriate steps to prevent any attack on his person, freedom or dignity." **Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations in 1961**, Article 29. "When the functions of a person enjoying privileges and immunities have come to an end, such privileges and immunities shall normally cease at the moment when he leaves the country, or on expiry of a reasonable period in which to do so, but shall subsist until that time, even in case of armed conflict. However, with respect to acts performed by such a person in the exercise of his functions as a member of the mission, immunity shall continue to subsist." **Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations in 1961**, Article 39/2.

<sup>376</sup> Bardakçı, "Kahire'deki Unutulmuş..." ; Oran (ed.), **op.cit.**, p.621.

climaxed with Tugay's quarrel with Nasser. On the other hand, Tugay had informed all these press attacks to the Ministry and demanded his assignment to another country.

However, the Ministry's position looks like Chamberlain's policy of appeasement before the outbreak of the war. The Ministry instructed a moderate and even-tempered attitude towards all these articles since they were not official declaration but just an innuendo. Yet these instructions got the Ambassador in a vicious circle that Egyptian press continued to attack Ambassador or his wife, he could not react against such accusations or unfounded claims. Laçiner evaluated this crisis through Menderes government's inexperienced in foreign policy.<sup>377</sup> However, the Ministry had a deep-rooted tradition in overcoming this asserted inexperience. It was a negligent attitude to make a right prediction about the Turkish-Egyptian relations after the revolution. These responses and belated actions put Ambassador Tugay in an awkward position after the abolition of the monarchy and rising press attacks. The Ministry did not pay enough attention to ambassador's concerns about his wife's position, and his complaints about the press attacks, and did not get right on Tugay's new assignment. Its procrastination went as far as making Tugay lose his temper in the presence of Nasser that night.

The Egyptian side had already implied its desire for the assignment of a new envoy. When this implied demand was not met by Turkey, their man in the press, especially Heikal, clearly targeted Ambassador Tugay. However, Ambassador's undiplomatic reaction to Nasser was unexpected. The Turkish Embassy was accused of being associated with anti-revolutionary intrigues for a long time. Therefore, Tugay's attack on Nasser did more good than harm on Nasser's position within the government. Nasser used this quarrel to emphasize his position in the government and for the personification of the revolution. Tugay's attack on Nasser was presented as Turkey's attack on Egypt. After Tugay's expulsion Turkey was accused of having diplomatic relations with Israel and forcing Egypt to attach a pro-imperialist regional bloc. In addition, while Tugay was accused for being a

---

<sup>377</sup> Laçiner, *op.cit.*, p.134.

reflection of this Turkish policy; Nasser became the defender of the revolution and embodiment of Egypt. The persona non grata declaration targeted not only the Ambassador but also Turkish-Egyptian struggle for regional leadership. It also declared Turkey as civitas non grata in regional politics due to its pro-West policies and regional pact efforts. Ambassador Tugay is still remembered with exaggerated comments and the legacy of the Tugay Affair is revisited in the times of crisis in bilateral relations.<sup>378</sup>

#### 4.1.4. Turkish-Egyptian Relations after the Tugay Affair: 1954-1956

The results of the Free Officers coup d'état on Egyptian foreign affairs caused a circumspect approach towards the new Egyptian regime. During this period, Turkey's policies towards the Middle East were adversely affected by Turkey's total identification with Western policies. Therefore, Turkey assumed a similar attitude alongside with the Western countries on the matter of the Free Officers revolution, as well. On the Egyptian side, the Free Officers avoided any quarrel in foreign relations and adopted a neutralist foreign policy. In this regard, the Turkish-Egyptian relations were shaped under the reflection of this attitude. Egypt was regarded as a variant of Turkey while the deputies were comparing Turkey's social and economic data.<sup>379</sup> Moreover, the reformist period of the Free Officers was followed closely by the Turkish deputies, especially about the land reform.<sup>380</sup>

As mentioned in the previous part, the most problematic factor of bilateral relations during the first months of revolution was Ambassador Tugay's relations

---

<sup>378</sup> Sayed Abdel-Maguid, "Past Example", **Al-Ahram Weekly**, 26 November 2013. Muhammad Hassanein Heikal, "Proclamation of the Republic and the position of Muhammad Abdel Moneim", **Al-Jazeera**, 29 October 2006.

<sup>379</sup> The opposition deputy underlined that, he choose Egypt because "Turkey still seen as a Middle East country on the ground of social and economic aspects" and Egypt was among the closest comparable countries in his perspective. **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 9, Vol. 20, Session 3, 16.02.1953, p.333.

<sup>380</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 9, Vol. 20, Session 3, 20.02.1953, p.597.

with the new regime and members of the RCC. Secondly, the abolition of monarchy and confiscation of royal properties could be another issue, except from its effects on Mrs. Tugay. However, Turkey remained indifferent to the situation of Neslishah Sultan who was a member of the Ottoman dynasty and wife of the Regent Prince Abdel Moneim, then and afterwards.<sup>381</sup> On the contrary, Turkey welcomed the abolition of monarchy as another republican regime in the region. Not a member of Ottoman dynasty but Ambassador Tugay's kinship with Muhammad Ali dynasty would cause a diplomatic crisis in bilateral relation.

The Tugay Affairs resulted with the first persona non grata declaration of a Turkish diplomat in the history of Republic of Turkey. Even though it deteriorated the bilateral relations; the other factors of the crisis besides Tugay's behaviour were shelved by both sides. This chapter will focus on the outcome of the Tugay Affair on bilateral relations. First of all, both parties did not overrate this situation since Nasser had domestic priorities in his political agenda as consolidation of power or other prominent issue in foreign policy. Therefore, he only used this incident to promote his personification of the revolution by demonstrating Ambassador's expression as an insult on revolution through himself. On the other hand, the Menderes government called for an election in a few months. On the eve of general election, the Democrat Party wanted to preserve the image of Turkey's successful foreign policy with their achievements such as Turkey's accession to NATO or improved relations with Western countries. Secondly, the regional defence pact efforts were the primary foreign policy objective of Turkey towards the Middle East. Thus, Egypt was still regarded as a valuable partner, and Turkey did not make it impossible for further repercussion. It could recover bilateral relations for the sake of a possible persuasion of Egypt.

The Turkish press and deputies in the parliament were interested in the process of this crisis and future of Turkish-Egyptian relations. The very first news in the Turkish newspapers completely accused Ambassador Tugay of degrading Turkey's reputation by enslaving his feelings due to his kinship with Muhammad

---

<sup>381</sup> "Egypt Investigates 'Anti-Nasser Plot' ", **New York Times**, 28 December 1957.; Murat Bardakçı, "İki sürgün yaşayan Neslishah Sultan askeri mahkemelerde yargılanmıştı", **Hürriyet**, 17 Ocak 2006.

Ali dynasty.<sup>382</sup> These news about the “Cairo Scandal” remained on headlines for about a week and gradually fell of the agenda.<sup>383</sup> On the other hand, it remained the main topic of foreign policy issues in the parliament for a while. The first statement was made by Fuad Köprülü, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, on 6<sup>th</sup> of January. He confirmed the occurrence of the Tugay Affair and added that he would not approve of this kind of behaviour from any Turkish diplomat. He comprehended Egypt’s declaration with respect; yet criticized it since Ambassador’s diplomatic immunities were abolished. It was like an expulsion of a diplomatic envoy in a non-civilized manner, and he added that Turkey sent a diplomatic note about this event and treatment.<sup>384</sup> Moreover, Turkey admitted that Tugay’s behaviour was unacceptable. In a budget discussion, Köprülü noted that the issue would have been simpler if Egypt had also acknowledged its flaw about the immunity issue and undiplomatic treatment during Ambassador’s leaving.<sup>385</sup>

On the Egyptian side, the Tugay Affair was a provoked yet unexpected outcome. Nasser skilfully manipulated this event to personify the revolution and besmirch Turkey’s reputation in the region by insulting its ambassador. However in public, he asserted that the decision was taken due to Ambassador’s behaviour only and should not be considered against Turkey. He argued that, Tugay’s personality became incompatible with the existence and continuation of the revolution. This crisis was the first sign of regional struggle between Turkey and Egypt. This is because, there were many accusations before and after this crisis on not only the Ambassador himself but also on Turkey, a newly member of NATO, due to Turkey’s decisions such as the recognition of Israel, advocating the Western interests in the region and imposing Egypt to be involved in the pro-West regional

---

<sup>382</sup> “Kahire elçimiz neden çıkarılıyor?”, **Akşam**, 05 January 1954. “Mısırın şaşılacak hareketi Elçimizi hudud dışı ediyor”, **Cumhuriyet**, 05 January 1954. “Mısır hükümetininin dostluğa sığmayan bir hareketi Mısır Büyükelçimiz terke davet edildi”, **Milliyet**, 05 January 1954.

<sup>383</sup> “Mısır’ın hareketine karşı sert tedbirler alınacak”, **Akşam**, 06 January 1954. “Kahire rezaleti bütün dünyada esefle karşılandı”, **Cumhuriyet**, 06 January 1954. “Hükümetimiz dün Mısır’a bir nota verdi”, **Milliyet**, 07 January 1954. “Kahire elçimiz geldi, iddialar yalandır, diyor”, **Cumhuriyet**, 08 January 1954. “Kahire rezaleti Meclis dışişleri komisyonunda”, **Cumhuriyet**, 12 January 1954.

<sup>384</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 9, Vol. 27, Session 4, 06.01.1954, p.63-64.

<sup>385</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 9, Vol. 28, Session 4, 24.02.1954, p.779.

pact. This harsh treatment and instrumentalization of the Tugay Affair should also be considered as a diplomatic vengeance against the old ruler from the point of Nasser's nationalist interpretations. On 29 March 1954, the day Nasser achieved a major gain in domestic politics, the Tugay Affair was swept under the carpet by a mutual declaration which underlined sharing mutual sincere sorrow about that "Cairo incident".<sup>386</sup>

During the year of 1954, Turkey was brought to Egypt's agenda through Anglo-Egyptian negotiations. The Anglo-Egyptian negotiations were among the top priorities of revolutionary officers; however Turkey came to the fore in these delicate negotiations. Britain insisted that, an external attack on Egypt or any other Arab states should be a reasonable circumstance for the re-entry of British forces. In relation to that, Britain insisted that Turkey should be among these stipulating countries. However, Egypt resisted this demand for a very long time as this demand was against the main purpose of Egyptian side, considering Nasser's remark that the British influence must entirely disappear.<sup>387</sup>

After all was said and done in the negotiations, Egypt finally compromised on the British demand for re-entry, and also accepted the condition about Turkey in January 1954. Turkey welcomed this Anglo-Egyptian Treaty by the virtue of solving another disagreement in the region and inclusion of the Turkey clause into the agreement.<sup>388</sup> Thereby, Egypt had connected itself indirectly to NATO and regional defence plans of West by means of the repercussions of potential external attack on Turkey.<sup>389</sup> Celal Bayar mentioned the agreement in his opening speech and evaluated that this agreement had a by-products, which was a rapprochement between Turkey and Egypt and Egypt's good intentions.<sup>390</sup> In addition to that, this

---

<sup>386</sup> "Türk-Mısır müşterek tebliği yayımlandı", **Milliyet**, 30 March 1954, p.1 and 7. For Nasser's achievement, see also: Davut Dursun, "Camal Abdünnâsır", **Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi**, Vol.7, Ankara, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998, p.298.

<sup>387</sup> Jankowski, **Nasser's Egypt...**, p.47.

<sup>388</sup> Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye'nin Arap Orta...**, p.58-59.

<sup>389</sup> Gordon, **op.cit.**, p.178.

<sup>390</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term 10, Vol. 2, Session 2, 01.11.1954, p.17.

reconciliation was evaluated as Egypt was starting to look westwards. However, this development has to evaluate as no more than a precautionary move in Egypt's contest in inter-Arab politics, Nasser's need for a major foreign-domestic policy achievement, which named him as the Evacuation Hero, and an agreement on the Suez Canal at last.<sup>391</sup>

There were two reasons for Egyptian willingness to compromise: First of all, Nasser was in need of a significant achievement in 1954; especially after he promoted himself with the Tugay Affair and got into conflict to consolidate his power and influence against President Neguib. Secondly, there was a rising American pressure on both sides to come to terms by settling the bilateral issue.<sup>392</sup> Thus, all parties focused on regional pact efforts and hoped to overcome Egypt's persistent objection to the Middle East defence proposals. Therefore, Turkey launched a cooperation and friendship campaign towards the Arab Middle East, hoping to form a basis for regional defence pact.<sup>393</sup> A few days after the agreement, Nasser published an article titled "Brother Turkey" in Cairo journal. Menderes was encouraged by Nasser's brother description and sought reconciliation with Egypt through a bilateral meeting with Nasser.

There were some attempts for reconciliation but the regional conjuncture and Nasser's concerns over Egyptian society could not allow a sustainable rapprochement. Yet more, Menderes invited Nasser to Ankara if he could not visit Cairo. Nasser's reply to Dikerdem about this invitation was:

I am grateful for your Prime Minister's invitation. However, the purpose of this visit is taking a concrete step towards friendship and cooperation among our countries; not establishing intimate relations among leaders. Yet the Egyptian society is not ready to welcome such a meeting with your Prime Minister, due to two main factors. The first one is your relations with Israel and secondly, Turkey is

---

<sup>391</sup> Podeh, **The Quest for...**, p.98.

