

Negative Perceptions of Jews in Turkish Politics: An Analysis of the Parliamentary Debates between 1983 and 2016

Turkay Salim NEFES

Abstract

What are the political roots of the anti-Jewish rhetoric? This study analyses the perception of Jews in Turkish politics to address this ever-important query. Building on group position theory and the historical background of the Turkish-Jewish relations, the research proposes that right-wing ideological orientation and perceived threats can predict negative perception of Jews. It scrutinises the Turkish parliamentary proceedings by quantitative and qualitative content analysis. The findings support the premise. The study concludes that discussing about perceived threats tends to evoke the negative rhetoric and right-wing ideological orientation seems to be a predictive factor for the expression of such views. This implies that an effective management of perceived threats would decrease the frequency of anti-Jewish statements in Turkish politics.

Keywords: anti-Semitism; parliamentary proceedings; political parties; group position theory; Sèvres syndrome; Turkey

Why do politicians encourage hostility towards other religious groups? According to a substantial sociological perspective, group position theory (Blumer 1958; Bobo 1999), dominant groups' perception of threat to their prerogatives can explain their hostility. This perspective mainly analyses the developed world and pays attention to the sizes of minority populations and worsening economic conditions. While it provides invaluable insights, it has some limitations: (a) it lacks analyses of the historical backgrounds of intergroup hostility; (b)

it does not bring sufficient examples from less developed countries; and (c) very few studies (e.g. King and Wiener 2007) benefit from group position theory to explain hostility towards Jews, despite being one of the most widespread forms of prejudice. This research addresses the latter scholarly gaps (b and c) by analysing the relationship between perceived threats and Turkish political parties' descriptions of Jews and the first gap (a) by accounting for the historical background of the hostility towards non-Muslims in Turkey. The study relies on the following definition of Jews: 'any person belonging to the worldwide group that constitutes, through descent or conversion, a continuation of the ancient Jewish people, who were themselves descendants of the Hebrews of the Old Testament' (Britannica 2018).

Turkey provides an interesting context, because although the local Jewish population has declined below 1%, this did not end the negative political rhetoric. After the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, non-Muslim minorities gradually emigrated from the country (Akturk 2017). Their overall population reduced from 19.2% in 1914 to 0.2% in 2005 (Içduygu et al. 2008). Various scholars underlined the Turkish state's exclusionary policies (e.g. İçduygu & Soner 2006; Nefes 2018a) as the main reason for the emigration pattern. The academic literature provides contrasting perspectives on the perception of Jews in Turkey. On the one hand, various studies argue that the country has always been a generous host to Jews (e.g. Lewis 1984; Shaw 1991). They give examples of tolerance, such as the Ottoman emperor Bayazid II's formal invitation to the persecuted Jews from Spain in the 15th century. On the other hand, others posit that Turkish politics and society is replete with anti-Jewish sentiments (e.g. Bali 2001; 2006; 2009). Given that ethnic and religious hostility is a central concern in the geopolitical region, it is imperative to explore the contexts and factors that evoke the negative perception of religious minorities in Turkish politics.

This research focuses on the Turkish parliamentary proceedings between 1983 and 2016. Relying on quantitative and qualitative content analysis, it examines how members of the

parliament (MPs) describe Jews and what contexts encourage negative remarks about Jews. Building on group position theory and the historical prevalence of anti-Jewish attitude in Turkish right-wing politics, the paper proposes that perceived economic/national/religious threats and right-wing ideological orientation are important predictors of hostility towards Jews in Turkish parliamentary politics. The research develops the scholarship in various ways. First, it expands our knowledge about group position theory by bringing evidence from macro-level parliamentary politics, using mixed methods in a complementary manner and accounting for the historical background of the perceived security threats. Second, the study contributes to the scholarship on the perception of Jews by being one of the few researches that shows the strength of the group position theory in explaining the anti-Jewish political rhetoric. Third, for using the Turkish parliamentary proceedings between 1983 and 2016, the study is one of the few systematic analyses on the perception of minorities in contemporary Turkish politics.

The paper begins with providing a brief historical background of the Turkish perception of Jews. Then, it brings together the academic literatures on the Turkish perception of Jews and group position theory to provide a novel theoretical perspective. Subsequently, the study outlines the research context, procedures and the methodological choices. Last, it presents the main findings and discusses their implications.

A brief history of the Turkish perception of Jews

The analysis should be informed by the experience of the community during the Ottoman Empire (1299-1923). According to Lewis (1984), the most significant Jewish migration wave to the Ottoman Empire took place following their expulsion from Spain and Portugal in the fifteenth century. The Sephardic Jews mainly migrated to the cities, such as Salonika, Edirne and Izmir. Jews lived under the millet system in the Ottoman Empire, which recognised the community as a religious minority and gave them independence in fiscal, religious and

educations affairs (Barkey 2008; İçduygu & Soner 2006). The Ottoman Jews were organised around the authority of the Chief Rabbi. Despite their autonomy, they were in a subordinate position to the Muslim ruler, paying extra taxes and could not serve as state officers (İçduygu et al. 2008; Zürcher 2004). This system gradually ended during the collapse of the Ottoman rule in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. It was completely abolished after the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923.

The Ottoman Jews lived in a relatively tolerant environment, as their presence was seen as beneficial by the authorities (Shaw 1991). Jewish bankers and tax farmers had a prominent place in the Ottoman economy (Inalcık & Quataert 1997). Lewis (1984) added that as the major enemy of the Ottomans were Christians, Jews received more sympathy. In line with this view, Cohen (2014) showed that towards the end of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Jews were seen as a model community, whose members were loyal servants of the empire. One of the noteworthy events that could support this perspective is Sultan Abdul Mecid's response to the blood libel accusations by the Christian communities (Lewis 1984). To stop the discrimination against the Jewish minority, the sultan issued an order in 1840, which assured that in such cases the Ottoman court would investigate the claims and provide justice (Shaw 1991, p. 200).

The collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the subsequent creation of the Turkish Republic on 29 October 1923 meant a drastic change in the legal status of the Jewish minority. The establishment of the republic was marked by the signature of the Lausanne Peace Treaty in 1923 following the Turkish Independence War (1919-1923). This treaty promised a continuation of the rights of the millet system and offered autonomy to the religious minorities. Toktaş (2005) claimed that the republican elite did not want to give this much autonomy, as it contrasted their quest to create a homogenous Turkish society. Aviv (2017) argued that the Jewish community feared from the Turkish state pressure and renounced these rights. The Armenian and Greek minorities also followed. This meant their transition to the modern

citizenship, which promised them an equal position as the citizens of Turkey. Nevertheless, as attested by many events, the equality in law did not match *de facto* treatment of these minorities. For example, on 6-7 September 1955, an act of mass violence against non-Muslim minorities took place in Istanbul. Kuyucu (2005) underlined that the event showed the Turkish state's unequal treatment of the religious minorities, as the state did not give adequate economic compensation for the looted shops to the effected members of the minorities.

