

---

# Consumer Markets

By Shahan Kandaharian

Aztag Daily Lebanon - 17/1/2009

---

The tactical games of official statements that Turkey is playing over the events taking place in Gaza suffer inconsistency or better to say they lack harmony. Although it's a standard procedure to find open doors in the announcements or statements made by foreign ministers, nevertheless the obvious game of distribution of roles is seen in the harsh stances of prime minister Erdogan and the rather milder approach of the foreign minister Ali Babacan.

Indeed, there is a race of explaining and interpreting the statements made by Turkish officials over the events taking place in Gaza on Turkish Internet websites. Let's shed a light on the following points extracted from the news published by Turkish diplomatic sources:

A- Turkish diplomacy is not ready to condemn Israel and go forth with the demands of sanctions against it.

B- It's more logical and helpful for Turkey to prefer the strategic thinking.

C- It's not easy to keep at the same distance from Israel as Syria and Iran are keeping.

Before comparing the contents of the statements issued by the Turkish diplomacy and the announcements made by the prime minister, let us try to simplify what is being tried to convey through diplomacy. In a simple and explicit way the following is being said: Turkey's strategic cooperation is obliging the Turkish state to continue to put its interests above any other factor or obligation. Moreover, the third point mentioned above, being a natural continuation of the first two, must capture the attention of the observers of not only the Gaza events but also the Turkish movements and regional developments.

Here it is. Setting aside the mention of Iran for a while, let's remember that Turkey was aspiring to play a major mediatory role in the talks between Syria and Israel. On the days of the proclaimed war over Gaza, the highest chief of Turkish diplomacy considered the Israeli sudden attack as an insult against Turkey, thereby halting the negotiations.

Now, what is being said exactly? The mediator announces that it cannot keep the same distance from both Syria and Israel. The latter is its strategic partner while the former is a country classified in the same group as Iran (that's the stance adopted by the West). In the practice of the international relationships it may be difficult to identify examples where the country that has adopted a mediatory mission explicitly announces that it cannot keep the same distance between the opposing sides, based on its interests.

This observation is still not enough to underline the contradictions recorded among the different sections of the Turkish executive authorities. Prime minister Erdogan sided with the people of Gaza with a surprising zeal. Moreover, he presented himself with the "crime against humanity" announcement, which has legal and political implications, in front of the media representatives.

The responsibility for "a crime against humanity" is discussed on international stages. Otherwise, it would be limited to the field of

propaganda or, as is the case here, it would be aimed at specific consumer markets. It's enough to read the speech of the Turkish foreign minister during the discussions of the UN resolution 1860 on Gaza; it not only lacked the mention of any crime against humanity but also it included a clear effort to keep a balance between the opposing sides.

It seemed that the strategic game that Turkey had initiated could last a little longer. Different representatives of the same country proved by their statements that it was just a short-term endeavor directed towards both the Turkish public and the Arab world. There are signs to believe that time will prove that it is so.

---