<sup>392</sup> For further information about the role of the US to that Agreement, see also: Laila Amin Morsy, "The Role of the United States in the Anglo-Egyptian Agreement of 1954", **Middle Eastern Studies**, V.29, N.3, July 1993, p.526-558.

<sup>393</sup> Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye'nin Arap Orta...**, p.59-65.

promoting the Middle East Defence Pact along with the UK, the US and France.... So then, first we have to prepare our societies towards the Turkish-Egyptian friendship.<sup>394</sup>

By the end of the year, the negative impact the Tugay Affair had almost disappeared. Moreover, a Turkish weekly journal put Nasser on its cover and said “Fellow Egyptian”<sup>395</sup> and emphasized Nasser’s amicable messages and greetings owing to the Hijri New Year and ‘Eid al-Adha.<sup>396</sup> Despite all these tensions in bilateral relation and difference in regional policy; Turkey finally sent its new ambassador to Cairo on 21 December 1954. It was the only success of Menderes’s reconciliation efforts in terms of Egyptian chapter. Rifki Rüştü Zorlu, who was elder the brother of Fatin Rüştü Zorlu, Deputy Prime Minister at the government and Minister of Foreign Affairs in the next term, continued this assignment for more than two years. His selection signified the importance of Egypt’s position in Turkish foreign policy agenda.

To sum up; the Tugay Affair caused almost a year-long rupture in diplomatic relations and a left a negative mark in the diplomatic history of two countries. Both parties had different motivations for increasing or defusing the tension over the crisis. However, neither part chose these impulsive options; on the contrary the crisis was solved within a few months and they mostly put all the blame on Ambassador Tugay’s behaviour. During this period, Egypt had to focus on its negotiation with Britain and Turkey had to repair its image and relations in the Arab Middle East. Moreover, there were more significant regional and international events in the year of 1955, such as the formation of the Baghdad Pact and Bandung Conference. They de-emphasized the bilateral relations by their impact on foreign policy agendas and directed Turkish-Egyptian relations to carry out through regional and international confrontations.

---

<sup>394</sup> Dikerdem, *op.cit.*, p.101-102. For this short-lived rapprochement, see also: G.E.K., “The Turco-Egyptian Flirtation of Autumn 1954”, *The World Today*, Vol. 12, No. 11, November 1956, p. 447-457.

<sup>395</sup> *Akis*, 11 September 1954, p.3.

<sup>396</sup> “Araplardan tebrik”, *Akis*, 11 September 1954, p.9.



## 4.2. TURKISH-EGYPTIAN RELATIONS ON REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS

### 4.2.1. The Regional Confrontation: The Baghdad Pact

The struggle over the Baghdad Pact reflected not an ideological clash between the two sides but a clash over countries' role perceptions for regional leadership and different interpretations of Arab nationalism. This struggle did not only occur between Egypt and Turkey. Egyptian-Iraqi struggle had a long-standing controversy between Nuri al-Said Pasha and Nasser. They had adopted different interpretations of Arab nationalism and regional perception, but the Iraqi side lost this struggle in a most terrible way. From the beginning, Turkey emphasized these efforts to build a regional pact as fruitless, yet still participated vis-à-vis its total identification with Western policies.<sup>397</sup>

The Baghdad Pact was formed as the instrument of military containment in the Middle East by Iraq, Turkey, Iran, Great Britain and Pakistan.<sup>398</sup> However, it divided the region into three parts; member countries of the Pact, hostile countries to such a pro-West pact led by Nasser's Egypt and neutral countries such as Jordan and Lebanon which were torn between Nasser's critics and Menderes's insistence and impatience. After 1954, the primary goal of the Menderes government in the Middle East was to persuade as many countries as possible to join the Baghdad Pact. In this regard Laçiner argued that Menderes' personality had a negative effect on Turkey's

---

<sup>397</sup> Ayşegül Sever, "The Compliant Ally? Turkey and the West in the Middle East 1954-1958", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.34, Vo.2, April 1998, p.74-75.

<sup>398</sup> For the formation and the outcomes of the Baghdad Pact, see also: Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye'nin Arap Orta...**, p.51-82. Yeşilbursa, **The Baghdad Pact ...**, *passim*. Magnus Persson, **Great Britain, the United States, and the Security of the Middle East The Formation of the Baghdad Pact**, Lund: Lund University Press, 1998, *passim*. Elie Podeh, **The Quest for Hegemony in the Arab World the Struggle over the Baghdad Pact**, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1995, *passim*.

Middle East policies due to his impatience, especially over Jordan and Iraq.<sup>399</sup> Egypt would be added to this consideration since Menderes overlooked a significant factor about the 1954 Anglo-Egyptian Agreement, which was not conducting an alliance between Egypt and Britain; yet an amicable separation via the evacuation agreement. This division among the Middle East states resulted with Iraqi isolation from the Arab core, and also set off domestic clashes between pro-Nasserite group and others in these neutral countries.<sup>400</sup>

The Baghdad Pact brought the strained relations and divided confrontations of the Cold War along with its formation and divided the region through political commitments. Therefore, Kerr described the forthcoming era as the Arab Cold War due to that division among the Middle East states as Nasser and his rivals.<sup>401</sup> This confrontation was mainly between the Cairo-led triumvirate and Turkey-Iraqi alliance.<sup>402</sup> While Arab nationalism was in vogue, Iraq was the only Arab member of the pact and this situation was a symbolic weakness of the Baghdad Pact in terms of participation by Arab countries. Even it was in accordance with the Northern Tier concept; rest of the Arab Middle East was left to witness an endless and self-defeating pursuit between Iraq and Egypt. This is because Nasser opposed such a regional pact by considering it as a new means of Western dominance and denied Iraq's right to sign a separate pact with non-Arab states without consulting its Arab partners. Moreover, two countries were in a direct competition for both Arab

---

<sup>399</sup> Laçiner, **op.cit.**, p.135.

<sup>400</sup> While Nasser was successfully opposing the Baghdad Pact, the Hashemite Kingdom of Iraq was overthrown in July 1958 by a bloody coup d'état, which regarded as pro-Nasserite takeover in its first days, and the monarchy replaced with a republican regime. Besides, this event had serious repercussions both on Lebanon and Jordan which were neutral countries to Baghdad Pact and witnessed foreign interventions due to internal turmoil.

<sup>401</sup> Malcolm H. Kerr, **The Arab Cold War, 1958-1964: A Study of Ideology in Politics**, London, Oxford University Press, 1965.

<sup>402</sup> Kürkçüoğlu explained inclusions of Saudi Arabia and Syrai due to lasting rivalry and opposition of Saudi Arabia against the Hashemite dynasty and the struggle of Syrian government against Turkey's policies and its leading pact. Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye'nin Arap Orta...**, p.67.

legitimacy, leadership in the region and Western assistance, which inevitably clashed with one another.<sup>403</sup>

Nasser's impact on Egypt's foreign policy and its reflection on Turkish-Egyptian relations through the Baghdad Pact can be summarized in three factors. First of all, Turkey was labelled as a collaborator of the West in the region as Egypt had a different political agenda based on the expulsion of colonialist/imperialist influence, promoting neutral stance in foreign policy and seeking Arab nationalist policy in the region. On the other hand, Turkey shared the American perception of the communist threat against the Middle East. Nevertheless the Baghdad Pact started a new rift in the region and accelerated the separateness of Arab states through Iraqi-Egyptian struggle. Turkey was another prominent member of the pact thanks to the notable efforts of Prime Minister Menderes and total identification of Turkish foreign policy with the Western perceptions on the Middle East.

Therefore, Egypt challenged these regional defence efforts, which it labelled as a tool of imperialist dominance as it had already refused all proposals even before the revolution. Egypt legitimized its opposition to these historical roots and the doctrine of positive neutralism which was viewed as a specifically anti-Western perception.<sup>404</sup> Moreover, its inclusion in such a pro-Western pact meant a roll-back just after achieving the most significant goal of the revolution with the evacuation agreement and losing ground to imperialist powers in the region, once again. Britain also joined the alliance and it was a point of no return for the fate of Baghdad Pact and Egypt's decision.<sup>405</sup> Egypt had a different perception about the Middle East region and that did not match with the Turkish one in sum.

---

<sup>403</sup> Laura M. James, **Nasser at War: Arab Images of the Enemy**, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, p.11.

<sup>404</sup> For additional information about the positive neutralism, see also: Hrair R. Dekmejian, **Egypt under Nasir; A Study in Political Dynamics**, Albany, State University of New York Press, 1971, p.108-118.

<sup>405</sup> The inclusion of the non-Middle East countries was a controversial issue between Britain and the US. Eventually Britain joined the Pact and Eden considered that as a strengthening factor for British influence throughout the region. On the American side, Dulles thought otherwise and rejected any US's commitment through full membership but opting for observer status. He believed that being

Secondly, Egypt and Turkey became two sides of a regional struggle for leadership through clear confrontation. In this regard, it could identify Nasser's Three Circles Theory with the Turkish-Egyptian tension through the Baghdad Pact. Nasser defined three main areas of influence for Egypt two of which were under the threat of Baghdad Pact regarding to the Islam circle and especially the Arab circle. So, the pact indeed became a divisive factor on Arab states into three groups and Nasser had to struggle primarily with Iraq. On the other hand, the pact was a defensive organization for Turkey, while Egypt considered it as a Turkish-Iraqi plot and the Western attack against its policies and Nasser's influence in the region.<sup>406</sup> It was a clear dissent of these two countries and this contradiction would harm their relations in 1950s more than the Tugay Affair did.

Turkey's position was labelled as an anti-Nasser collaborator outside the Arab circle. Moreover, Egypt made counter propaganda to include in such a collaborator regional pact over the member countries in the Pact. Egyptian radio, for example, labelled them as a collaborator with imperialism and old colonialist Britain. Turkey found much more place in this counter propaganda, not only having a recent diplomatic crisis but also common criticism over its relation with Israel or being a NATO member in the region. Thus, Egypt tried to neutralize and isolate Iraqi participation within Arabs and prevent Turkish efforts over the Arab states. Therefore, standing aloof to Iraqi and Turkish encouragements was considered as advocating Nasser's cause and Egypt-led Arab nationalism, at least preventing his criticism over the state.

Last but not least, the Turkish-Egyptian confrontation was beneficial for both sides during the bipolar conjuncture and part of the containment in the Middle East. Turkey and Egypt benefited from this regional polarization by racing to become the leader of their sides. Nasser had instrumentalized these containment efforts in the

---

identified through open membership weakened the Western position, but they should have supported the Pact, behind the scenes rather than being identifies with, openly. C.D. Smith, **op.cit.**, p.164.

<sup>406</sup> On 22 February 1955, Nasser shared his concerns over the Baghdad Pact to Eden and said; it was an instrument to divide Arab world apart from his ideals and left Egypt alone against Israel. Heykel, **op.cit.**, p.57-58. The Egyptian ambassador to London also claimed that the Baghdad Pact was a Turkish-Iraqi plot for the eventual dismemberment of Syria. James, **op.cit.**, p.12.

region to improve Egyptian-Soviet relations, but also had been using his insistent objection to assure Western aids to Egypt (or credit demands) by having an excessive indulgence to his policies to prevent further resistance. On the other side, Turkey also improved its position at NATO by virtue of its policies regarding the Middle East. This is because Turkey instrumentalized its foreign policy towards the Middle East to secure its position and proved its worth for Western countries, especially to the US, and demonstrated its allegiance to the Western values. Turkey and Egypt were regarded as a gateway for both blocs in the region.

In conclusion; Nasser vilified Turkey for being a puppet of the West in the region and Iraq for betraying the Arab cause and nationalist interests. Turkish-Egyptian relations deteriorated more than ever because of this regional struggle for leadership. Their attitudes towards Baghdad Pact were a clear political alienation for both sides. Moreover, Nasser tried to isolate Turkey as he succeeded on Iraq because formation of the Baghdad Pact further intensified Egypt's involvement in Arab affairs vis-à-vis Arab nationalism, struggle for leadership and end of the consolidation period of Nasser's leadership.

Despite all, Turkey continued to identify its policies with the West, which caused further West-oriented foreign policy decisions in times of crisis. Therefore, the Middle East became an essential part of Egyptian and Turkish foreign policies but in different motivations and objectives. Nasser also used his commitment to neutrality, which was adopted by Nehru against Pakistan, to legitimize his critics to such a defence pact. The essential factor of the opposition to this alliance and Egyptian struggle for regional leadership avoided the political and military isolation of Egypt at all costs. The Bandung Conference was the sally port of Egypt. The international conjuncture took Egypt's side at the time through the rise of Asian-African world.

#### 4.2.2. Confrontation on International Level: The Bandung Conference

The First Asian-African Conference was held at Bandung on 18-24 April 1955.<sup>407</sup> Representatives of 29 governments, mostly from newly independent nations, gathered in Indonesia to exchange their views on peace, economic development, decolonization and the role of the Third World during the Cold War. Turkey was the only invited ally from both blocs of the Cold War. In the midst of regional struggle in the Middle East through the formation of Baghdad Pact, almost all parties of this regional confrontation attended the conference. Turkey did not want to attend the conference at first to prove its allegiance to the alliance and emphasized its European identity. In addition, Turkey interpreted the conference as a part of a communist conspiracy, but the US suggested Turkey join the conference. Turkey's participation was considered as an essential opportunity for Western interests to promote the aims and objectives of the alliance.<sup>408</sup> Turkey was still championing the cause of its Western allies as in the Baghdad Pact, in order to secure greater aid from the West. This is because neither Baghdad Pact provided any additional security nor its pro-Western position was welcomed by the participants of Bandung Conference.