In addition, there is an ongoing ideological hostility of the far-right Islamist and Turkish nationalist groups against Jews (Bali 2001; Landau 1988; Nefes 2015a; 2015b). One of the early events that the Islamists' hostility dates back to is Theodor Herzl's request to Sultan Abdulhamid II to buy Palestine in 1899 to establish a Jewish settlement (Shaw 1991). This was rejected by the sultan, and in 1908, he was toppled. Some Islamist circles interpret this as a Jewish revenge for not selling Palestine. The enmity continued during the modern Turkish republic period. Prominent intellectuals of the right-wing, such as Islamist Necip Fazıl Kısakürek (2013), and Turkish racist Hüseyin Nihal Atsız (1934) described Jews in anti-Semitic terms as a nefarious enemy of Turks. In the 2000s, the books with anti-Semitic themes, such as *Efendi* series (Yalçın 2004, 2006), became best-sellers in Turkish book market implying a move towards mainstream Turkish culture. Although Yalçın defines himself as a secular and socialist author, there is no historical prevalence of the anti-Semitic theme in left-wing politics of Turkey comparable to the right-wing. Accordingly, this study expects Turkish-nationalist and Islamist MPs to be more likely to utter anti-Jewish sentiments in the parliament.

Understanding the negative perception of Jews via perceived threats

The academic literature on Turkish perception of Jews can be divided into two main perspectives. One line presents a tolerant, multicultural atmosphere. They conceptualise anti-Semitic events as exceptions, which are likely to come from marginal groups (Levy 1994; Shaw

1991; Toktaş 2006). Galanti (1947) and Shaw (1991) added that Jews have been exemplary citizens in return to the tolerance. In a more recent study, Toktaş (2006) interviewed Turkish-Jews about the treatment of the community and found that anti-Semitism is infrequent and taking place on individual level prejudices. An alternative perspective challenges this view. They argue that anti-Semitism is a mainstream phenomenon in Turkey and Turkish-Jews are seen as a foreign group (Bali 2001; 2008; Brink-Danan 2012; Haker 2003). İçduygu et al. (2008) proposed that the nation-building process in Turkey excluded the religious minorities and only included the Turks and Muslims in the definition of the nation. In parallel, in his analysis of the World and European Values Survey data (1999–2002), Dixon (2008) found that Turkish people are less tolerant of minorities compared to the people in EU member and candidate states. We can transcend this scholarly division about the perception of Jews in Turkey by drawing on the systematic evidence in the parliamentary records, which can elucidate the political reasons for the negative perception. Group position theory can guide such an endeavour.

Group position approach proposes that ethnic prejudice emerges from dominant group members' perception of outgroups as a threat to their prerogatives (e.g. Blumer 1958; Bobo 1999; Olzak 1992). The theory is basically broken down to two premises: (a) dominant group members see themselves entitled to have certain rights and privileges; (b) any perception of threat to these prerogatives would incline members of the dominant group towards negative prejudices about subordinate groups. That is to say, group position theory links social position to dominant group members' perception of others. It builds on Blumer's (1958) work that views the root of prejudice in the perceived social position. Blumer stated that four kinds of feelings are present in prejudiced attitude: (1) dominant group's superiority; (2) the essential difference of the subordinate groups; (3) dominant group's proprietary claim to certain areas of privilege and advantage; (4) fear about other groups' designs on their privileges. Blumer (1958)

prioritised the third feeling, as he saw prejudice as a defensive reaction against dominant group members' perceived threat to their prerogatives. That is, prejudice is a protective device, historically and collectively developed to defend social positions.

Group position theory expects that negative attitudes toward out-groups would grow with an increase in their populations and deteriorating economic conditions. The empirical research focuses predominantly on dominant groups' perception of economic threats and sizes of minority groups (e.g. Blalock 1956; Dixon 2010; Meuleman et al. 2009). This micro-level emphasis on individuals' perceived economic threats is plausible considering that most of these studies focus on the developed parts of the world. Nevertheless, it sets a limitation, as the historical, political and contextual influences on prejudice are not sufficiently analysed. Quillian (1995; 1996) stressed the importance of the historical and cultural components of the relationship between dominant societies and outgroups. While attempting to account for the impacts of significant historical processes, such as the Civil Rights movement in attitudes towards African-Americans in the United States, Quillian (1996) stated that precise measures of these factors are not available. Further, the scholarship needs to focus on less developed countries, where the social dynamics of prejudice could differ. Using group position theory, this study not only contributes to the literature on the Turkish perception of Jews with a systematic perspective, but also develops the group position scholarship by focusing on macro-level politics in a fresh context. It also advances the theoretical understanding of the reasons behind anti-Jewish rhetoric.

One of the well-known historical resources for the perceived political threats in Turkish politics is the Sèvres syndrome, the anxiety about external enemies in collaboration with minorities to carve up the Turkish Republic (Göçek, 2011; Nefes 2012; 2013; 2018b). It originated from the Ottoman downfall at the end of the First World War. The Ottoman Empire signed the Treaty of Sèvres with the Allies in 1920, which was annulled in 1923 at the end of the Turkish

Independence War (1919-1923). The Sèvres treaty had severe conditions, which divided the current borders of Turkish Republic among Armenians, Kurds, Greeks, French and Turks. It meant the empire's ultimate collapse and therefore, generated a significant ontological anxiety about dismemberment by foreign powers and minorities in modern Turkish politics, called the Sèvres syndrome. The first line of the national anthem can be read as an example to this anxiety: 'No Fear! For the crimson flag that proudly ripples in this glorious twilight, shall not fade'. Various scholars underlined the significant impacts of the Sèvres syndrome in various areas, such as the perception of Europe and the European Union (Aydın-Düzgit 2016; 2018; Yilmaz, 2011), anti-Semitism (Nefes 2015c) and Turkish intellectuals' perception of society, politics and world affairs (Guida 2008). In parallel, Çelik et al. (2017) found that perceived threats are successful predictors of increased levels of social distance and dislike among identity groups in Turkey. All in all, the Sèvres syndrome left an ongoing anxiety about being conspired against by foreign powers and minorities in modern Turkey. Building on the theoretical insight of the group position theory and the historical background of the Sèvres syndrome, the study analyses how Turkish MPs describe Jews in their speeches, which are related to economic, national and religious threats.

Methodology

The study analyses the Turkish parliamentary proceedings between 1983 and 2016. The main reasons for choosing the parliamentary records are as follows: (1) they present systematic information by containing all mentions of Jews in the parliament; (2) they bring evidence from mainstream politics, and therefore, provide valuable data on the general perception of Jews; (3) they encompass speeches of various political parties and illustrate the varieties in the perception of Jews among different groups; (4) parliamentary discussions are often on the most important issues in Turkey, and this allows us to see the rhetoric about Jews in significant political debates; (5) the records contain all policy debates, and thus demonstrates the political

rationale of the policies with regards to Jews; and (6) they constitute an under-explored resource in the scholarship on the perception of minorities in Turkey. Hence, the main advantage of using this material is that it provides an under-explored and all-inclusive insight into the mainstream political rhetoric about Jews in Turkish politics. In addition, thanks to the online availability of parliamentary records in many countries today, it can open the way to international comparative studies on the political communication of ethno-religious hostility. The main disadvantage of using the parliamentary records is that they do not contain evidence on the perception of Jews among political groups that were not represented in the parliament. Nevertheless, given that the political parties in the parliament were elected by the majority of votes, the proceedings comprise representative evidence on the perception of Jews in Turkish politics.