On the Egyptian side, this was an opportunity to promote its ideals and display Nasser's leadership on the international stage; which would have a blocking effect on Israel's participation. Moreover, Egypt had already adopted a neutralist policy in its foreign relations, advocating decolonization and seeking new opportunities for development, partnership and cooperation. Besides these elements, the Bandung Conference would be a concrete step on international level for all circles of Nasser's Three Circles Theory. Therefore, Nasser also proved its Africa circle was not particular to North Africa but the whole continent including newly independent states. Furthermore, there were seven Arab states attending the

---

<sup>407</sup> Also referred as the Bandung Conference.

<sup>408</sup> The US Ambassador to Jakarta stated in a telegram that discouraging their friends from participating has no advantage for them. He added that "I would hope that our influence would be brought to bear to induce the Philippines and Thailand and especially Iran, Egypt and Iraq and above all Turkey to attend so that their voices may be heard." Ampiah, *op.cit.*, p.69-73

Bandung Conference and this international state was also instrumentalized by Nasser to reach all these states in the name of neutralism, anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism. The major successes of Egyptian participation were based on the Arab cause in Palestine and questions of the Arab Maghreb (North Africa) in the name of promoting world peace, self-determination and human rights perception.

The head of Egyptian delegation, Prime Minister Nasser touched upon in his opening speech to the flagrant injustice upon the people of Palestine, criticized power politics of big powers, liquidation of colonialism, liberation of Egyptians and release from foreign domination by the 1952 Revolution, Egyptian support on self-determination, human rights with regard to North Africa and Palestine. He also added that “Every power has the right to choose freely its political as well as economic systems”.<sup>409</sup> On the other side, the head of Turkish delegation, Deputy Prime Minister Fatin Rüştü Zorlu mentioned in his opening address the “pressure from a neighbouring country” on Turkey, alliances of peace loving countries such as NATO, the Balkan Pact, SEATO and the Turkish-Iraqi Pact, “co-existence” approach from the “aggressive” camp.<sup>410</sup>

Turkey strongly defended the alliances of “peace loving” countries with harsh attacks on non-alignment, neutralism in foreign policy and communism as a threat to world peace. Minister Zorlu evaluated the Turkish position in the conference as both an obligation and success, and there were some harsh polemics between deputies and Menderes/Zorlu. Foreign Minister Zorlu’s answer clarified Turkey’s motivation to attend the conference:

Zorlu: “...Our mission is clear. We have to defend our policy and our opinion first; and then defend with our current and future friends. I have to tell you; we went there at last minute. This neutralist group had been preparing for a year.”

Prime Minister Menderes: “Our Allies requested insistently.”

Zorlu (continued): “Yes, our allies pressed for. They said please you must go, there will come to a bad end in case you do not attend.”<sup>411</sup>

---

<sup>409</sup> **Ibid.**, p.58-60.

<sup>410</sup> **Ibid.**, p.81-83.

<sup>411</sup> **TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi**, Term. 10, Vol. 10, Session 2, 25.02.1956, p.736-737.

Egypt justified its neutralist, anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist positions in the Middle East with this international countenance. Mazrui identified its neutralist policy as the fourth circle of Nasser, the neutralist circle:

This has opened up a whole new “Circle” within which Egypt might seek leadership; a Circle not catered for or expounded upon in The Philosophy of the Revolution. This is the Neutralist Circle, for which the allegedly more precise term has of late been “Non-alignment”.<sup>412</sup>

On the other side, Turkey interpreted the developments in the Asian-African world from American perspective and advocated Western principles by rejecting neutralism which would help to spread of communism in the world. Naturally, Turkey’s pro-Western attitude worsened its relations with many countries in the Third World.<sup>413</sup> However, Turkish critics about the Soviet Union welcomed by Chou En-lai, Premier of the People's Republic of China. If the evacuation agreement was considered as Nasser’s most important achievement in internal affair, the Egyptian participation to the Bandung conference was an equal on international stage. On the other side, the Turkish participation to the Bandung Conference was as significant as its efforts in the Middle East for the formation of Baghdad Pact, to demonstrate its total identification with Western policies.<sup>414</sup> Turkey strongly defended its allegiance to its alliances with harsh attacks on neutralism and communism. Therefore, the Bandung Conference was a clear dissent between Turkey and Egypt on the international stage, as well as their regional confrontation over the formation of Baghdad Pact. For example, a Turkish journal interpreted the Turkey’s participation as “Fatin Rüştü Zorlu – went to fight a duel with Nasser” before the conference was held.<sup>415</sup>

---

<sup>412</sup> Ali A. Mazrui, “Africa and the Egyptian's Four Circles”, **African Affairs**, Vol. 63, No. 251, April 1964, p.131.

<sup>413</sup> Laçiner, **op.cit.**, p.147.

<sup>414</sup> Aydın, **opc.it.**, p.114.

<sup>415</sup> **Akis**, 16 April 1955, p.3.



Zorlu fought a losing battle by advocating pro-West stance and the winner of the duel was Nasser. Moreover, Egypt achieved an international acceptance from the neutralist participants and Nasser had a leading position within forthcoming Non-Aligned movement. That would help his aim to promote the cult of personality and international and international identification of Egypt with his leadership. Nasser welcomed in Egypt shouting “Welcome the hero of Bandung; champion of peace and freedom; champion of Asia and Africa!”<sup>416</sup> While the Bandung Conference increased Nasser’s prestige on the Arab and international scenes and strengthened his leadership domestically, Turkey had to wait to repair its worsening image in the Asian-African world almost a decade later, just after its isolation by the UN in the Cyprus issue. The Bandung Conference was an international witnessing of Egyptian-Turkish political alienation in the Middle East, as well as on an international level.

---

<sup>416</sup> Güler, *op.cit.*, p.121.

## CONCLUSION

Turkish-Egyptian relations during the first-three decades and the 1950s demonstrate both continuities and discontinuities with their regional foreign policy orientations. During its reformist period, the Middle East symbolizes what Turkey wanted to leave behind from its ancient heritage to adopt its reforms and get further motivation for its modernization process. Therefore, starting from the Treaty of Lausanne to the Second World War, Turkish foreign policy was limitedly involved in the Middle East affairs. It was neither standing aloof to the regional issues nor remaining indifferent to new developments, especially concerning its domestic reforms or unsolved issues. During this period, Egypt occupied itself with discussing different political orientations to define Egyptian identity, the characteristics of Egyptian nationalism and Egypt's role in regional affairs in this context. Even some criticism from Arab scholars emphasized the success of Turkish struggle in this period and suggested this kind of inward looking towards Arab countries.

The role of the Caliphate efforts fit these discussions in Egypt's politics as much as King Fuad and King Farouk's efforts to prioritize the position of the Palace in Egyptian politics, as well as enhancing its influence and esteem in the region. However, Turkey was highly concerned about the efforts for revival of the Caliphate and even about discussing it to raise some criticism to its abolition or to make an effort for bringing back the Ottoman caliph. This issue was a distinct example of Turkey's limited involvement in the Middle East affairs, besides its involvement in some issues with its neighbours. Thus, the Caliphate issue became the first major concern in Turkish-Egyptian relations until it was tailed off by the disapproval of many countries, and outbreak of the Second World War.

After the Second World War, regional and international conjunctures were changed by the Cold War. The Arab-Israeli conflict is still the main problem in the region since the foundation of the State of Israel and the 1948 Arab-Israeli War. On

the other hand, the impact of the Cold War gradually affected the Middle East politics, and reached a peak in its first decade with the formation of West-oriented regional defence organization. Turkey and Egypt pursued different foreign policies and their different policy orientations drove a wedge between the two sides at first and later turned into a clear confrontation about the regional issues. The Arab-Israeli conflict and the regional defence organization issue was the main separation between Egypt and Turkey after a short-term rapprochement between Turkey and the Arab Middle East countries in post-second World war era. In this context, Arab countries and Egypt interpreted the shift of Turkish decisions as a betrayal to the Arab cause in Palestine and a break- up of “Muslim Solidarity”.<sup>417</sup> Thus, the criticism of the Arab countries on Turkey’s decisions and eventually the recognition of Israel by Turkey were the moral rupture between these two sides whereas the confrontation over the regional defence organization would be a political one in the context of Cold War conjuncture.

Turkey joined the Western alliance in 1952 as the only NATO member in the Middle East. Turkey did not change its West-oriented foreign policy choices, turning into a clear advocate of these West-oriented policies and regional perceptions. Therefore, Turkey did not comprehend two major changes and their outcomes in regional politics. First of all, Middle East and the Third World countries were generally trying to gain their true independences based on the right of nations to self-determination. However, Turkey gave its support to the old colonial power, since it had to protect the interests of its allies. Secondly, Turkey ignored their neutralist stance in foreign policy, and the rise of non-aligned movement. Moreover, Turkey emphasized the Soviet influence in the region as a grave threat. However, Arab countries had another major rival, Israel, as well as an instrument in their domestic and regional politics. Therefore, Turkey failed to understand trends of development in the Arab Middle East.

---

<sup>417</sup> Gürün, **op.cit.**, p.345. Some western publications were interpreted Turkey’s voting with Arab countries as a reflection of “Muslim Brotherhood”. Oran (ed.), **op.cit.**, p.637. Al Misri newspaper of Egypt harshly criticize the Turkish member of the UNCCP, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, because “helping Jews and be in favour of Jewish advantage to overshooting the mark than the Israeli envoy.” Kürkçüoğlu, **Türkiye’nin Arap Orta...**, p.30.

To sum up this background, Turkey and Egypt had a problematic relations background before the Free Officers Movement seized power in Egypt. There were two main reasons: First of all, Egypt did not comprehend Turkey's reformist period and its possible reflections in Turkish foreign policy. Therefore, that would cause bilateral problems such as the fez affair or the regional confrontation such as the Caliphate issue, even Turkey did not wanted to involve the Middle East affairs during the interwar period. Egypt had not any purpose to challenge Turkey or its domestic reforms but King Fuad and then King Farouk's instrumentalization of the Caliphate issue coincided with Turkey's concerns on any foreign challenge to its domestic reforms or a revival effort for that position. Secondly, the Western factor was the main determinant that affected Turkish foreign policy.<sup>418</sup> It gave a different direction to the foreign policy of Turkey than Arab Middle East states. Moreover, it primarily affected its relation with Egypt, considering the fact that Turkey's changing voting pattern on Arab-Israeli conflict and the MEDO and the MEC proposals. Since Egypt was not only at the forefront of this conflict but also had the primary respondent position of these regional defence pact proposals, due to dominant British demand on this matter.

The Free Officers coup d'état in Egypt coincided with the transition of regional politics since the late 1940s and the start of Turkish and Egyptian discontent over regional issues. After the Free Officers Revolution, Egypt initially pursued a neutralist foreign policy and sought good relations with other countries, even had confidential communication with Israel. Since the new revolutionary Egyptian regime needed to legitimate its rule and had to avoid any foreign critics for its take-over. On the other side, Turkey mainly looked its Western ally's policies towards that new regime and the Western factor shaped its early response to the revolution. Turkey had expectations from this new regime of the Free Officers Movement to compromise on the regional issues and leave the problematic relations with the Egyptian monarchy behind. Besides, Turkey hoped to improve its relations with this new Egyptian regime, unlike to the problematic one with its predecessors. These domestic reforms after the revolution, especially the proclamation of the

---

<sup>418</sup> Kürkçüoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Arap Orta...*, p.195.

republic and praising comments on Turkish Army and Mustafa Kemal's leadership supported its hopes. This caused a short-term rapprochement between two countries until the Tugay Affair caused a rupture in diplomatic relations.

Tugay Affair is the first *persona non grata* declaration of an Ambassador of Turkey, and a major diplomatic crisis between Turkey and Egypt. The reasons behind this issue include Ambassador Tugay's undiplomatic behaviour, Egyptian press attacks on Mrs. Tugay and impact of domestic reforms of the new regime on Ambassador Tugay's wife due to her blood relations with the Egyptian dynasty. In this regard, the thesis evaluated the impact of the Tugay Affair on diplomatic relations and also on domestic politics in Egypt, as being the main reason developed out of domestic aspect. The main reason of this issue was the personal mishap of Ambassador Tugay. However, Turkey had the same negligence on the domestic reforms in Egypt as Egypt disregarded Turkish reformist period and its reflection on foreign policy during the interwar period. Even the Tugay Affair caused a rupture in diplomatic relations; it was not totally isolated bilateral connections just as seen in continued efforts of Menderes to reconcile with Nasser.<sup>419</sup> However, political orientations of Turkey and Egypt and their persistent confrontations in the region made any reconciliation or a new rapprochement in the following years, impracticable. Therefore, the impact of the revolution on bilateral relations was short-term rapprochement and a struggle for leadership in the long run against charismatic and influential leadership of Nasser and prominent role of Egypt in regional politics.

After the Tugay Affair, there was nearly a year-long rupture in diplomatic relations between two countries. This void in bilateral relations was the same period that Nasser achieved the consolidation of power and gained legitimacy to his leadership. When Turkey and Egypt re-established diplomatic relations in late 1954, Nasser had already secured his position. Thus, Nasser instrumentalized that issue to connect his prominent position in the regime with the revolution itself for reaching the personification of the revolution on behalf of his leadership. It was the first

---

<sup>419</sup> Podeh, *The Struggle over....*, p.98.

foreign policy leverage for these processes. Besides, this persona non grata declaration was a clear turning point to openly criticize Turkey's foreign policy orientation, its joining to the Western alliance, its pro-Western efforts in the region and Turkish-Israeli relations. Moreover, Turkish-Egyptian struggle went beyond bilateral level, and these two countries struggled for a prominent role in the region on regional and international stages. Regarding this rupture in bilateral relations, Turkish-Egyptian relations after the Tugay Affair are examined clearly through the formation of the Baghdad Pact and their participations to the Bandung Conference. The regional and international levels became more important points of contact between two countries than bilateral relations itself.

The formation of the Baghdad Pact was an essential objective for Turkey's politics towards the Middle East even though a major challenge for Nasser's objectives in the region. The impact area of this defence pact coincided with Nasser's sphere of influence in terms of his Arab and Islam circles from his Three Circles Theory. Moreover, it was also challenging the Arab nationalist and Pan-Arabist objectives because Iraq was a founding member of this pact and was blamed by Nasser for dividing Arab countries into three parts; members; opponents and neutrals. Nasser was a beacon for nationalist, neutralist, anti-West and anti-Israeli Arab countries in the region. On the other side, Turkey and Iraq were the main opponents with their pro-West policies. Thus, either side in this regional leadership struggle also took advantage from this enmity. It divided Arabs into different camps but also marked the line of influences in the region and leaders of the both sides. The Bandung Conference was a primary success for Nasser on the international stage, and a fighting a losing battle for Turkish side. Nasser gained popularity by this conference which gave him a prominent role in the Asian-African bloc as well as domestic support due to international prestige.

Turkey and Egypt also benefited from this regional polarization by struggling to become the leader of their sides. Nasser had instrumentalized these containment efforts in the region to improve Egyptian-Soviet relations, but also had been using his insistent objection to assure Western aids to Egypt (or credit

demands) by having an excessive indulgence to his policies to prevent further resistance. On the other side, Turkey also improved its position at NATO by virtue of its policies regarding the Middle East. This is because Turkey instrumentalized its foreign policy towards the Middle East to secure its position and proved its worth for Western countries, especially to the US. Turkey and Egypt were regarded as a gateway for both blocs in the region. Even in the 1960s, Prime Minister İnönü underlined this ongoing Turkish-Egyptian struggle as an instrument for promoting Turkey's position in the eyes of NATO allies.<sup>420</sup>

The confrontation between Turkey and Egypt became not only an instrument for regional affairs but also a domestic instrument for Nasser's consolidation of power and the personification of the revolution. While Nasser was consolidating his power; the instrumentalization of Turkey firstly came with an unexpected event with the Tugay Affair, but then as an inevitable choice in terms of regional confrontation and struggle for regional leadership. His anti-Turkey discourse worsened the bilateral relations over the years alongside with their struggle for dominant regional influence. His instrumentalization of Turkey can be understood under six factors: Turkey signified a historical "alien" or "other" and the Ottomans are accused of being a foreign invader. Turkey is both a NATO member and prominent country in the region; therefore any quarrel would target both its regional influence and the image of West in the region. Turkey and Egypt already had a troubled relationship before the revolution. The Western-oriented policies of Turkey were a clear contradiction with Nasser's neutralist stance. The Tugay Affair was an unexpected event but turned into a big asset for Nasser. He instrumentalized this quarrel for the personification of the revolution by considering any criticism against him as equal to criticizing the revolution and the regime. Thus, the Baghdad Pact and the Bandung Conference were regional and international stages of struggle for leadership and ongoing confrontation.

---

<sup>420</sup> Akdoğan quoted İnönü's assessment as: "We will never concern Nasser's relation with the Soviet Union; on contrary his alignment with the Soviets enhances our importance in the eyes of the US." Lütfü Akdoğan, **Krallar ve Başkanlarla 50 Yıl**, Vol.I, Ankara, Gazeteciler Cemiyeti Yayınları, 2012, p.248.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS & PUBLIC SPEECHES

*Kanunlar Dergisi*

*Nasser's Speeches*: <<http://nasser.org/Speeches/SpeechesAll.aspx>>

*Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi* (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi).

*Treaty Series No.6 (1937) Treaty of Alliance*, London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1937.

*Treaty of Peace with Turkey, signed at Lausanne, July 24, 1923*

*Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations in 1961*

### BOOKS

Abou-El-Fadl, Reem, *Divergent pasts, diverging choices: foreign policy and national building in Turkey and Egypt during the 1950s*, (DPhil thesis), University of Oxford, U.K., 2010.

---, *Rethinking the National Projects of Egypt and Turkey*, (Master's thesis), Oxford University, U.K., 2005.

Aburish, Said K., *Nasser: The Last Arab*, New York: St. Martin Press and Thomas Dunne Books, 2004.



Akdoğan, Lütfü, *Krallar ve Başkanlarla 50 Yıl, Vol.I*, Ankara: Gazeteciler Cemiyeti Yayınları, 2012.

Akşin, Aptülahat, *Atatürk'ün Dış Politika İlkeleri ve Diplomasisi*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991.

Alterman, Jon B., *Egypt and American Foreign Assistance 1952-1956*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Ampiah, Kweku, *The Political and Moral Imperatives of the Bandung Conference of 1955*, Folkestone: Global Oriental, 2007.

Antonius, George, *The Arab Awakening The Story of the Arab National Movement*, London: H. Hamilton, 1938.

Ardıç, Nurullah, *Islam and the Politics of Secularism The Caliphate and Middle Eastern Modernization in the Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century*, New York: Routledge, 2012.

Armaoğlu, Fahir, *20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi 1919-1995, Vol I-II*, İstanbul: Alkım Yayınevi, 2005.

Arnold, Sir Thomas W., *The Caliphate*, Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1924.

Aslan, Tamer, *Türkiye-Mısır İlişkileri: 1922-1981*, (unpublished master's thesis), Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey, 2013.

Ayyad, 'Abd al-'Aziz A., *Arab Nationalism and Palestinians 1850-1939*, Jerusalem: PASSIA, 1999.

Ateş, Ahmet, *1952-2011 Yılları Arasında Mısır Dış Politikası*, (unpublished master's thesis), Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey, 2012.

Bağcı, Hüseyin, *Türk Dış Politikasında 1950'li Yıllar*, Ankara: ODTÜ Yayıncılık, 2007.

Balfour-Paul, Glen, *The End of Empire in the Middle East*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Banerjee, Anil Chandra, *Two Nations: The Philosophy of Muslim Nationalism*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, 1981.

Bardakçı, Murat, *Neslişah Cumhuriyet Devrinde Bir Osmanlı Prensesi*, İstanbul: Everest Yayınları, 2011.

Berger, Morroe, *Bureaucracy and Society in Modern Egypt*, New York: Russell & Russell, 1957.

Bilgin, Pınar, *Regional Security in the Middle East: A Critical Perspective*, New York: Routledge, 2005.

Birand, Mehmet Ali, et.al., *Demirkırat: Bir Demokrasinin Doğuşu*, İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2007.

Blum, William, *Killing Hope, US military & CIA Interventions since World War II.*, London: Zed Books, 2004.

*Britannica Book of the Year 1953*, London: Encyclopaedia Britannica Ltd., 1953.

Botman, Selma, *Egypt from Independence to Revolution, 1919-1952*, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1991.

Bozdağlıoğlu, Yücel, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge Press, 2003.

Bulliet, Richard W., *Religion and the State in Islam: From Medieval Caliphate to the Muslim Brotherhood*, University of Denver Center for Middle East Studies Occasional Paper Series, Paper No. 2.

Campbell, John C., *Defense of The Middle East, The Problems of American Policy*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Carr, Edward Hallett, *What is History?*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

Choueiri, Youssef M., *Arab Nationalism A History*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

--- (ed.), *A Companion to the History of the Middle East*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Churchill, Winston S., *Europe Unite Speeches 1947 and 1948 by Winston S. Churchill*, Randolph S Churchill (ed.), London: Cassell, 1950.

Cohen, Michael J., *Strategy and Politics in the Middle East, 1954-1960: Defending the Northern Tier*, London: Frank Cass, 2005.

Cole, Juan R. I., *Colonialism and Revolution in the Middle East Social and Cultural Origins of Egypt's Urabi Movement*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Cook, Steven A., *Ruling but not Governing The Military and Political Development in Egypt, Algeria and Turkey*, Baltimore: John's Hopkins University Press, 2007.

Copeland, Miles, *The Game of Nations: The Amoral of Power Politics*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1969.

Daly, M.W. (ed.), *Cambridge History of Egypt Volume II, Modern Egypt, from 1517 to the End of the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet, *Stratejik Derinlik*, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2012.

Dawisha, Adeed, *Arab Nationalism in the Twentieth Century From Triumph to Despair*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2003.

DeFronzo, James V. (ed.), *Revolutionary Movements in World History From 1750 to the Present Vol.I.*, California: ABC-CLIO, 2006.

Dekmejian, Hrair Richard, *Egypt under Nasir; A Study in Political Dynamics*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1971.

---, *Patterns of Political Leadership: Egypt, Israel, and Lebanon*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1975.

Dikerdem, Mahmut, *Ortadoğu'da Devrim Yılları (Bir Büyükelçinin Anıları)*, İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1977.

--- *Üçüncü Dünyadan*, İstanbul: Cem, 1977.

Doran, Michael, *Pan-Arabism before Nasser Egyptian Power Politics and the Palestine Question*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Erden, Kürşat Nusret, *Menderes Dönemi Türkiye'nin Arap Ortadoğu Politikası*, (unpublished master's thesis), Dumlupınar University, Kütahya, Turkey, 2009.

Erhan, Çağrı, *Beyaz Savaş Türk Amerikan İlişkilerinde Afyon Sorunu*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1996.

Erim, Nihat, *Günlükler, 1925-1979, Vol.I*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2005.

Esmer, Ahmet Şükrü and Sander, Oral, *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası, 1939-1945 Dönemi, Vol.I*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1987.

Fawcett, Louise (ed.), *International Relations of the Middle East*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Gershoni, Israel and Jankowski, James, *Egypt, Islam and the Arabs: the Search for Egyptian Nationhood 1900-1939*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

---, *Redefining the Egyptian Nation, 1930-1945*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

---, *Rethinking Nationalism in the Arab Middle East*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Ginat, Rami, *The Soviet Union and Egypt, 1945-1955*, Portland: Frank Cass, 1993.

Goldschmidt Jr., Arthur, *A Concise History of the Middle East*, Colorado: Westview Press, 2002.

Gordon, Joel, *Nasser's Blessed Movement Egypt's Free Officers and the July Revolution*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Gönlübol, Mehmet and Ataöv, Türkkaya, *Turkey in the United Nations, A Legal and Political Appraisal*, Ankara: Ajans Türk Press, 1960.

Güler, E. Zeynep, *Arap Milliyetçiliği: Mısır ve Nasırcılık*, İstanbul: Yazılama, 2011.

--- (der.), Mahmut Dikerdem Eserler "Salon Verir Sokak Alırız", İstanbul: Yazılama, 2013.

Gürün, Kamuran, *Dış İlişkiler ve Türk Politikası (1939'dan günümüze kadar)*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1983.

Hahn, Peter L., *United States, Great Britain, and Egypt, 1945-1956: Strategy And Diplomacy In The Early Cold War*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Hail, J.A., *Britain's Foreign Policy in Egypt and Sudan, 1947-1956*, Reading: Ithaca Press, 1996.

Hale, William, *Turkish Foreign Policy since 1774*, New York: Routledge, 2013

Halliday, Fred, *The Middle East in International Relations, Power, Politics and Ideology*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Hanioglu, M. Şükrü, *Atatürk: An Intellectual Biography*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Hashmi, Y.A. (ed.), *Dr. I.H. Qureishi Memorial Lectures: Shari'ah, Ummah, and Khilafah*, Karachi: University of Karachi, 1987.

Hassouna, Mohamed Abdel Khalek, *The First Asian-African Conference held at Bandung, Indonesia (April 18-24, 1955)*, Cairo: Imprimerie Mısır S.A.E, 1955.

Hassouna, Moustafa El Said, *Leadership efficiency and Weberian charisma : the case of Gamal Abdel Nasser (1952-1970)*, University of Kent at Canterbury, 1990.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, *Philosophy of Right*, Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001.

Heykel, Muhammed Hasaneyn, *Kahire Dosyası*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1974.

Hinnebusch, Raymond and Ehteshami, Anoushiravan (eds.), *The Foreign Policies of the Middle East States*, Colorado: Lynne Rienner, 2002.

Hobsbawm, Eric J., *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780 Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Holt, P. M., et al., *The Cambridge History of Islam, I*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Hourani, Albert, *Arabic Thought in The Liberal Age: 1798-1939*, London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Hurewitz, Jacob Coleman, *Middle East Politics: The Military Dimension*, Colorado: Westview Press, 1982.

Ikram, Khalid, *The Egyptian Economy, 1952-2000 Performance, Policies, and Issues*, New York: Routledge, 2006.

Ismael, Tareq Y., *Middle East Politics Today Government and Civil Society*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001.