The study relies on a theory-based content analysis (Bonoma & Rosenberg 1978) and mixes quantitative and qualitative techniques to give a comprehensive examination of the main argument. As the number of analysed speeches is 476, it is not feasible to give a full account via a solely qualitative approach. Indeed, quantitative analysis presents an overall picture by providing statistical evidence about the extent to which perceived threats and ideological orientation are relevant to the negative descriptions of Jews. Subsequently, a qualitative analysis shows the ways MPs described Jews and justified their accounts. This does not only afford comprehensive evidence, but also help to check the validity and reliability of the quantitative results.

Various studies underline the advantages of mixed-method content analysis (Cabrera & Reiner 2018; Chi 1997; Onwuegbuzue 2003). Of particular importance is the process of quantizing, assigning numerical values to non-numerical data (Sandelowski et al. 2009). I and a research assistant (RA) coded the content in the Turkish parliamentary proceedings into quantitative categories. The unit of analysis was individual speeches. First, I collected all the (N=476)

speeches in the Turkish parliamentary proceedings between 1983 and 2016 that contain the word Jew: *Yahudi* and *Musevi*. Second, I created three main categories by analysing the entire speeches of MPs in which they referred to Jews. I and the RA looked at (a) how MPs described Jews [whether negatively or not]; (b) MP political party affiliation as an indicator of the ideological standpoint; (c) the debate topic, such as religious education or national security, in which Jews were mentioned to analyse whether discussing threat-related topics trigger negative views. We separately coded qualitative texts into these categories. Then, I conducted the quantitative and qualitative content analyses.

I and the RA double coded the material to ensure the reliability and validity of the study (Hayes & Krippendorff 2007). To measure the level of reliability, the study calculated both percentages of agreements of the coders as well as Scott's pi, which accounts for the probability of agreeing by chance (Potter & Levine-Donnerstein 1999). The results demonstrate that, with regards to the debate titles, we had 100% agreement (Scott's $\pi=1.0$). The high-level of agreement might be due to the clear presentation of the title in the parliamentary speeches. About the comments on the perception of Jews, there was 86.9% simple inter-coder agreement (Scott's $\pi=.68$), which also shows a high-level of reliability. Neuendorf (2002) finds simple agreement levels of 80% and higher as acceptable for most variables. The reason for the high rate of agreement between coders might be due to the dual categories of opposite stances, which simplified the coding process. Overall, these present strong indicators of validity and reliability.

Threat, ideology and perception

The study scrutinises five threat related debates (see Table 1 below) in which the word Jew was mentioned. While doing so, it reveals the ways MPs portrayed Jews when they were reflecting on economic, national and religious threats. To start with, the research focuses on the parliamentary discussions about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, such as the Israeli territorial

expansion¹, the Al-Aqsa Intifada between 2000 and 2005² (BBC 2008), the Mavi Marmara flotilla incident in 2010³ (Saltzman 2015) and the 2014 Gaza conflict⁴ (BBC 2015).

Table 1. Topics of Turkish parliamentary debates related to perceived threats

Debate	Nature of threat
Israel-Palestine conflict	Religious, National
Kurdish problem in Turkey	National
National security	National
Non-Muslim charity property ownership rights	National
Economic corruption	Economic

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict was framed as a religious and national security threat by the MPs, because it was seen as a danger to Islam and/or linked to politicians' fears that Israel has a hidden desire to invade some parts of Turkey. Thus, it could evoke the negative rhetoric about Jews. Second, the Kurdish question is considered as one of the most important security threats in Turkey. The parliamentary discussion on this topic reflected on different phases of the Turkey-PKK (*Partiya Karkerên Kurdistanê* - Kurdistan Workers' Party) conflict (1978-) (Unal 2016) and its potential reasons, such as lack of human rights. The perceived security threats could be associated with a negative perception of foreign powers including Israel. Third, there

¹ This refers to Israeli settlements, inhabited almost exclusively by Jewish citizens of Israel and are established mainly on Palestinian lands that are occupied by the Israeli Army since the Six-Day War in 1967.

² The Al-Aqsa Intifada refers to the Palestinian uprising against Israel. It began following Ariel Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount Complex in 2000, the site of the Dome of Rock and the Al-Aqsa Mosque, before his election as the prime minister of Israel. Palestinians perceived this as a provocation, because the Al-Aqsa Mosque is considered a holy site for Muslims.

³ The incident occurred after the death of activists, including Turkish citizens, as a result of a military operation by Israel to a Turkish owned civilian ship, Mavi Marmara, in the Mediterranean Sea. It resulted in a diplomatic tension between Turkey and Israel.

⁴ This refers to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict during the Israeli Defence Force's Operation Protective Edge in 2014. BBC (2015) reported that 67 Israeli soldiers and six civilians were dead, and 1462 civilians were among the losses of the total of 2251 people on the Palestinian side.

were other debates about national security: threats to Turkish sovereignty and the problems of the Turkish police force, which could trigger politicians' perceived security threats and negative rhetoric about Jews and Israel as a potential enemy. Fourth, the study examines the discussions about the property rights of the non-Muslim foundations of the Armenian, Greek and Jewish minorities between 2002 and 2008. The suggestions to improve the property rights were often framed as a security threat and could lead to negative comments about the non-Muslim minorities. Last, the study scrutinises the speeches about economic corruption, which includes various corruption allegations to business people, state officials and politicians. These allegations warned about important economic threats in the country and could evoke negative rhetoric by being linked to conspiracy theories about alleged Jewish domination in world economy and the stereotype about crook Jewish business people.