İnalçık, Halil, *From Empire to Republic Essays on Ottoman and Turkish Social History*, Istanbul: Isis Press, 1995.

James, Laura M., *Nasser at War: Arab Images of the Enemy*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Jankowski, James, *Nasser's Egypt, Arab Nationalism, and The United Arab Republic*, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.

Karpat, Kemal H., *Ortadoğu'da Osmanlı Mirası ve Ulusçuluk*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2001.

---, *Politicizaion of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

--- (ed.), *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition: 1950-1974*, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1975.

Kerr, Malcolm H., *The Arab Cold War, 1958-1964: A Study of Ideology in Politics*, London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Kiremitçi, Gamze Güner, *Otoriter rejimlerde karizmatik meşruiyet: Nasır Dönemi Mısır*, (unpublished master's thesis), Kadir Has University, Istanbul, Turkey, 2012.

Korany, Bahgat and Dessouki, Ali E. Hillal, *The Foreign Policies of Arab States: The Challenge of Globalization*, Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2008.

Kürkçüoğlu, Ömer, *Mondros'tan Musul'a Türk-İngiliz İlişkileri*, Ankara: İmaj Yayıncılık, 2006.

---, *Türkiye'nin Arap Orta Doğusu'na Karşı Politikası (1945-1970)*, Ankara: Barış Kitap, 2010.

Lacouture, Jean, *The Demigods: Charismatic Leadership in the Third World*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

Lacouture, Jean and Lacouture, Simonne, *Egypt in Transition*, London: Methuen & Co, 1958.

Laqueur, Walter, *The Soviet Union and the Middle East*, New York: Praeger, 1959.

---, *The Struggle for the Middle East*, London: The Macmillan Company, 1969.

Leffler, Melvyn P. and Westad, Odd Arne (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War (Volume 1: Origins)*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Levey, Zach and Podeh, Elie (eds.), *Britain and the Middle East: From Imperial Power to Junior Partner*, Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2008.

Lewis, Bernard, *The Emergence of the Modern Turkey*, London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

---, *The Shaping of the Modern Middle East*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Mansfield, Peter, *A History of the Middle East*, London: Penguin Books, 2003.

Marlowe, John, *Arab Nationalism and British Imperialism: A Study in Power Politics*, London: Crescent Press, 1961

Marsot, Ali Lutfi Al-Sayyid, *A History of Egypt From the Arab Conquest to Present*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2007.

---, *Egypt's Liberal Experiment 1922-1936*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.



Mattar, Philip (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of the Modern Middle East and North Africa Vol.I*, Michigan: Thomson Gale, Second Edition, 2004.

McGhee, George, *The US-Turkish-NATO Middle East Connection, How the Truman Doctrine Contained the Soviets in the Middle East*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

McNamara, Robert, *Britain, Nasser and the Balance of Power in the Middle East 1952-1967 From the Egyptian Revolution to the Six Day War*, London: Frank Cass, 2003.

Mitchell, Richard Paul, *The Society of the Muslim Brothers*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Morris, Benny, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881-2001*, New York: Vintage Books, 2001.

Nasser, Gamal Abdel, *Egypt's Liberation the Philosophy of the Revolution*, Washington D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956.

Oliver-Dee, Sean, *The Caliphate Question The British Government and Islamic Governance*, New York: Lexington Books, 2009.

Oran, Baskın, (ed.), *Türk Dış Politikası, Kurtuluş Savaşı'ndan Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Vol. I: 1919-1980*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2008.

Oren, Michael B., *The Origins Of The Second Arab-Israeli War: Egypt, Israel and the Great Powers, 1952-56*, New York: Frank Cass, 1992.

Ovendale, Ritchie, *The Origins of the Arab-Israeli Wars*, New York: Longman, 1992.

Owen, Roger, *State, Power and Politics in the Making of the Modern Middle East*, London: Routledge, 2004.

Özdemir, Seçil, *Demokrat Parti Dönemi Türk Amerikan İlişkileri ve Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu Politikaları*, (unpublished master's thesis), Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey, 2009.

Persson, Magnus, *Great Britain, the United States, and the Security of the Middle East The Formation of the Baghdad Pact*, Lund: Lund University Press, 1998.

Podeh, Elie, *The Politics of National Celebrations in the Arab Middle East*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

---, *The Quest for Hegemony in the Arab World The Struggle Over the Baghdad Pact*, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1995.

Podeh, Elie and Winckler, Onn (eds.), *Rethinking Nasserism Revolution and Historical Memory in Modern Egypt*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2004.

*President Gamal Abdel Nasser*, Cairo: Information Department Press, 1965.

Proctor, J. Harris (ed.), *Islam and International Relations*, New York: Preager, 1965.

Robins, Philip, *Turkey and the Middle East*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1991.

Roosevelt, Elliott, *As He Saw It*, New York: Greenwood Press, 1974.

Rubin, Barry, *The Tragedy of the Middle East*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Sander, Oral, *Siyasi Tarih 1918-1994*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2007.

---, *Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Melek Fırat (ed.), Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2013.

Sayed,-Ahmed, Muhammad Abd al-Wahab, *Nasser and American Foreign Policy: 1952-1956*, London: LAAM, 1989.

Sever, Ayşegül, *Soğuk Savaş Kuşatmasında Türkiye, Batı ve Orta Doğu 1945-1958*, Boyut Kitapları, İstanbul, 1997.

Seyyid Bey, *Hilafet'in Mahiyet-i Şeriyyesi*, Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Matbaası, 1923.

Shaked, Haim and Rabinovich, Itamar (eds.), *The Middle East and the United States Perceptions and Policies*, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1980.

Shlaim, Avi, *The Iron Wall Israel and the Arab World*, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2000.

Smith, Charles D., *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Smith, Simon C., *Ending Empire in the Middle East Britain, the United States and post-war Decolonization 1945-1973*, New York: Routledge, 2012.

--- (ed.), *Reassessing Suez 1956 New Perspective on the Crisis and its Aftermath*, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008.

Snyder, Richard C., Bruck, H.W. and Sapin, Burton, *Foreign Policy Decision Making*, New York: Free Press, 1962.

Soysal, İsmail, *İki Tarafın Bakış Açısından Türk-Arap Münasebetleri*, İstanbul: IRCICA, 2000.

Şehsuvaroğlu, Bedii Nuri, *Hekim Bir Siyasimizin Portresi, Büyükelçi Doktor A. Hulusi Fuad Tugay*, İstanbul: Hüsnütabiat Matbaası, 1972.

Taşpınar, Ömer, *Turkey's Middle East Policies Between Neo-Ottomanism and Kemalism*, Carnegie Papers, No.10, Washington DC, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Publications Department, 2008.

Telhami, Shibley and Barnett, Michael N. (eds.), *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, New York: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Tibi, Bassam, *Arab Nationalism Between Islam and the Nation State*, New York: St. Martin Press, 1997.

Toynbee, Arnold J., *Survey of International Affairs, 1925: Vol. I, The Islamic World Since the Peace Settlement*, London: Oxford University Press, 1927.

Tugay, Emine Fuat, *Bir Aile Üç Asır*, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2013.

Tunçay, Mete, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi'nin Kurulması (1923-1931)*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999.

*Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998.

Vatikiotis, Panayiotis Jerasimof, *Nasser and His Generation*, London: Croom Helm, 1978.

---, *The Egyptian Army in Politics Pattern for New Nations?*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961.

---, *The Modern History of Egypt*, New York: Praeger, 1969.

Waterbury, John, *The Egypt of Nasser and Sadat The Political Economy of Two Regimes*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983.

White, Nicholas J., *Decolonization: The British Experience Since 1945*, New York: Routledge, 2013.

Woollacott, Martin, *After Suez: Adrift in the American Century*, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2006.

Yaqub, Salim, *Containing Arab Nationalism The Eisenhower Doctrine and the Middle East*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Yeşilbursa, Behçet Kemal, *The Baghdad Pact Anglo-American Defence Policies in the Middle East, 1950-1959*, Oxon: Frank Cass, 2005.

Zeine, Zeine N., *The Emergence of Arab Nationalism*, New York: Caravan Books, 1973.

Zürcher, Erik-Jan and Atabaki, Touraj (eds.), *Men of Order: Authoritarian Modernization Under Atatürk and Reza Shah*, New York: I.B.Tauris, 2004.

## ARTICLES

Aboul-Enein, Youssef H., “Al-Ikhwan Al-Muslimeen: the Muslim Brotherhood”, *Military Review*, Vol.83, No.4, (July-August 2003), pp.26-31.

Alterman, Jon B., “American Aid to Egypt in the 1950s: From Hope to Hostility”, *Middle East Journal*, Vol.52, No.1, (Winter 1998), pp.51-69.

Ansari, Zafar Ishaq, “Contemporary Islam and Nationalism Case of Egypt”, *Die Welt des Islams*, Vol. 7, Issue 1/4, (1961), pp.3-38.

Aydın, Mustafa, “Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy: Changing Patterns and Conjunctures during the Cold War”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 1, (January 2000), pp. 103-139.

Badeau, John S., “A Role in Search of a Hero: A Brief Study of the Egyptian Revolution”, *Middle East Journal*, Vol.9, No.4, (Autumn 1955), pp.373-384

Bagley, F.R.C., “Egypt under Nasser”, *International Journal*, Vol.11, No.3, (Summer 1956), pp.193-204.

Baram, Amatzia, "Territorial Nationalism in the Middle East", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.26, No.4, (October, 1990), p.425-448.

Botman, Selma, "Egyptian Communists and the Free Officers: 1950-54", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.22, No.3, (July, 1986), pp.350-366.

Bullock, Walter F., "The Fight for the Caliphate", *The North American Review*, Vol.181, No.585, (August 1905), pp.229-236.

Bulut, Semih, "Atatürk Dönemi Türkiye-Mısır İlişkileri (1926-1938)", *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, Vol. XXVI, No.78, (November 2010).

Bush, Ray, "Consolidations for Dispossession and Networks of Resistance? Land, Politics and Agrarian Reform in Egypt", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.38, No.3, (December 2011), pp.391-405.

Bustani, Emile, "The Arab World and Britain", *International Affairs*, Vol.35, No.4 (October, 1959), pp.427-437.

Chejne, Anwar G., "Egyptian Attitudes Toward Pan-Arabism," *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 3, (Summer 1957), pp.253-268.

Colombe, Marcel, "Egypt Yesterday and Today", *Middle Eastern Affairs*, Vol. X, No.4, (April 1959), pp.134-150.

Coşar, Nevin and Demirci, Sevtap, "The Mosul Question and the Turkish Republic: Before and After the Frontier Treaty, 1926" *The Turkish Yearbook*, Vol. XXXV, 2004, pp. 43-59.

Coury, Ralph M., "Who Invented the Arab Nationalism? Part I", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 14, No.3, (August 1982), pp.249-281.

Çolak, Melek, "Türk Mısır İlişkileri Çerçevesinde Mısır'ın Atatürk ve Türk Devrimine Bakışı (1919-1938)" *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, No.6, (Spring 2010), pp.24-35.

Devereux, David R., "Britain, the Commonwealth and the Defence of the Middle East 1948-56", *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 24, No. 2, Studies on War, (April 1989), pp.327-345.

Dooley, Howard J., "Nasser and De Gaulle: Heroes in Search of a Role", *The History Teacher*, Vol.4, No.2, (January 1971), pp.48-53.

Erhan, Çağrı, "Hilal ve Sion Yıldızı Türk-İsrail İlişkilerinin Dünü ve Bugününe Kısa Bir Bakış", *Mülkiyeliler Birliği Dergisi*, Vol.21, No.202, (August-September 1997), pp.32-38.

Fatemi, N. Saifpour, "The United States in the Changing Middle East", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 294, America and a New Asia, (July 1954), pp.151-157.

G.E.K., "The Turco-Egyptian Flirtation of Autumn 1954", *The World Today*, Vol. 12, No. 11, November 1956, pp.447-457.

Gilead, Baruch, "Turkish-Egyptian Relations 1952-1957", *Middle Eastern Affairs*, Vol. X, No.11, (November 1959), pp.356-363.

Golani, Motti, "The Historical Place of the Czech-Egyptian Arms Deal, Fall 1955", Vol.31, No.4, (October, 1995), pp.803-827.

Gorgas, Jordi Tejel, "The Limits of the State: Student Protest in Egypt, Iraq and Turkey, 1948-63", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.40, No.4, (2013), pp.359-377.

Hamza, Mohamed Abdel Kader, "Egyptian foreign policy", *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol.6, No.1, (March 1953), pp.29-35.

Hattamer, Richard, "Atatürk and the reforms in Turkey as reflected in the Egyptian press" " *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1, January 2000, pp.21-42.

Hermann, Margaret G., "Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 1, March 1980, pp.7-46.

Hermann, Margaret G. and Hermann, Charles F., "Who Makes Foreign Policy Decisions and How: An Empirical Inquiry", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 4, December 1989, pp.361-387.

Hourani, Albert, "The Decline of the West in the Middle East-I", *International Affairs*, Vol. 29, No. 1, January 1953), pp.22-42.

Hudson, Valerie M., "Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations", *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Vol. 1 No. 1, March 2005, pp.1-30.

Jasse, Richard L., "The Baghdad Pact: Cold War or Colonialism?", *Middle East Studies*, Vol.27, No.1, (January 1991), pp.140-156.

Joffé, E.G.H., "Arab Nationalism and Palestine", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 20, No. 2, June 1983, pp.157-170.

Kedourie, Elie, "Egypt and the Caliphate 1915-1946", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 3/4, (October 1963), pp.208-248.

Kürkçüoğlu, Ömer, "An Analysis of Atatürk's Foreign Policy 1919-1938", *The Turkish Yearbook of international Relations*, Vol.20, 1980, pp.133-187.

---, "An Analysis of Turkish-Arab Relations", *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol.27, No.1, 1972, pp.117-134.

Laçiner, Sedat, "The Democratic Foreign Policy Approach (1950-1960)", *USAK Yearbook*, Vol.4, 2011, pp.109-157.

Lesch, David W., "Gamal Abd al-Nasser and an Example of Diplomatic Acumen", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 31, No..2, (April, 1995), pp.362-374.

Lewis, Bernard, "Islamic Revival in Turkey", *International Affairs*, Vol.21, No.1, (January 1952), pp.38-48.



MacMichael, Sir Harold, "Egyptian-Sudanese Relations", *Middle Eastern Affairs*, Vol. X, No.3, (March 1959), pp.102-108.

Mansfield, Peter, "Nasser and Nasserism", *International Journal*, Vol.28, No.4, (Autumn 1973), pp.670-688.

Mazrui, Ali A., "Africa and the Egyptian's Four Circles", *African Affairs*, Vol. 63, No. 251, April 1964, pp. 129-141.

Morsy, Laila Amin, "American Support for the 1952 Egyptian Coup: Why?", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 31, No.2, (April, 1995), pp.307-316.

---, "Britain's Wartime Policy in Egypt, 1940-42", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.25, No.1, (January, 1989), pp.64-94.

---, "The Role of the United States in the Anglo-Egyptian Agreement of 1954", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.29, No.3, July 1993, pp.526-558.

Okur, Mehmet, "Cumhuriyet'in İlk Yıllarında Türkiye-Mısır İlişkileri ve Mısırlı Bir Gazetecinin Gözüyle Mustafa Kemal Paşa", *Modern Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 8, No.3, 2011, pp.199-211.

Oren, Michael B., "Secret Egypt-Israel Peace Initiatives Prior to the Suez Campaign", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.26 No.3, (July, 1990), pp.351-370.

Özgiray, Ahmet, "Türkiye-Mısır İlişkileri (1920-1938)", *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, No. 11, 1996, pp.55-70.

Parker, J.S.F., "The United Arab Republic", *International Affairs*, Vol.38., No.1, (January 1962), pp.15-28.

Peretz, Don, "Nonalignment in the Arab World", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol.362, (November 1965), pp.36-43.

Podeh, Elie, "The Drift towards Neutrality: Egyptian Foreign Policy during the Early Nasserist Era, 1952-1955" *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 32, No.1, (January 1996), pp.159-178.

Range, Willard, "An Interpretation of Nasserism", *The Western Political Quarterly*, Vol.12, No.4, (December 1959), pp.1005-1016.

Razi, G. Hossein, "Legitimacy, Religion, and Nationalism in the Middle East", *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 84, No. 1, (March 1990), pp.69-91.

Sanjian, Avedis K., "The Sanjak of Alexandretta (Hatay): Its Impact on Turkish-Syrian Relations (1930-1956)", *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 4, (Autumn 1956), pp.379-394.

Selak Jr., Charles B., "The Suez Canal Base Agreement of 1954 Its Background and Implications", *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol.49, No.4, (October 1955), pp.487-505.

Sever, Ayşegül, "The Compliant Ally? Turkey and the West in the Middle East 1954-1958", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.34, No.2, April 1998, pp.73-90.

Soysal, İsmail, "The 1955 Baghdad Pact", *Studies on Turkish-Arab Relations*, Annual, 1990, pp.43-95.

---, "Turkish-Arab Diplomatic Relations after the Second World War (1945-1986)", *Studies on Turkish-Arab Relations*, Annual, 1986, pp.249-266.

Sönmez, Şinasi, "Cemal Abdün Nasır İktidarında Mısır-Türkiye İlişkilerinin Türk Basınına Yansımaları (1954-1962)", *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, No.43, Spring 2009, pp.491-516.

Spain, James W., "Middle East Defense: A New Approach", *Middle East Journal*, Vol.8, No.3, (Summer 1954), pp.251-266.

Şimşir, Bilâl N., "Fes Olayı Türkiye-Mısır İlişkilerinde Bir Sayfa (1932-1933)", *Belleten*, Vol.XLVIII, No. 189-190, (January-April 1984), pp.1-54.

Taha, Fawda A.A., “The Sudanese Factor in the 1952-53 Anglo-Egyptian Negotiations”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.44, No.4, (July, 2008), pp.603-631.

Tür, Özlem, “Türkiye ve Filistin – 1908-1948: Milliyetçilik, Ulusal Çıkar ve Batılılaşma”, *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol.62, No.1, pp.223-251.

Uzer, Umut and Uzer, Ayşe, “Diverging Perceptions of the Cold War: Baghdad Pact as a Source of Conflict Between Turkey and the Nationalist Arab Countries”, *The Turkish Yearbook*, Vol.36, 2005, pp.101-118.

Ülman, A. Haluk, “Türk Dış Politikası'na Yön Veren Etkenler (1923-1968) I”, *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol.23, No.3, 1968, pp.241-273.

Ülman, A. Haluk Ülman and Sander, Oral, “Türk Dış Politikası'na Yön Veren Etkenler (1923-1968) II”, *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol.27, No.1, 1972, pp.1-24.

Warburg, Gabriel R., “Islam and Politics in Egypt: 1952-80”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.18, No.2, (April, 1982), pp.131-157.

Wright, Quincy, “The Mosul Dispute”, *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol.20, No.3, (July 1926), pp. 453-464.

Yavuz, Fehmi, “Tarım ya da Toprak Reformu”, *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol.22, No. 2, pp.29-41.

Yılmaz, Mehmet Serdar, “Türkiye'deki Şapka ve Kıyafet İnkılâbının Mısır Kamuoyunda Yansımaları (1925-1932)”, *Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol.1, No.2, Fall 2005, pp.91-103.

## NEWSPAPERS

Abdel-Maguid, Sayed, “Past Example”, *Al-Ahram Weekly*, November 26, 2013.

*Al-Ahram*, “T̄arada sefir Turkiya min Maşr (Ambassador of Turkey expelled from Egypt)”, January 5, 1954.

*Al-Ahram*, “Nasser, Myself and the Muslim Brotherhood”, July 23, 2013.

*Al-Ahram Weekly*, “All the revolution's men”, Issue No. 595, July 18 – 24, 2002.

*Al-Arabiya*, “Egypt’s King Farouk: philanderer of family man?”, Paul Crompton, January 28, 2014.

*Al-Arabiya*, “King Farouk’s fabulous wealth”, Paul Crompton, January 30, 2014.

*Akis*, April 16, 1955.

*Akis*, September 11, 1954.

*Akşam*, “Ankara Palas’ta Verilen Ziyafet”, November 30, 1932.

*Akşam*, “Kahire elçimiz neden çıkarılıyor?”, January 05, 1954.

*Akşam*, “Mısır’da hükümet darbesi”, July 24, 1952.

*Akşam*, “Mısır’ın hareketine karşı sert tedbirler alınacak”, January 06, 1954.

Bardakçı, Murat, “İki sürgün yaşayan Neslişah Sultan askeri mahkemelerde yargılanmıştı”, *Hürriyet*, January 17, 2006.

Bardakçı, Murat, “Kahire’deki Unutulmuş Skandal”, *Habertürk*, September 23, 2011.

Bardakçı, Murat, “Müslüman Kardeşler’in liderinin bundan 26 sene önceki öngörüsü”, *Habertürk*, August 18, 2013.

*Cumhuriyet*, "Atlantik Paktına eşit haklarla iltihakımız", February 18, 1952.

*Cumhuriyet*, “İngiltere, Süveyş Kanalı’na yeni kuvvetler yığıyor” July 29, 1952.

*Cumhuriyet*, “Kahire Büyükelçimiz ve Mısır Basını”, November 25, 1953.

*Cumhuriyet*, “Kahire elçimiz geldi, iddialar yalandır, diyor”, January 08, 1954.

*Cumhuriyet*, “Kahire rezaleti bütün dünyada esefle karşılandı”, January 06, 1954.

*Cumhuriyet*, “Kahire rezaleti Meclis dışişleri komisyonunda”, January 12, 1954.

*Cumhuriyet*, “Mısır’da General Necib hükümet darbesi yaptı”, July 24, 1952.

*Cumhuriyet*, “Mısırın şaşılacak hareketi Elçimizi hudud dışı ediyor”, January 5, 1954.

*Cumhuriyet*, “Mısır Kralı Faruk tahttan feragat etti”, July 27, 1952.

*Daily Herald*, “Diplomatic Storm A Fez May Cause”, London, November 11, 1932.

Daver, Abidin, “Hükümetimizin Kazandığı Zafer,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 18, 1952.

*Empire News*, “Make no mistake...”, October 12, 1952.

*Evening Standard*, “Fuss Over a Fez”, November 11, 1932.

Fenik, Mümtaz Faik, “Mısır’daki Darbenin İçyüzü”, *Zafer*, July 26, 1952.

Fenik, Mümtaz Faik; “Türkiye ve Mısır”, *Zafer*, January 26, 1955.

Fenik, Mümtaz Faik “Yepyeni Bir Devre Giriyoruz”, *Zafer*, February 18, 1952.

Heikal, Muhammad Hassanein, “Proclamation of the Republic and the position of Muhammad Abdel Moneim”, *Al-Jazeera*, October 29, 2006.

*La Domenica del Corriere*, August 12, 1956.

*Milliyet*, “Atatürk’ün ilk portresi Mısır’da yazıldı”, February 8, 2011.

*Milliyet*, “Hükümetimiz dün Mısır’a bir nota verdi”, January 07, 1954.

*Milliyet*, “İngiltere, Mısır’ın iç işlerine müdahalede bulunmayacak”, July 29, 1952.

*Milliyet*, “Kardeş Mısır nihayet istiklaline kavuştu”, August 27, 1936.

*Milliyet*, “Meclis, Kuzey Atlantik Paktına İltihakımızı İttifakla tasvip etti”, February 19, 1952.

*Milliyet*, “Mısır Basını Fuat Hulusiye Hücum Ediyor”, November 25, 1953.

*Milliyet*, “Mısır, bir Orta Doğu paktına girmeyecek”, March 01, 1953.

*Milliyet*, “Mısır’da bir takım münafıklar mesele çıkardılar”, December 5, 1932.

*Milliyet*, “Mısır’da dün ordu iktidarı ele aldı”, July 24, 1952.

*Milliyet*, “Mısır hükümetininin dostluğa sığmayan bir hareketi Mısır Büyükelçimiz terke davet edildi”, January 05, 1954.”

*Milliyet*, “Türk-Mısır müşterek tebliği yayınlandı”, March 30, 1954.

Nadi, Nadir, “O’nun İzinde”, *Cumhuriyet*, August 17, 1952.

*Newsweek*, “Key to Middle East Future: What Happens Next in Egypt”, August 25, 1952.

*Newsweek*, “Washington Trends”, August 25, 1952.

Ortaylı, İlber, “Hiçbir zaman efsaneleşmedi”, *Milliyet*, September 25, 2011.

Raafat, Samir, “Neslishah Sultan 1921-2012”, *Al-Ahram Weekly*, May 10, 2012.

Sulzberger, Cyrus L., “Foreign Affairs”, *New York Times*, November 17, 1954.

*The Examiner*, “Mob Riots After Move by Farouk”, December 28, 1951.

*The Morning Post*, “Nations Quarrel Over A Hat”, London, December 8, 1932.

*The New York Times*, “Egypt Investigates ‘Anti-Nasser Plot’ ”, December 28, 1957.

*The New York Times*, “Tahseen Bashir, Urbane Egyptian Diplomat, Dies at 77”, June 14, 2002.

*Ulus*, “Kuzey Atlantik Paktına Resmen Girdik”, February 19, 1952.

Yalçın, Hüseyin Cahit, “Bir Benzeyiş”, *Ulus*, August 7, 1952.

## APPENDICES

### TURKISH SUMMARY

Eski dünyanın merkezinde olan ve son yüzyılda Orta Doğu olarak adlandırılan coğrafyada, Nil Havzası da Anadolu da her dönem için önemli güç merkezleri olagelmıştır. Bu anlamda bu iki önemli coğrafya üzerindeki devletlerin ilişkilerini değerlendirmek, sadece ikili diplomatik ilişkilerin ötesinde bölge siyasetine yön veren iki ülkenin etkileşimini ve politikalarının değişimi ortaya koyacaktır. Bu bağlamda, 1922 ile 1956 arasındaki Türkiye-Mısır ilişkilerini değerlendiren bu tezde sadece ikili ilişkiler değil aynı zamanda iki ülkenin bölge politikaları ve gerek bölge gerekse dünya siyasetinden nasıl etkilendikleri de ortaya konmaktadır. Aynı zamanda ikili ilişkilerin ilk yıllarını araştıran kısıtlı akademik çalışmalara katkı yapmayı hedeflemekte ve dar çevreye sıkışmış öncüllerinin aksine Türkiye ve Mısır'ın bakış açıları uluslararası ilişkiler disiplini çerçevesinde değerlendirmektedir.