Another important variable is political ideology. The speakers' political party affiliations are taken as an indicator of ideological orientation. To that end, I prepared a four-point identification scale (seen Table 2 below). The right-wing political parties are the Turkish nationalist MDP (*Milliyetçi Demokrasi Partisi* - Nationalist Democracy Party), MHP (*Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi* - National Action Party) and political Islamist parties. The Islamists come from a single movement, *Millî Görüş* (National Vision), and the different parties were necessities in response to the state closure. In 1998, the Constitutional Court of Turkey banned the RP (*Refah Partisi* - Welfare Party) from politics for violating the secular separation of religion and state, which led to the creation of the FP (*Fazilet Partisi* - Virtue Party). The FP was also banned by the same court for the same reason in 2001. The centre-right ideology is attributed to the political parties that define themselves liberal, namely ANAP (*Anavatan Partisi* – Motherland Party), DYP (*Doğru Yol Partisi* - True Path Party) and AKP (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi* - Justice and Development Party). It should be added that although the founders of the AKP came from the political tradition of the National Vision, they broke away

with it to establish the AKP. They defined themselves as conservative liberals and therefore were placed in the centre-right. Social democratic political parties of CHP (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi -Republican People’s Party), HP (*Halkçı Parti* - Populist Party) and SHP (*Sosyal Demokrat Halkçı Parti* - Social Democratic People's Party), which claim to continue the legacy of the founding father Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, are viewed as the centre-left. The only left-wing political parties in the parliament are from the Kurdish movement. Like the Islamists, they are represented by various political parties because of the state closures with the exception of the BDP (*Bariş ve Demokrasi Partisi* - Peace and Democracy Party), dissolved by the movement to be succeeded by the HDP (*Halkların Demokratik Partisi* - People’s Democratic Party). The Constitutional Court of Turkey banned the DEP (*Demokrasi Partisi* - Democracy Party) in 1994 and the DTP (*Demokratik Toplum Partisi* - Democratic Society Party) in 2004 for having links with the PKK. It should be noted that the ideological identification scale is an approximation of the overall ideological position of the political parties that does not take into account minor shifts in time and the differences in the ideological profiles of individual MPs (see Uluğ & Cohrs 2017). While it illustrates the general picture of the ideological differences, it is not an all-encompassing account. Regardless, the political parties have not changed their position significantly in the scale in the period of the analysis.

Table 2. Turkish political parties: ideological orientations and years in parliament

Right-wing	Centre-right	Centre-left	Left-wing
MHP (1999-2002; 2007-)	ANAP (1983-2002)	CHP (1995-1999; 2002-)	DEP (1993-1994)
MDP (1983-1986)	DYP (1987-2002)	HP (1983-1985)	DTP (2007-2009)
RP (1991-1998)	AKP (2001-)	SHP (1985-1995)	BDP (2009-2014)
FP (1998-2001)			HDP (2014-)

We coded the perception of Jews into two categories, because understanding the factors contributing to the negative perception necessitates the distinction between negative and non-negative remarks. Negative comments are any statements that associate Jews with negative attributes and characteristics. For example, while talking about an alleged incident of Israeli soldiers' beating of a Palestinian child to death, İsmail Köse (DYP) suggested that 'Turkish state should condemn the ruthless, Jewish servant of capitalism'⁵. The non-negative statements are positive and neutral descriptions of Jews. An example to the positive description can be found in the speech of Cevat Ayhan (RP), where he criticised the leadership in Turkey: 'Three million Jews governed their country much better than Turkish politicians'⁶. The non-negative views are neutral comments about Jews: in his discussion of religious freedom, Temel Karamollaoğlu (FP) praised that 'most of our Jewish citizens send their children to synagogues to teach their religion'⁷.

Overall effects of ideological orientation and perceived threats on the perception of Jews

Table 3 below illustrates that apart from the right-wing MPs, politicians' remarks about Jews tend to be non-negative most of the time. In contrast, right-wing MPs use negative remarks in the majority of their contributions: 90 speeches used negative descriptions, while 68 talks contained non-negative rhetoric. This implies that right-wing political orientation could predict the anti-Jewish remarks in Turkish politics.

⁵ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 18, Legislative Year 1, Sitting 16 (02.02.1988), p. 55.

⁶ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 19, Legislative Year 4, Sitting 32 (10.11.1994), p. 198.

⁷ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 21, Legislative Year 3, Sitting 73 (22.03.2001), p. 240.

Table 3. Frequency of remarks about Jews by ideological orientation of Turkish MPs, 1983-2016

Party ideology	Total remarks		Negative remarks		Non-negative remarks	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Right-wing	158	33.2	90	62.5	68	20.5
Centre-right	132	27.7	18	12.5	114	34.3
Centre-left	133	27.9	31	21.5	102	30.7
Left-wing	53	11.1	5	3.5	48	14.5
Total	476	100	144	100	332	100

Since the study covers a long period between 1983 and 2016, one might question to what extent specific political events and periods make a difference in politicians' approaches. To address that inquiry, Table 4 below outlines the frequency of negative/non-negative remarks between the 17th and 26th parliamentary periods. In Turkey, each parliamentary period is expected to last four years between general elections. In certain cases, early elections took place. For example, in our dataset, there is no mention of Jews in the 25th period, because it lasted less than four months. As Table 4 shows, in all periods, we see that negative comments were less than the non-negative ones. There was not a specific period that drastically changed the general balance between negative and non-negative rhetoric. Nevertheless, the frequencies and the ratios of the negative and non-negative comments showed some variation in time. This could be due to various factors, such as the number of MPs in the parliament changed from 400 in the 17th term to 450 in the 18th and 19th periods and then to 550 in the subsequent periods, which might have increased the frequencies. It could be added that important events, such as the Mavi Marmara incident in 2010, might have contributed to these variations. All in all, while certain contexts might have contributed to the variations in the frequencies and ratios, they

were not robust enough the change the overall balance between the negative and non-negative rhetoric.

Table 4. Frequency of remarks about Jews by Turkish MPs 1983-2016, by parliamentary period

Period & Year	Total remarks		Negative remarks		Non-negative remarks	
	Count	% within period	Count	% within period	Count	% within period
17 (1983-87)	13	100	5	38.5	8	61.5
18 (1987-91)	18	100	5	27.8	13	72.2
19 (1991-95)	94	100	42	44.7	52	55.3
20 (1995-99)	36	100	12	33.3	24	66.7
21 (1999-02)	63	100	10	15.9	53	84.1
22 (2002-07)	36	100	2	5.6	34	94.4
23 (2007-11)	84	100	25	29.8	59	70.2
24 (2011-15)	102	100	36	35.3	66	64.7
26 (2015-16)	30	100	7	23.3	23	76.7
Total	476	100	144	30.3	332	69.7

A binary logistic regression analysis helps to understand to what extent ideological orientation and perceived threats can predict the negative perception of Jews in the parliamentary debates. The model includes the threat related discussions (economic corruption, Israel-Palestine conflict, Kurdish question, non-Muslim charity property ownership, security threats) in which the word Jew was mentioned as well as the ideological orientations (right, centre-right, centre-left, left) of the political parties who referred to Jews in their speeches. Both variables are very significant predictors of the negative perception (see Table 5). Moreover, the odds ratios demonstrate that if the word Jew was mentioned in a discussion on threat-related topics, it is between 2.9 and 12.5 times more likely than any other topics that the Jews are described in negative terms. If the speakers (MPs), who cited the word Jew, are from the right-wing (the reference category), it is between 7 and 12 times more likely than the other ideological views (centre-right, centre-left, left) that they will describe Jews negatively, as seen in the odds ratios of the other ideological perspectives. All in all, the full model clearly shows that being a

member of a right-wing political party and discussing about threat-related topics are reliable indicators predicting negative remarks about Jews.

Table 5. Binary logistic regressions of Turkish MPs' negative perception of Jews, 1983-2016

	B (SE)	Odds ratio	95% confidence interval	
			Lower	Upper
Economic corruption	2.533*** (.649)	12.596	3.533	44.901
Israel-Palestine conflict	1.768*** (.322)	5.861	3.118	11.015
Kurdish problem	1.549*** (.407)	4.705	2.120	10.446
Non-Muslim property ownership	1.071* (.433)	2.920	1.250	6.819
Security threat	2.408** (.904)	11.108	1.889	65.319
Centre-right ideology	-2.019*** (.326)	.133	.070	.252
Centre-left ideology	-1.354*** (.284)	.258	.148	.451
Left ideology	-2.524*** (.532)	.080	.028	.227
Constant	-.448* (.199)	.639		

Note: $R^2 = .32$ (Hosmer & Lemeshow), .259 (Cox & Snell), .367 (Nagelkerke).

Model $\chi^2(8) = 147.70$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

An in-depth analysis of how Turkish MPs portrayed Jews

This section focuses on the threat-related debates to demonstrate how MPs' ideological orientations and threat perception relate to their perception of Jews.

The Israel-Palestine conflict

MPs reflected on the Israel-Palestine conflict, especially the events that triggered or followed violence. The debates were about Israeli state's policies in Palestine, the Al-Aqsa Intifada, the Mavi Marmara flotilla incident, and the 2014 Israel-Gaza conflict. The politicians tended to condemn Jews or Israel. When they linked the conflict with their perceived religious and national threats, they predominantly used negative terms about Jews. The right-wing political parties, which mentioned the word Jew while discussing the topic, were the Turkish nationalists (MDP and MHP) and the political Islamists (RP, FP and SP). The nationalists used the word Jew negatively as the oppressors of Palestinians and as a potential threat to national borders.

For example, Rifat Bayazıt (MDP) claimed that ‘Jews could invade here as they did in Palestine’⁸. In parallel, the Islamists framed the Israel-Palestine conflict both as a religious and national threat and blamed Jews. Cevat Ayhan (RP) was furious that ‘we [Muslims] left Karabagh to Armenians, Palestine to Jews, Bosnia to Serbs... and did not stand up against European countries, who caused all these disasters’⁹. Like the nationalists, the Islamists warned that Israel has a secret agenda to establish a Greater Israel, which includes a part of the Southeast Turkey.

While the centre-right political parties (DYP, ANAP, AKP) were not as critical as the right-wing, their general tone was often negative particularly with regards to the violence perpetrated against Palestinians. Ali Kul (AKP) stated that ‘Turks [Ottoman Empire] welcomed the persecuted Jews in the 15th century, a momentous example of tolerance. In contrast, today, Jews kill our Palestinian sisters and brothers in the Gaza strip without any remorse despite the protest of the entire world’¹⁰. Nonetheless, various MPs from the centre-right political parties carefully distinguished between the state of Israel and Jews and did not comment negatively about Jews. Egemen Bağış (AKP) reminded that ‘for centuries, we [Turks] live peacefully with Jews, Armenians, Greeks and other minorities. Our non-Muslim citizens are also critical of the Israeli violence’¹¹.

The centre-left political parties (CHP, SHP) and the independent MP, Kamer Genç, whose ideological orientation is also centre-left, contributed to the discussion. Their descriptions were neutral, as they condemned Israel, not Jews. Onur Oymen (CHP) declared that ‘we understand that the Turkish public is angry about “the Mavi Marmara incident”, although we hope that this

⁸ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 17, Legislative Year 1, Sitting 71 (29.05.1984), p. 87.

⁹ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 19, Legislative Year 4, Sitting 142 (18.07.1995), p. 337.

¹⁰ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 23, Legislative Year 3, Sitting 49 (27.01.2009), p. 699.

¹¹ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 23, Legislative Year 3, Sitting 40 (06.01.2009), p. 67.

will never turn into violence against our Jewish citizens'¹². Some MPs from the centre-left became critical of an Anti-Defamation League (ADL), a Jewish non-governmental organization in the United States that aims to 'stop the defamation of the Jewish people, and to secure justice and fair treatment to all' (Anti-Defamation League 2018), award to Erdoğan. Tanju Ozcan (CHP) questioned that 'how could Erdoğan claim that he supports Palestinians, if he does not renounce his Jewish Courage award?'¹³

Overall, these findings are in line with the argument that right-wing political ideology and perceived threats are significant predictors of the negative rhetoric about Jews. The right-wing MPs viewed the Israel-Palestine conflict as a threat to Muslims as well to Turkish national borders, i.e. the Sèvres syndrome. The centre-right had a more liberal attitude. While some of them reacted to the Israel state's violence against Palestinians by describing Jews negatively, the others were more tolerant. The centre-left took a neutral stance that did not link the Jewish identity with perceived threats.

The Kurdish question

The parliamentary debates on the Kurdish question were on the historical background and potential reasons of the Turkey-PKK conflict. During these discussions, when politicians reflected on their perceived national security threats about dismemberment, they tended to portray Jews in unfavourable terms, most often as a foreign conspirator. To begin with, the Turkish nationalists had a negative view of Jews, describing them as enemies. İsmet Büyükataman (MHP), quoting the well-known Turkish racist, Nihal Atsız (1905-1975), criticised the AKP government's attempts to end the Kurdish question with a peaceful solution: 'Atsız warned: "If a Jew becomes the Minister of Finance, he will fill his pocket... and make

¹² TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 23, Legislative Year 4, Sitting 109 (01.06.2010), p. 19.

¹³ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 24, Legislative Year 4, Sitting 122 (21.07.2014), p. 80.

a grandson of a Kurdish separatist, Sheikh Sait, Prime Minister.” Evocatively, we witness that Sheikh Sait is treated as a hero today’¹⁴. The Islamists contributed to this rhetoric. Necmettin Erbakan (RP), the founder of *Millî Görüş*, repeatedly claimed that Jews have been involved in the conspiracy that triggered the Kurdish question: ‘...foreign powers are behind this terror. It is a part of the Zionist ideology... They train Jews and Armenians, who can speak Kurdish, to encourage our people in the southeast [Kurds] to rebel against the Turkish state’¹⁵. Abdullah Gül (RP) shared this perspective: ‘It is the same conspiracy as the one that took place in Palestine 50 years ago’¹⁶.

The centre-right described Jews in negative and neutral terms. In line with the right-wing, their negative comments posited that Jews took part in the conspiracy that triggered the Kurdish question. İsmail Köse (DYP) suggested that ‘with the help of Armenians, Greeks and Jews, Saddam Hussein used the PKK to kill our civilians and security forces’¹⁷. Their neutral comments often argued that while Jews are a minority in Turkey, Kurds have equal status with Turks. Mehmet Nedim Budak (ANAP) stated that ‘they will not achieve to divide us [Kurds and Turks]. We do not have different cultures... We only have Armenians, Greeks and Jews as minorities, certified by the Lausanne Treaty’¹⁸. The centre-left mentioned Jews in a neutral way, as a part of the cultural mosaic of Turkey. Algan Hacaloğlu (CHP) underlined that ‘as our Jewish citizens can use Ladino in education; as our Armenian citizens can use Armenian in their schools... if our Kurdish citizens would like to have education in Kurdish, it should be allowed’¹⁹. In parallel, Abdurrahman Küçük (DSP) expressed his pride in the Ottoman history

¹⁴ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 24, Legislative Year 5, Sitting 26 (11.12.2014), p. 15.

¹⁵ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 19, Legislative Year 1, Sitting 89 (26.06.1992), p. 198.

¹⁶ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 19, Legislative Year 2, Sitting 51 (24.12.1992), p. 411.

¹⁷ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 19, Legislative Year 1, Sitting 59 (23.03.1992), p. 271.

¹⁸ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 19, Legislative Year 1, Sitting 57 (21.03.1992), p. 78.

¹⁹ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 20, Legislative Year 3, Sitting 96 (02.06.1998), p. 45.

for welcoming of the persecuted Jews in the 15th century: ‘The Sultan Bayazid invited them by stating that all the oppressed people of the world are welcome to this country’²⁰.

The left-wing pro-Kurdish political parties mentioned Jews in neutral terms as another minority in three manners. First, they implied that Kurds merit democratic rights more than the non-Muslim minorities. Mehmet Emin Sever (DEP) stated that ‘Kurds helped to save this country by fighting in Canakkale, Cyprus, in the East, but they do not have the right to live their own culture... Do they have to be a Christian, Jew or Greek to deserve it?’²¹ The second is by underlining equality between all people. Hüda Kaya (HDP) criticised the Turkish government for a military operation in the majority Kurdish populated Southeast Turkey: ‘Our Lord says: you should care for your neighbour. No matter Jewish, atheist, Christian, Kurdish... we shall not make a group of people suffer’²². Third, the MPs used the Holocaust as an example of Kurdish suffering. Idris Balüken (HDP) stated that ‘in the Dersim massacre’²³, the Turkish state had shameful and unlawful acts, only equalling to Hitler’s acts during the Holocaust’²⁴.

In short, we see a decline of negative comments from the right-wing to the left. Right-wing MPs mentioned Jews in 15 speeches on this topic, and in 14 of them, they used negative rhetoric; centre-right MPs mentioned Jews in 9 speeches, and in 4 of them, they used negative rhetoric. Centre-left and left-wing MPs did not make negative comments in their 14 speeches. Moreover, the negative perception is justified with perceived threats about a Jewish conspiracy, reminiscent of the Sèvres syndrome, because it often presents Jews as important agents of the international plots to dismember Turkey.

²⁰ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 21, Legislative Year 3, Sitting 49 (25.01.2001), p. 8.

²¹ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 19, Legislative Year 3, Sitting 79 (03.03.1994), p. 384.

²² TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 26, Legislative Year 1, Sitting 25 (07.01.2016), p. 4.

²³ The Dersim massacre refers to the Turkish military operations in the Dersim region, now called Tunceli, between 1937 and 1938, which resulted in a high death toll of rebellious Kurdish tribes and civilians.

²⁴ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 24, Legislative Year 2, Sitting 84 (28.03.2012), p. 25.

National security

The debates about national security were on the potential threats and problems of the security forces. In these discussions, MPs tended to describe Jews in negative terms, especially as a foreign enemy. The Turkish nationalists portrayed Jews as a threat. Nevzat Kormaz (MHP) mocked the AKP government for the Jewish security business in Turkey: ‘Well done! 170 hundred thousand men with guns are under the command of... the Jewish economic capital’. The Islamists underlined the perceived threats of the Greater Israel for the national borders. İbrahim Kumaş (RP) noted that ‘it is written in the Torah that “I gave you a country from the Nile to the Euphrates”’²⁵. From the centre-right, the AKP gave a positive multicultural description that portrayed Jews as a part of the communities which helped to establish the Turkish Republic. Bülent Arınç (AKP) stated that ‘our ancestors from different backgrounds waged a war to secure our independence. Many of them were Armenians, Jews and Christians’²⁶. The centre-left made a neutral comment with a negative undertone. While warning about national security threats, Bülent Baratalı (CHP) mentioned that ‘the ex-Foreign Minister of the United States, who was a Jew, Brezinsky, stated that one should control Eurasia to be able to control the world’²⁷. As in the previous debates, the right-wing had the most negative attitude, as they related Jews to security threats, which was at times about dismemberment anxiety, i.e. the Sèvres syndrome. The centre-right and centre-left did not share this perspective.

Non-Muslim foundations’ property ownership rights

Between 2002 and 2008, there were parliamentary debates about the legal improvements in the property ownership rights of the non-Muslim minority foundations of the Armenian, Greek and

²⁵ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 19, Legislative Year 3, Sitting 50 (20.12.1993), p. 705.

²⁶ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 22, Legislative Year 3, Sitting 73 (22.03.2005), p. 16.

²⁷ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 22, Legislative Year 3, Sitting 116 (23.06.2005), p. 665.

Jewish communities in Turkey. In line with the prevalent fears of dismemberment, the MPs often saw the debate as a security threat and tended to describe Jews in negative terms for undermining Turkish sovereignty. The MPs, who did not see any threats in the legal changes, did not use the negative rhetoric. To begin with, Turkish nationalists saw this as a security threat and made negative remarks about Jews and the other non-Muslims. Hasan Çalış (MHP) argued that the minorities would continue asking for more rights until ‘they remove all Turks from Anatolia’²⁸. The Islamists also had a predominantly negative tone and described the Jewish foundations as a security threat. İbrahim Halil Çelik (RP) stated that ‘Jews see the south-eastern city Urfa as a part of the Promised Land and pose threat to the region’. Nevertheless, some MPs had a more liberal approach. Abdullah Gül (RP) celebrated the existence of the non-Muslim minorities as a part of cultural richness of the country.

The centre-right took a more liberal approach. Mehmet Ali Şahin (AKP) reminded the equality of legal rights between the all citizens of Turkey: ‘They can be Greeks, Armenians or Jews, but they are Turkish citizens... This law ensures equality between all citizens of Turkey’²⁹. The centre-left political parties (DSP, CHP) and the independent MP Kamer Genç supported the equality and the integration of all different groups into the Turkish identity. Ahmet Tan (DSP) stated that ‘these religious people are Turkish citizens, and their legal rights are under the protection of the Turkish Constitution’³⁰. The pro-Kurdish left-wing reminded that Turkey has to tolerate minorities and secure equal rights. Gülten Kışanak (HDP) stated that ‘equal citizenship is secured by law’³¹. To sum up, the right-wing showed a predominantly negative attitude towards Jews by seeing them as a part of security threats. They objected to the

²⁸ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 23, Legislative Year 2, Sitting 65 (14.02.2008), p. 31.

²⁹ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 23, Legislative Year 2, Sitting 55 (29.01.2008), p. 167.

³⁰ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 21, Legislative Year 4, Sitting 125 (02.08.2002), p. 78.

³¹ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 23, Legislative Year 2, Sitting 64 (13.02.2008), p. 55.

suggestions to improve the property rights of the minorities as a dismemberment threat, the Sèvres syndrome. The other political actors did not share this tendency.

Economic corruption

The MPs debated about various cases of alleged economic corruption. They framed these cases as significant economic threats to the country and tended to portray Jews in negative terms, particularly as corrupt business people. The right-wing Islamists and Turkish nationalists viewed Jewish business as an economic threat. Sevket Kazan (RP) warned about the involvement of the Turkish-Jewish capital in the telecommunication business: ‘these are the corporates of Hayim Erkohen, Yasef Malki, and Nesim Malki. They are all Jews. They are the former bosses of Mr Caglar [another MP] ... Mr Çağlar is dependent on these Jews’³². The nationalists portrayed Jews in a similar manner: Hüseyin Erdal (MHP) argued that Turkey ‘wasted billions of dollars by buying F-16 jets from an American-Jewish corporate... as their planes keep crashing’³³.

The centre-right also used the word Jew: Erkan Mumcu (ANAP) took a neutral approach and argued against racism towards economic capital. He underlined that money ‘has no religion, ethnicity or race’³⁴. Muharrem Ince (CHP) and Kamer Genç (independent) from the centre-left also linked economic corruption to Jewish business. Further, a member of the left-wing HDP, Altan Tan, gave a negative account: ‘the world economy is ruled by Jews and Israel, and the government cannot raise its voice against them’³⁵. In line with the previous discussions, the right-wing tended towards making negative comments by linking Jews with economic threats. Unlike the other debates, the centre-left and left-wing also shared this negative attitude.

³² TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 19, Legislative Year 1, Sitting 86 (23.06.1992), p. 197.

³³ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 19, Legislative Year 4, Sitting 50 (22.12.1994), p. 694.

³⁴ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 22, Legislative Year 4, Sitting 11 (25.10.2005), p. 50.

³⁵ TBMM, *Tutanak Dergisi*, Term 24, Legislative Year 4, Sitting 56 (04.02.2014), p. 52.

Conclusion

The findings support the main premise that right-wing ideological orientation and perception of economic, national and religious threats are significant elements of the negative descriptions of Jews in Turkish politics between 1983 and 2016. The descriptive quantitative analysis presents that the right-wing Islamists and Turkish nationalists more frequently referred to Jews in negative terms. It also clearly illustrates that specific periods, political events and contexts did not make a very significant difference in politicians' approaches to Jews, as the general proportions of negative/non-negative rhetoric did not change drastically in parliamentary periods between 1983 and 2016. In addition, the binary logistic regression analysis confirmed that being from the right-wing political parties and debating about threat related topics are statistically significant predictors of the MPs' negative remarks about Jews. Qualitative analysis complements these results. It demonstrates that the right-wing political parties justify their negative descriptions of Jews by portraying them as agents of the threats. For example, during the debates on the Kurdish question, most right-wing and some centre-right politicians based their negative descriptions on a conspiratorial view that Jews in collaboration with other foreign powers were behind the problem. The only exception is the discussion about economic corruption, where the centre-left and left-wing political parties also had a negative attitude towards Jews. This could be due to the prevalence of the cultural stereotype about crook Jewish business people among all political circles. Another reason could be that the small numbers of speeches on this debate from the left and centre-left, which totals to four.

The conclusion that underlines the significance of perceived threats and right-wing ideological orientation in the anti-Jewish political rhetoric is in line with the findings of various studies. Brink-Danan (2012, p. 58) noted that Turkish-Jews developed their community life on a basic principle of avoiding being seen as a threat and supported centre-left political parties: they 'practice a quiet cultural citizenship less threatening to a state that directly or indirectly

supports a classic Turkish republican (Kemalist) ideology, in which difference is a private matter'. Future studies could test the validity of the argument by examining the impact of ideological orientation and threat perception on the approach towards other minorities, such as Kurds and Armenians. This would not only provide a fresh approach to understand the roots of hostility towards other ethnic and religious groups but could also bear important policy outcomes especially given that the exclusionary politics was one of the reasons for the diminished numbers of the non-Muslim minorities in Turkey.

All in all, the conclusion implies that an effective management of perceived threats in Turkish politics, particularly with regards to the Sèvres syndrome, would help to decrease the frequency of the anti-Jewish rhetoric. However, this would not bring an end to the negative remarks about Jews, because they seem to be a historically rooted element of Turkish right-wing politics. Moreover, foreign events, such as the Israel-Palestine conflict, seems to contribute to the continuation of the negative descriptions of Jews. In parallel, the study presents evidence that MPs from all political sides infrequently mention global anti-Semitic conspiracy rhetoric about the economic power of Jews.

Biographical note

Dr Turkay Salim Nefes is a William Golding Junior Research Fellow at Brasenose College, University of Oxford. He is the author of *Online Anti-Semitism in Turkey* (Palgrave) and various journal articles. His research is available online at https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tuerkay_Nefes/research

References

Akturk, Ş. (2017) 'Post-imperial democracies and new projects of nationhood in Eurasia: Transforming the nation through migration in Russia and Turkey', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 43, no. 7, pp. 1101–1120.

Anti-Defamation League. (2018) 'Our mission', available online at: <https://www.adl.org/who-we-are/our-mission> (accessed 14 November 2018).

Atsız, N. (1934) 'Musa'nın necip (!) evlatları bilsinler ki... [The noble! sons and daughters of the Moses should know...]' *Orhun Dergisi*, available online at <http://www.nihal-atsiz.com/page/223> (accessed 10 February 2017).

Aviv, E. (2017) *Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism in Turkey: from Ottoman Rule to AKP*, Routledge, London.

Aydın-Düzgüt, S. (2016) 'De-Europeanisation through discourse: A critical discourse analysis of AKP's election speeches', *South European Society and Politics*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 45-58.

Aydın-Düzgüt, S (2018) 'Foreign policy and identity change: Analysing perceptions of Europe among the Turkish public', *Politics*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 19–34.

Bali, R. 2001. *Musa'nın Evlatları Cumhuriyet'in Vatandaşları [The Sons/Daughters of the Moses and the Citizens of the Republic]*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bali, R. (2006) 'The politics of Turkification during the single party period', in *Turkey Beyond Nationalism: Towards Post-Nationalist Identities*, ed H. Keiser, London, Health Press, pp. 43-49.

Bali, R. (2008) *A Scapegoat for All Seasons: Dönmes or Crypto-Jews of Turkey*, The Isis Press, Istanbul.

Barkey, K. (2008) *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

BBC NEWS (2008) 'Second intifada', available online at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/7381378.stm (accessed 19 March 2018).

BBC NEWS (2015) 'Gaza conflict 2014: "War crimes by both sides" – UN', available online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-33223365> (accessed 19 March 2018).

Blalock, H. (1956) 'Economic discrimination and negro increase', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 584-588.

Blumer, H. (1958) 'Race prejudice as a sense of group position', *The Pacific Sociological Review*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3-7.

Bobo, L. (1999) 'Prejudice as group position', *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 445-472.

Bonoma, T. & Rosenberg, H. (1978) 'Theory-based content analysis: A social influence perspective for evaluating group process', *Social Science Research*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 213-256.

Brink-Danan, M. (2012) *Jewish Life in 21st-Century Turkey: The Other Side of Tolerance*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Cabrera, L. & Reiner, P. (2018) 'A novel sequential mixed-method technique for contrastive analysis of unscripted qualitative data: Contrastive quantitized content analysis', *Sociological Methods & Research*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 532-548.

Chi, M. (1997) 'Quantifying qualitative analyses of verbal data: A practical guide', *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 271-315.

Cohen, J. (2014) *Becoming Ottomans: Sephardi Jews and Imperial Citizenship in the Modern Era*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Çelik, A., Bilali, R. & Iqbal, Y. (2017) 'Patterns of 'Othering' in Turkey: A study of ethnic, ideological, and sectarian polarisation', *South European Society and Politics*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 217-238.

Dixon, J. (2008) 'A clash of civilizations? Examining liberal-democratic values in Turkey and the European Union', *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 681-708.

Dixon, J. (2010) 'Opposition to enlargement as a symbolic defence of group position: Multilevel analyses of attitudes toward candidates' entries in the EU-25', *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 127-154.

Encyclopaedia Britannica (2018) 'Jew', available online at <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Jew-people> (accessed 05 March 2018).

Galanti, A. (1947) *Turkler ve Yahudiler: Tarihi ve Siyasi Tetkik [Turks and Jews: A Historical and Political Inquiry]*, Tan Matbaasi, Istanbul.

Göçek, M. (2011) *The Transformation of Turkey: Redefining State and Society from the Ottoman Empire to the Modern Era*, I. B. Tauris, London.

Guida, M. (2008) "'The Sèvres syndrome" and "komplo" theories in the Islamist and secular press', *Turkish Studies*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 37-52.

Haker, E. (2003) *Once upon a Time Jews Lived in Kırklareli: The Story of the Adato Family, 1800-1934*, The Isis Press, Istanbul.

Hayes, A. & Krippendorff, K. (2007) 'Answering the call for a standard reliability measure for coding data', *Communication Methods and Measures*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 77-89.

İçduygu, A. & Soner, A. (2006) 'Turkish minority rights regime: Between difference and equality', *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 447-468.

İçduygu, A, Toktas, S. & Soner, A. (2008) 'The politics of population in a nation-building process: Emigration of non-Muslims from Turkey', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 358-389.

Inalcık, H. & Quataert, D. (1997) *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, vol 1, 1300-1600*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kastoryano, R. (1992) 'From millet to community: The Jews of Istanbul', in *Ottoman and Turkish Jewry: Community and Leadership*, ed A. Rodrigue, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 253-277.

Kısakürek, N. F. (2013) *Türkiye'nin Manzarası [The Panorama of Turkey]*, Büyük Dogu Yayinlari, Istanbul.

King, R. & Weiner, M. (2007) 'Group position, collective threat, and American anti-Semitism', *Social Problems*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 47-77.

Kuyucu, T. (2005) 'Ethno-religious "unmixing of Turkey": 6-7 September riots as a case in Turkish nationalism', *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 361-380.

Landau, J. (1988) 'Muslim Turkish attitudes towards Jews, Zionism and Israel', *Die Welt des Islams*, vol. 28, no.1/4, pp. 291-300.

Levy, A. (1994) *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire*, Darwin Press, New Jersey.

Lewis, B. (1984) *The Jews of Islam*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Meuleman, B., Davidov, E. & Billiet, J. (2009) 'Changing attitudes toward immigration in Europe, 2002–2007: A dynamic group conflict theory approach', *Social Science Research*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 352–365.

Nefes, T. S. (2012) 'The history of the social constructions of Dönmes (Converts)', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 413-439.

Nefes, T. S. (2013) 'Political parties' perceptions and uses of anti-Semitic conspiracy theories in Turkey', *The Sociological Review*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 247-264.

Nefes, T. S. (2015a) *Online Anti-Semitism in Turkey*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Nefes, T. S. (2015b) 'Understanding the anti-Semitic rhetoric in Turkey through the Sevres syndrome', *Turkish Studies*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 572-587.

Nefes, T. S. (2015c) 'Scrutinizing impacts of conspiracy theories on readers' political views: A rational choice perspective on anti-Semitic rhetoric in Turkey', *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 557-575.

Nefes, T. S. (2018a) 'The sociological foundations of Turkish nationalism', *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 15-30.

Nefes, T. S. (2018b) 'Political roots of religious exclusion in Turkey', *Parliamentary Affairs*, vol. 71, no. 4, pp. 804-819.

Neuendorf, K. (2002) *The Content Analysis Guidebook*, SAGE, Thousand Oaks, California.

Olzak, S. (1992) *The Dynamics of Competition and Conflict*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Onwuegbuzie, A. (2003) 'Effect sizes in qualitative research: A prolegomenon', *Quality & Quantity*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 393-409.

Potter, J. & Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1999) 'Rethinking validity and reliability in content analysis', *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 258-284.

Quillian, L. (1995) 'Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 586-611.

Quillian, L. (1996) 'Group threat and regional change in attitudes toward African-Americans', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 102, no. 3, pp. 816-860.

Saltzman, I. (2016) 'Honor as foreign policy: The case of Israel, Turkey, and the *Mavi Marmara*', *International Studies Review*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 249-273.

Sandelowski, M., Voils, C. & Knafl, G. (2009) 'On quantitizing', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 208-222.

Shaw, J. S. (1991) *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic*, MacMillan, Basingstoke.

Toktaş, Ş. (2005) 'Citizenship and minorities: A historical overview of Turkey's Jewish minority', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 394-429.

Toktaş, Ş. (2006) 'Perceptions of anti-Semitism among Turkish Jews', *Turkish Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 203-223.

Uluğ, Ö. M. & Cohrs, C. (2017) "'Who will resolve this conflict if the politicians don't?': Members' of parliament understandings of the Kurdish conflict in Turkey', *International Journal of Conflict Management*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 245-266.

Unal, M. (2016) 'Is it ripe yet? Resolving Turkey's 30 years of conflict with the PKK', *Turkish Studies*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 91-125.

Yalçın, S. (2004) *Efendi: Beyaz Türklerin Büyük Sırrı [The Master: The Big Secret of White Turks]*, Doğan Kitap, Istanbul.

Yalçın, S. (2006) *Efendi 2: Beyaz Müslümanların Büyük Sırrı [The Master 2: The Big Secret of White Muslims]*, Doğan Kitap, Istanbul.

Yılmaz, H. (2011) 'Euro-scepticism in Turkey: Parties, elites, and public opinion', *South European Society and Politics*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 185-208

Zürcher, E. (2004) *Turkey: A Modern History*, I.B. Tauris, New York.