Orta Doğu coğrafyasındaki bölgesel liderlik mücadelesi açısından Türkiye ve Mısır'ın tarihsel etkinliklerine değinildikten sonra tezin konusunu belirleyen tarih aralığının, 1922 ila 1956 arasındaki dönemin seçilme sebepleri giriş kısmında anlatılmıştır. Ardından daha önceki yıllarda yapılmış olan akademik çalışmalara ilişkin inceleme sunulmuştur. Giriş bölümünün bu kısımda önceki çalışmaların eksik bıraktıkları noktalar ve onların noksan yönleri açıklanarak bu çalışmanın literatürde gidereceği eksiklikler ifade edilmiştir. Belirtilen tarih aralığındaki ikili ilişkilere değinen çalışmaların değerlendirmesinin ardından Türkiye Mısır ilişkileri temel olarak 1922-1952 ve 1952-1956 dönemleri olmak üzere iki ana bölüme ayrılmıştır. Bu ayırım aynı zamanda 1952 yılındaki Hür Subaylar Devrimi'nin Mısır dış politikasına ve ikili ilişkilere etkilerini göstermek açısından da isabetli olmuştur. Tezin genelinde izlenen yöntem doğrultusunda, belirtilen dönemlerde taraflardan her birine ait Orta Doğu'ya yönelik dış politika anlayışını aktarmak ve iki ülkeyi



yakından ilgilendiren konular çerçevesinde ikili ilişkilerdeki sorun başlıkları üzerinden bir değerlendirme yapmak amaçlanmıştır.

1952 yılında gerçekleşen Hür Subaylar Darbesi'nin ikili ilişkilere etkilerini odak noktası olarak belirleyen bu çalışmada, devrim öncesindeki otuz yıllık dönem ilişkilerin arka planı olarak sunulmaktadır. Bu dönemde Mısır, Birinci Dünya Savaşı başında İngiltere'nin ilhakına uğramış; 1922 yılında ise İngiltere'nin tek taraflı ilanı ile bağımsızlığını elde etmiştir. Bu sürecin ardından Mısır politikasının temel belirleyicisi Mısır Kralı, Vafd Partisi'nin ağırlıkta olduğu Mısır Meclisi ve Mısır'daki güçlü İngiliz nüfuzu arasındaki güç mücadelesi olmuştur. Öte yandan bu dönemde hem Mısır kimliğinin içini doldurma hem de bölgede siyasetinde öncü bir rol oynama çabası yıllarca Mısır siyasetindeki tartışmaların ve özellikle dış politika tercihlerinin belirleyici unsurlarından olmuştur.

Türkiye'nin özellikle iki savaş arası dönemde Arap Orta Doğusu'na yönelik politikası kayıtsızlık olarak değerlendirilse dahi; aksine bu dönemde Türkiye'nin Orta Doğu'daki gelişmelere sınırlı bir dahiliyeti söz konusudur. Bu sınırlılığı belirleyen temel faktörler ise Türkiye'nin güvenlik kaygıları yanında aynı zamanda Kemalist modernleşme sürecine ait kaygılarıdır. Orta Doğu coğrafyası siyasi ilişkileriyle, kültürel gelenekleriyle ve toplumsal yapısıyla bu dönemin yönetiminin ardında bırakmak istediği ve modernleşmesine çabaladığı yapıyı yansıtmaktadır.

Bu şartlar altında, Türkiye ve Mısır arasındaki diplomatik ilişkiler 1925-1926 yıllarında karşılıklı olarak diplomatik görevlerin tesis edilmesiyle başlamıştır. Oysaki Türkiye ve Mısır'ın ilk teması 1923 yılında imzalanan Lozan Barış Antlaşması ile olmuştur. Türkiye'nin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndan bakiye Mısır üzerindeki hukuki haklarından feragat ettiğine ilişkin madde ve diğer ilgili maddeler sayesinde Mısır, Türk dış politikasının konusu olmuştur. Aynı zamanda bu feragatin 5 Kasım 1914 tarihinden itibaren geçerli sayılması da hem İngiltere'nin ilhakını hem de Mısır'ın bağımsızlık kararını hukuken meşrulaştırmıştır.

İkili ilişkilerdeki küçük çaplı sorunların yanında hilafet konusundaki anlaşmazlık bu dönemin en önemli ve uzun süreli sorunu olarak gösterilebilir. 1924 yılında halifenin halli ve hilafetin ilgası sonrasında gerek bu makamın mülgasına tepkiler, gerekse hilafetin Mısır Kralı için bir meşruiyet ve nüfuz aracı olabilirliği

açısından hilafet makamının yeniden tesisi için çabalar ortaya çıkmıştır. Mısır Kralı Fuad'ın ve ardından Kral Faruk'un da önemli rol oynadıkları bu çabalar İslam dünyasında herhangi bir uzlaşma sağlanamadığı için sonuçsuz kalsa da Türkiye'nin reformist kaygılarının had safhada olduğu bir konu olmuştur. Mısır'ın bu konudaki çabaları ve Türkiye'nin kaygılarının çatıştığı bu konu 1920'ler ve 1930'lar boyunca ikili ilişkilerdeki en önemli konu olmuştur. Bu bağlamda şu denebilir ki, Mısır bu dönemde Türkiye'nin reformist hassasiyetlerini kavrayamamış ve bunun dış politikaya yansımaları doğru değerlendirememiştir. Ayrıca dış politika kararlarına iç politikasındaki üçlü çekişmenin ve kimlik inşa sürecinin yansımalarına da izin vermiştir. Bu açıdan Türkiye'nin sınırlı dahiliyeti olan konuların arasına Mısır'ın hilafet çabalarının girmesine neden olmuştur.

Türkiye'nin güvenlik endişeleri ve yeni düzendeki kısa süreli yalnızlığı dolayısıyla İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında Türkiye ile Arap Orta Doğu'su arasında kısa süreli bir yakınlaşma yaşanmıştır. Bu yakınlaşma güneyden gelebilecek güvenlik tehditlerini bertaraf ederken aynı zamanda ilerleyen yıllarda Orta Doğu'daki etkinlik üzerinden kendi değerini kanıtlama çabalarının da ilk başarılı örneği olacaktır. Bu yakınlaşma sürecinin en önemli yansıması Arap-İsrail çatışmasındaki tutumu ve Birleşmiş Milletler Genel Kurulu'ndaki oy tercihlerinde görülmektedir. Türkiye ortaya çıkan Soğuk Savaş düzeninde kendine yer edindikçe bu ilişkilerin belirleyici Türkiye ile müttefikleri arasındaki ilişkiler olmuştur. Türkiye'nin Arap yanlısı tutumundan vazgeçmesi, bilhassa İslam dünyasından İsrail'i tanıyan ilk ülke olması ile Türkiye ile Arap Orta Doğu'su arasındaki ilişkiler duygusal bir kopuş yaşamıştır. Arap ülkeleri Türkiye'yi ihanetle suçlarken aynı zamanda sömürgecilerle işbirliği yapmakla suçlayarak eski egemen kimliğini öne çıkartmışlardır. Arap-İsrail sorununun en önemli taraflarından olan Mısır'da da bu durum benzer bir sonuç yaratmıştır.

Türkiye'nin Orta Doğu siyasetinde Batı faktörünün giderek baskın bir rol oynamaya başlamasıyla birlikte bu duygusal kopuşun yanında siyaseten bir kopuş olarak eklenecek unsur ise Orta Doğu savunma paktı çabaları ile oluşmuştur. Gerek Orta Doğu Komutanlığı çabalarında gerekse Orta Doğu Savunma Örgütü tekliflerinde Türkiye'nin verdiği destek ile başlayan bu kopma Bağdat Paketi'nin

kurulmasına kadar uzanmaktadır. Türkiye-Mısır ilişkileri açısından dikkat çeken unsur ise, bu tekliflerin Arap coğrafyasındaki esas muhatabının Mısır olması ve böylece Mısır ile Türkiye'nin bu süreç üzerinden yeni bir etkileşime girmesidir. Bu Mısır tercihindeki temel sebep mevcut bölgesel pakt çabalarındaki İngiliz anlayışının hâkim olmasıdır. Kuzey Kuşağı bağlamında Amerikan anlayışının öne çıkmasına kadar Mısır bu çabalarda hedeflenen ülke olmaya devam etmiştir. Mısır'ın itirazları ve teklifleri reddetmesi dolayısıyla Mısır Türkiye ilişkileri zarar görürken, 1952 öncesinden itibaren aslında bölge siyasetinde iki ülkenin izleyeceği çizgilerin uzlaşmaz biçimde farklılaşmaya başladığı ortaya çıkmıştır.

İkili ilişkilerin ilk yıllarındaki bazı küçük çaplı sorunlar ve hilafet tartışmaları, Soğuk Savaş konjonktürünün hâkim olduğu dönemde Arap-İsrail ilişkilerindeki farklılaşan tutumlar ve Orta Doğu'daki bölgesel pakt çabalarını göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, Türkiye ile Mısır arasındaki ilişkilerin sorunlu bir gidişata sahip olduğu tespiti yapılabilir. Bu anlamda Türkiye ile Mısır'ın 1950'lerdeki siyasi mücadelesinin öncesinde de iki ülke ilişkilerinin sorunlu seyri göz önünde bulundurulmalı ve bu salt İkinci Dünya savaşı sonrasına ait değil aynı zamanda iki savaş arası dönemde de görülebilecek bir sorunlu ilişkiler sürecidir.

1952 yılında Türkiye NATO'ya üye olurken Mısır'da da Hür Subaylar adına sahip idealist genç subaylardan oluşan örgüt yönetimi ele geçirmiştir. Her ikisi de iki ülkenin dış politika anlayışında belirleyici ya da mevcut tercihlerini güçlendirici etkileri bakımından kayda değer gelişmelerdir. Bu tezin odak noktası olan 1952 devriminin iki ülke ilişkilerine etkilerinin değerlendirilmesinin öncesinde, hem bu devrimin Mısır dış politikasına etkileri hem de Türkiye'nin 1950'lerdeki dış politika anlayışı üçüncü bölümde ele alınacaktır. Türkiye açısından 1950'lerdeki politikada belirleyici olan unsurların başında Batı faktörü ele alınmıştır. Bunun yanı sıra Demokrat Parti'nin 1950'de yapılan ilk özgür seçimlerde iş başına gelmesi sonrası değişen ya da devam eden dış politika anlayışlarına değinilmiştir. Türkiye'nin Orta Doğu'ya yönelik politikaları özelinde iç politikadaki değişimin, dış politikadaki gerek bölgesel gerek uluslararası sistem bağlamındaki etkenlerin yansımalarına kısaca değinilmiştir.

Hür Subaylar Devrimi'nin Mısır'daki yansımaları ise hem dış politikadaki anlayışı nasıl değiştirdiğini anlatmak hem de Türkiye ile olan ilişkileri nasıl etkilediğini göstermek açısından daha kapsamlı ele alınmıştır. Bu bağlamda 1952 ile 1954 yılları arasında Hür Subaylar devrimi sonrası oluşan yeni rejimin meşruiyet çabaları ve devrimin perde arkasındaki gerçek lideri olan Cemal Abdul Nâsır'ın liderliğini sağlama alma çabalarına değinilmiştir. Ayrıca Nâsır'ın Devrim Felsefesi kitabı bağlamında dış politika anlayışının nasıl şekillendiği ve hedeflerinin neler olduğu da analiz edilmiştir. Bu yeni rejimin dış politika tercihleri açısından 1952 sonrasında mısır'ın Sovyetler Birliği, ABD ve Birleşik Krallık ile olan ilişkilerine ve hatta İsrail ile olan temasına kısaca değinilmiştir.

Hür Subaylar Devrimi'nin Türkiye Mısır ilişkilerine etkisine bakıldığı dördüncü bölümde hem doğrudan ikili ilişkilere hem de 1954'te yaşanan kopuş sonrası bölgesel ve uluslararası ilişkiler üzerinden devam eden Mısır-Türkiye çekişmesine temas edilmiştir. Bu çalışmada 1952 yılındaki devrimden 1954'te Tugay Krizi'nin yol açacağı ilişkilerdeki kopmaya kadar iki ülke arasında bir yakınlaşmanın yaşandığı öne sürülmektedir. Devrimin kısa vadedeki bu etkisinin her iki ülke açısından da farklı gerekçeleri mevcuttur. Mısır açısından bakıldığında yeni rejimin meşruiyet ihtiyacı onu her türlü dış eleştiriden ve başka bir ülke ile çekişmeden uzak kalmaya ve diğer ülkeler açısından yeni rejimden umdukları Mısır tahayyülünün devamını sağlamaya itmiştir. Bu sebeple en sorunlu ilişkiye sahip olduğu İsrail ve Birleşik Krallık ile dahi olumlu bir iletişim kurulmuştur. Genel olarak bakıldığında ise tarafsızlık yanlısı bir politika izlenerek iki kutuplu sistemde bir geçiş politikası uygulamıştır. Bu bağlamda Türkiye hem bir NATO üyesi hem de bölge siyasetinin yeni aktif üyesi olarak bu olumlu seyir arayışından etkilenmiş ve mısır açısından olumsuz bir söyleme maruz bırakılmamıştır.

Türkiye açısından ise 1952 sonrası başa geçen Hür Subaylar Hareketi'ne temkinli yaklaşım mevcuttur. Fakat müttefiklerinin iyi ilişkiler kurmaya başlaması sonrası, Türk dış politikasındaki Batı faktörü bu konuda da Türkiye'nin mevcut çekincelerini ortadan kaldırmaya yetmiştir. Mısır'daki yeni rejime yönelik Türkiye'nin beklentileri ve yakınlaşmanın Türkiye açısından hazırlayıcıları de temel olarak iki grupta toplanabilir. İlk olarak Türkiye, yeni oluşan rejimin eskisine göre

yeni bir dış politika anlayışına sahip olacağını umuyor ve dolayısıyla özellikle Orta Doğu güvenliği ve bölgesel pakt konusunda daha uzlaşmacı bir tavır takınmasını bekliyordu. Batı faktörü ekseninde anlaşılabilir olan bu beklenti Mısır tarafından karşılanmadığı gibi uzun vadede de Batılı politikalara ve Türkiye'nin bölgedeki etkinliğine karşı çıkmaya dönüşecektir. Türkiye'nin beklentilerinin ikinci unsuru ise eski rejimle sorunlu ilişkilerinin yeni dönemde değişeceği umidir. Eski rejimle yaşanan anlaşmazlıkların yanında, Hür Subayların yönetimi ele geçirmesi sonrası giriştikleri reformlar yeni rejimin Türkiye'dekine benzer bir modernleşme yolunu takip edeceği beklentisini oluşturmuştur. Özellikle monarşinin kaldırılması ve cumhuriyetin ilanı bunun en önemli sebebidir. Bu dönemde yabancı basında yer alan haberlerde de darbenin görünürdeki lideri ve ilk Mısır Cumhurbaşkanı General Muhammed Necib, Mısır'ın Atatürk'ü olarak anılmaktadır. Gerek General Necib'in açıklamalarındaki Türkiye'ye ve Türk modernleşmesine yapılan övgü gerekse Türkiye tarafından Mısır'a yollanan olumlu mesajlar devrim sonrasında iki ülke arasında yakınlaşmanın temel belirleyicileri olmuştur.

Ocak 1954'te Türkiye'nin Kahire Büyükelçisi F.Hulusi Tugay'ın Nâsır ile girdiği söz dalaşı sonrası persona non grata ilan edilerek sınır dışı edilmesi ikili ilişkilerde kopmayı da beraberinde getirmiştir. Büyükelçi Tugay'ın talebine gerekse Mısır Hariciyesi'nin deindiği değişiklik talebine rağmen sabık Mısır Kralı Faruk'un kuzeni ile evli olan Tugay devrim sonrası bir buçuk yıla yakın süre görevde kalmaya devam etmiştir. Yaklaşan krizin ayak sesleri uzun süredir duyulmasına rağmen olayın yaşanması sonrası bir yıla yakın süre Türkiye ile Mısır arasındaki diplomatik ilişkiler yeniden tesis edilememiştir. 1954 yılındaki bu gelişme sadece ikili ilişkiler açısından değil, Mısır iç politikası açısından da önem taşımaktadır. Çünkü devrimin ardından muhalifleri kademe kademe tasfiye etmekte olan Nâsır artık doğrudan yönetimi eline almaya çalışmaktadır. Bu süreçte özellikle Genral Necib'in tasfiyesi ve kendi liderliğinin tesisi için iç politikadaki başarıları ve reformları, dış politikadaki kararları ve idealleri araçsallaştırmaktadır.

Bu açıdan bakıldığında Tugay'ın kendisine yönelik onur kırıcı sözlerinin ardından Tugay'ın uzun süredir devam eden devrime muhalif tavrı ile bu son hareketini birleştirmiş ve kendisine yapılan hakareti devrime yapılan bir hakaret

olarak yansıtmıştır. Uzun süredir Türk sefirinin rejim karşıtı gruplara destek verdiği iddialar, sefirin eşine yönelik asılsız ve aşağılayıcı ithamlar ve Türkiye'nin bölge politikasını eleştiren gazete yazıları çıktığı göz önüne alınarak Nâsır'ın bu çıkışı temellendirilmiştir. Böylece Nâsır'a hakaret devrime hakaret, Nâsır'ın liderliğini sorgulamak devrimin meşruiyetini sorgulamak ve benzeri pek çok paralellikler kurulmasına zemin hazırlanmıştır.

Devrim ile Nâsır'ın liderliğinin özdeşleştirilmesinin ve devrimin Nâsır'ın liderliği üzerinden kişileştirilmesinin yanı sıra Nâsır'ın liderliğini sağlama almasında da önemli bir adım olarak Tugay olayı değerlendirilebilir. O tarihe kadar toprak reformunda ve cumhuriyetin ilanında halkla temas kuran ve ön plana çıkan Nâsır ilk kez bir dış politika meselesini kendi liderliğini güçlendirmek için araçsallaştırmıştır. Daha sonraki yıllarda 1954'teki Tahliye anlaşması, 1955'te Bandung Konferansı'na katılımı, Bağdat Paktı'na yönelik eleştirilerini, Süveyş Kanalı'nı millileştirmesini her aşamada dış politika gelişmeleri olarak değil aynı derecede iç politikada ve hip ettiği bölge politikalarında karizmatik liderlik inşasında birer araç olarak kullanmıştır.

Bu bağlamda değerlendirildiğine Türkiye-Mısır ilişkileri ve Türkiye'nin Orta Doğu politikası artık Nâsır için araçsallaştırılabilir bir dış politika unsuru haline getirilmiş ve Mısır'ın bölge siyasetindeki konumunu meşrulaştırmada ve güçlendirmede başarılı da olmuştur. 1950'ler boyunca etkisine baktığımızda ise iki önemli gelişmeyi not etmek gerekir. 1954 sonrasında kopan ilişkiler yeniden tesis edilene kadar Nâsır iç politikada yerini sağlamlaştırmış, rakiplerini tasfiye etmiş ve "Üç Çember" olarak isimlendirdiği etkinlik alanlarında ve bilhassa Arap coğrafyasında etkinlik arayışı içine girmiştir. Türkiye'nin Orta doğu'da üstlenmek istediği batı destekli liderlik arayışı Nâsır'ın etkinlik arayışı ile çakışmış ve iki ülkeyi bölge siyaseti üzerinden o döneme kadar görülmemiş biçimde karşı karşıya getirmiştir. Bağdat Paktı'nın kurulması ile bu mücadele daha şedid bir hal almış ve Nâsır öncülüğündeki siyasi anlayışın karşısında Türkiye-Irak bloğu ile büyük bir karşıtlık ortaya çıkmıştır.

Tugay olayı sonrası ikili ilişkiler özellikle Bağdat Paktı üzerinden bölgesel gelişmeler çerçevesinde ve Bandung Konferansı üzerinden uluslararası sistemde

ortaya çıkan yeni gelişmeler ışığında değerlendirilebilir. Türkiye'nin politikalarına ve bölgedeki etkinlik arayışına karşılık emperyalizm, sömürgecilik ve İsrail karşıtı, aynı zamanda Arap milliyetçiliğinin ve hatta Pan-Arabizm'in bayraktarı olmuş Mısır, Bağdat Paktı üzerinden Türkiye'nin etkinlik alanını kısıtlamış ve Nâsır nüfuzunu giderek güçlendirmiştir. Öte yandan üçüncü dünyada yükselen bağlantısızlık anlayışında Mısır'ın devrim sonrasında itibaren savunduğu tarafsızlık siyaseti ile üç çember (nüfuz alanı) içindeki etkinlik arayışı uyuşmuştur. Dolayısıyla Bandung konferansı Nâsır açısından gövde gösterisi olmanın yanında üçüncü dünyadaki itibarını arttırmada ve Arap ülkelerinin liderliğine soyunmada bir başarı hikâyesi olarak yüceltilmiştir. Türkiye ise, Türk medyasında ifade edildiği gibi Nâsır ile düelloya girmiş ve üçüncü dünya siyaseti açısından mağlup fakat kendi bloğuna sadakat odaklı anlayış açısından tatmin olmuş biçimde Bandung Konferansı'nı geçirmiştir.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışmanın birinci bölümünü teşkil eden ve 1952 devrimi öncesi ilişkileri değerlendirmeyi ve sorunlu arka planı vurgulamayı amaçlayan ilk dönemde, Türkiye ve Mısır'ın iki savaş arası dönemdeki temel meselesi hilafet tartışmasıdır. İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında değişen dünya ve bölgesel koşulların yansıması ikili ilişkilerdeki sorun ya da yakınlaşma etkenlerini de değiştirmiştir. Öncesinde sınırlı müdahil olan Türkiye'nin kendisini sınırlandırdığı hassasiyet noktaları önemliken 1945 sonrasında Arap ülkeleri ile yaklaşması ve ardından Orta Doğu'daki etkinliği temel çatışma noktalarının oluşmasına sebep olmuştur. Öte yandan Mısır'daki üçlü siyasi çekişme ve kimlik inşasındaki farklı değerlendirmeler bölge politikasını etkilemiştir. Kimlik inşasında araçsallaştırılan "öteki" algısında ise eski hükümdar Türker'den önce İngilizler ve 1948 sonrasında da İsrail'in varlığı yer tutmuştur. Bu anlamda iki savaş arası dönemde sorunların sebebi Mısır'ın Türk karşıtlığı değil, Türkiye'deki reformların dış politikasına yansıtacak hassasiyetleri kavrayamamasında yatmaktadır. 1945 sonrası dönemde ise Mısır açısından temel hedef İngiliz nüfuzundan kurtulmak ve değişen konjonktürde sömürge kalıntılarını tasfiye etmektir. Bu anlamda Türkiye'nin de dahil olduğu bölgesel savunmaya ilişkin "Dörtlü" teklifler, mısır'ın hedefleriyle örtüşmemektedir.

Türk dış politikasında Batı faktörünün giderek baskın etmen olduğu yıllarda Mısır'da yaşanan devrim, Mısır'ın bağlantısızlık yanlısı bir politika izlemesine yol açmıştır. Bu da bölgede batı bloğunun bölge politikasının savunucusu olan Türkiye ile yeni rejimin ve yeni karizmatik lider Nâsır'ın bölgesel amaçlarıyla çatışmıştır. Devrim sonrasında her iki taraf açısından farklı gerekçe ve beklentilerle oluşan yakınlaşma Tugay olayı ile sona erse de aslında sonrasındaki çatışan bölgesel nüfuz mücadelesi sebebiyle uzun yıllar onarılamaz bir gergin ilişki ortaya çıkartmıştır.

Bu anlamda Türkiye-Mısır ilişkilerinin sorunlu seyrinde 1952-1954 arasındaki dönem istisnai bir yakınlaşma dönemi olarak not edilmelidir. 1954 yılında ilişkilerin kopmasına sebep olan Tugay olayı sadece dış politika açısından değil, iç politikadaki yansımaları ve özellikle Mısır'da Nâsır'ın kendi liderliğini sağlama almak ve devrimi kendi liderliğinde kişileştirmek ve somutlaştırmak için kullandığı ilk dış politika aracı olmuştur. İlişkilerin kopmasının ardından 1954-1956 yılları arasında iki ülkenin teması, Bağdat Paktı ve Bandung Konferansı üzerinden çelişen politikalarını göstererek anlatılmalıdır.

Türkiye-Mısır ilişkilerine dair son bir husus ise ilişkilerin sorunlu seyrine ilişkin söylenmelidir. Türkiye ile Mısır arasındaki ilişkiler Orta Doğu coğrafyasının iki güç merkezi arasındaki bir güç mücadelesinin doğal yansımasıdır. Türkiye ile Mısır da bölgede liderlik arayışında oldukları sürece çatışma içinde olagelmıştır. İkili ilişkileri tesisinden itibaren sorunlu bir seyir izleyen ilişkiler ne yalnızca Türkiye'nin İsrail'i tanınmasıyla ne de Batı bloğuna dahil olmasıyla kötüleşmiştir denebilir. Bu gelişmeler ve siyasi kararlar ancak mevcut sorunlu gidişatı daha da kötüleştiren unsurlar olmuş ve zamanla baskın belirleyici haline gelmişlerdir. Diğer bir husus da Hür Subaylar Devrimi'nin etkileri bağlamındadır. Devrimin lideri Nâsır'ın Orta Doğu'daki liderlik mücadelesi Türkiye ile kaçınılmaz bir güç mücadelesine neden olmuştur. Ancak bunun başlangıcı 1952 ile tarihlendirilemez. 1952 ila 1954 yılları arasındaki yakınlaşmayı değerlendirmelere katmamak ve güç mücadelesini kesintisiz ele almak Nâsır'ın liderliğin tesis ettiği dönemi ve bunun dış politikaya yansımalarını göz ardı etmek anlamına gelecektir. Ayrıca Türkiye'nin 1952 sonrasında Mısır'daki rejime karşı izlediği siyasette Batı faktörünün etkisini ve sorunlu geçmişten farklı bir seyir beklentisini göz ardı edilmiş olacaktır.



## TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

### ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

### YAZARIN

Soyadı : ÖTERBÜLBÜL  
Adı : SELİM  
Bölümü : ORTA DOĞU ARAŞTIRMALARI

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : TURKISH - EGYPTIAN RELATIONS (1922-1956)  
AND THE IMPACT OF THE FREE OFFICERS REVOLUTION

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans  Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: