



The Divergence of Visions and Positions between Egypt and Turkey in the Light of the Issue of Jerusalem

M. M . Uday Najm Abdullah A. , Dr.Jassim Mohammed Abd

**Department of History, College of Arts, University of Anbar, Iraq
mail :odayalqassi7@gmail.com, djasmmhmd37@gmail.com**

Summary:

The research aims to shed light on the issue of Jerusalem and to explain its role and the extent of its impact on the political situation between Egypt and Turkey. In 1947, the Palestinian issue was referred to the United Nations, which formed a committee known as the Ensop Committee that issued the partition decision, and here the divergent positions between Turkey and Egypt began. The committee that approved the partition decision made Jerusalem under the international trusteeship system. The Turkish position tended to be moderate and follow a policy in line with British policy and try to balance its relations with Israel and the West. Despite the United Nations presenting a project that prevents the Arabs and Israel from making Jerusalem the capital of both parties, this aroused the ire of the Arabs and Israel, especially Egypt, as its leaders expressed that Turkey's relationship with Israel has become an unpopular country among the countries of the Middle East. This conflict may result in tension in Turkish-Egyptian relations

Keywords: contrast, attitudes, Jerusalem, Egypt, Turkey

Abstract

The research aims to shed light on the issue of Jerusalem and to explain its role and the extent of its impact on the political situation between Egypt and Turkey. In 1947, the Palestinian issue was referred to the United Nations, which formed a committee known as the Ensop Committee that issued the partition decision, and here the divergent positions between Turkey and Egypt began. The committee that approved the partition decision made Jerusalem under the international trusteeship system. The Turkish position tended to be moderate and follow a policy in line with British policy and try to balance its relations with Israel and the West. Despite the United Nations presenting a project that prevents the Arabs and Israel from making Jerusalem the capital of both parties, this aroused the ire of the Arabs and Israel, especially Egypt, as its leaders expressed that Turkey's relationship with Israel has become an unpopular country among the countries of the Middle East. This conflict may result in tension in Turkish-Egyptian relations.

Keywords: contrast, attitudes, Jerusalem, Egypt, Turkey

Objectives:

The research aims at a set of questions, including giving the Jews more rights and privileges than it gave the Arabs. And allowing the Jews to immigrate to Palestine with the help of the United States of America and the British government, as well as Egypt's stance and rejection of the issuance of the decision of the International Conciliation Commission in 1948, which allowed Israeli settlements to penetrate Jerusalem.

Methodology:

The hypothesis of the study formed the reliance on the historical and descriptive analytical method, through fact-finding and events, and analyzing the research. The research relied on many and varied sources, foremost of which are published and unpublished documents, as well as Egyptian newspapers, Arabic and foreign books, and also documents of the US State Department, which can be found in the list of sources.

Results:

The results of the research on the issue of Jerusalem revealed the tension of differences in opinions and positions between Egypt and Turkey, which resulted in the expulsion of the Turkish ambassador to Egypt (Khulusi Fuad Togay) in 1954. In addition to the severance of diplomatic relations in 1961. This is because Turkey stands with Western countries and continues its relations with Israel.

Conclusion:

Turkey tried to open up to the Arabs, but it did not make a change in its policy with Israel, which was evident through Turkey's hesitation in the discussions on the issue of Jerusalem. This is what aroused the ire of Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser by describing Turkey as a non-Islamic country. If it were truly Islamic, it would not have adhered to Israel at the expense of Jerusalem issue.

The Introduction :

The issue of Jerusalem was one of the most important Arab issues after World War II, especially after the Jews were allowed to immigrate to Palestine with the help and blessing of both the United States of America and the British government. This resulted in the formation of a committee consisting of twelve members from both sides that worked with all its powers to allow the entry of Jews into Palestine . Giving the Jews more rights and privileges than it gave the Arabs. The issuance of the decision of the International Conciliation Commission in 1948 had a bad effect on the hearts of the Arab people, especially the Egyptians, as Egypt expressed its rejection of everything that came in the decision of the Conciliation Commission, of which Turkey was a member. Turkey's attempt to justify its position that it

stands by the Palestinian people, an attempt to justify its position with the circumstances and requirements of Turkish foreign policy and its relations with the United States of America, which was stated by Turkish Foreign Minister Necmettin Sadeq by saying, "The State of Israel is a reality and has been recognized by many countries and that The Arabs are holding talks with Israel

This study relied on an introduction, topic and conclusion. The introduction dealt with the importance of the topic and the reasons for its selection. The topic included a statement of positions and differences on the issue of Jerusalem. Turkey did not have a declared and clear position on the issue of Jerusalem, which for it was just an international conflict.

The Divergence of Visions and Positions between Egypt and Turkey in the Light of the Issue of Jerusalem

The issue of Jerusalem was affected after the end of World War II after the US President (Harry Truman) asked the British government to approve the entry of (100) thousand Jews into Palestine, which had the effect of changing the policy of the British government, which was known for its support for the (Israeli) movement (Ali, Falah Khaled, 1st edition, 1980, pp. 216-217). After that, the United States of America and Britain agreed to form an Anglo-American committee in September 1945 consisting of twelve members, six of whom were from Britain and the other from the United States of America, and among them were loyal to the (Israeli) movement) and supporters of the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine and that the chairmanship of the committee be periodic, provided that it submits its report after four months of starting its work, and on the fourth of January 1946 the committee began its work in Washington, contacting its members and winning them over to the side of the (Israeli) movement. And their demand for the formation of a Jewish state in Palestine, and they achieved their goal in gaining members of the committee, and after the end of its work in Palestine (Al-Rawi, Ezzedin, 1959, pp. 215-216), the committee left for Switzerland on the :twenty-eighth of March 1946, when it made several recommendations, including

First: Allowing 100,000 Jews to enter Palestine and issuing concessions to them.

Second: Not to make Palestine an Arab or Jewish state, and not to have Arab sovereignty over the Jews .

Third: Palestine is the right place, not the Jewish population, and according to the committee's opinion, there is no country that can accommodate the number of Jews except Palestine.

Fourth: Britain, the Mandatory State, must abide by the Mandate Deed, which emphasizes facilitating Jewish immigration in a suitable environment and not harming other communities .with their rights and duties

Fifth: It affirms the continuation of the rule in Palestine due to the continuation of hostility .between the Arabs and the Jews.

Sixth: The committee's recommendations affirmed the development of industrial and agricultural development in Palestine in order to raise the standard of living for Arabs and (Jews. (document No. 450, pp. 586-587, FOREIGN RELATIONS, 1946.

And at a time when the committee gave the Jews greater rights than it gave the Arabs, even though the number of Jews is much less than the Arabs (Alloush, Naji, 3rd edition, 1975, Most of the Arab countries including (Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Jordan). Then those countries

submitted a protest note to the American and British governments (Al-Bakka, Taher Khalaf, 2001, pp. 154-156) and demanded that the Arab countries hold two Arab conferences on the twenty-eighth of May 1946 the first In the city of Anshas in Egypt, attended by the kings and presidents of Egypt, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon, the conference affirmed that the issue of Palestine is the issue of all Arabs and called for stopping Jewish immigration in Palestine. Palestinian rights (Ali, Falah Khaled, p. 224). As for the second, the Bloudan Conference was held in Syria in June 1946, which included the prime ministers and foreign ministers of the member states of the Arab League. The Egyptian delegation at the university had a prominent role in issuing secret and public decisions, and among the public decisions (are (Al-Kurji, Yahya Muhammad, 2006, p. 37.

Demanding Britain to end the mandate and establish committees to defend Palestine in all Arab countries. As for secrecy, it is:

First: Not endorsing any interest it has in any international body

Second: Not to allow Britain and the United States of America or their subjects any new economic concession.

Third: Allowing the Arab people to volunteer by all means to support the Arabs of Palestine. On the first of July 1946, the Secretary General of the British House of Lords (Herbert Morrison 1888-1965) announced the new policy of the British government towards Palestine. :This policy included dividing Palestine into four administrative regions

.First: The Jerusalem area includes Jerusalem and Bethlehem

Second: The Jewish region includes the largest part of the land area in which the Jews settled.

Third: The Negev region includes the uninhabited land triangle in southern Palestine.

Fourth: The Arab region is mostly Arab in terms of population and land. FOREIGN.p588), (RELATIONS, 1946).

Egypt, through President Gamal Abdel Nasser, responded to the issue of partition by saying, "The Palestinian issue is a global issue, and that dividing Palestine to form a Jewish state is a threat to the Arab nation." The Arab countries also rejected this project and affirmed the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination. NAÏLE, ERDEM, 2020 , p.125)) As for Turkey, it viewed the Palestinian issue as merely a humanitarian issue, and the (international community must help them. (Al-Dulaimi, Ahmed Sajer, 1988, p. 17.

On the seventeenth of February 1947, the British government presented a project known as the project (Ernest Bevin 1881-1951), British Foreign Minister (Alan Palmer, Part 2, 1992, pp. 110-111), which included keeping Palestine under British tutelage for a period of (five years) and after two years A thousand Jews will be admitted to Palestine, after which a consultative representative council will be formed during the mandate phase, but the Bevin (project failed in that (Al-Kurji, Yahya Muhammad, p. 48

which prompted the British government, on the eighth of April 1947, to take a decision to refer the Palestinian issue to the United Nations, which took a decision to form a committee in the United Nations known as the Unscop Committee (Hamad, Khairy, 1962, pp. 157-159), which issued a project to divide Palestine Immediately Turkey rejected the draft committee, as the Turkish Foreign Minister (Najmuddin Sadiq 1890-1953 Najm uddin Sadiq) (D.K.W, 2738/311, 1949, and 57, p. 72) commented on the twentieth of November 1947, saying, "We voted against Partition and we wanted to make our friends understand that this decision is not

enforceable” (D.K.W, 2737/311, 1948, and 79, p. 125). Despite this, the decision to divide Palestine between Arabs and Jews was ratified on the twenty-ninth of November 1947 by the International Committee of the United Nations and kept the issue of Jerusalem under the international trusteeship system (Zaiter, Akram, 1986, pp. 196-197). The Turkish position towards that was inclined To relative moderation and follow a policy parallel to Britain and try to balance its relations with Israel and the Arab countries (Al-Dulaimi, Ahmed Sager, p. (62

The issuance of the decision of the International Conciliation Commission No. (194) on the eleventh of December 1948 (Al-Shujairi, Jasim Muhammad, 1st edition, 2017, pp. 43-48) had a great impact on the hearts of the Egyptian people, as Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser expressed his rejection of the conciliation commission’s decision. The international judge calls on Arabs and Jews to direct negotiation, because the two projects (Inscope and the Conciliation Committee) contradict the Arabs’ aspirations and demands for the establishment .(of an independent Palestinian state (Iraq, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1948, p. 1).

Within the framework of that approach, the Egyptian newspapers, especially Al-Ahram newspaper, criticized on the fourteenth of December 1948 the appointment of Turkey as a member of the conciliation committee and its siding with Israel. The Arab countries did not prevent them from taking a positive stance except for some special actions that linked Turkey's policy with the American policy" (Al-Ahram, newspaper, 22754, 1948), and on February 8, 1949, Turkish Foreign Minister Necmettin Sadeq stated that "the State of Israel is a reality. He admitted it has more than thirty countries and Arab representatives are holding talks with representatives of (Israel)” (Iraq, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1949, p. 9). The Turkish-Israeli rapprochement caused Arab responses, especially Egypt, because the Arabs could not accept this position of a Muslim country linked by historical and economic ties and a common cultural, this recognition led to the emergence of differences, the results of which were the deterioration of those relations and their lack of development between Turkey and Egypt (Yesim, DEMiR, 1967, 167). Turkey justified its recognition of the State of Israel as an attempt to gain an ally in the Middle East to help it confront the growing communist threat in the region. However, the Arab public opinion denounced Turkey's position and called for not establishing good relations with the Turks and rejecting any proposal made by Turkey to the (Arab countries. (D.K.W, 2739, 1950, and 113, p. 244).

With regard to the issue of internationalizing Jerusalem, (Jalal Bayar 1883-1986 Celal Bayar), President of the Turkish Republic, spoke in the Grand National Assembly and on January 1, 1950, stating, "Our normal relations with the state (Israel) are in the way of development. We are making unremitting efforts in Conciliation Committee, to reassure the two parties to settle the outstanding issues in their minds” (Tawfiq, Sobhi Nazim, 2002, pp. 16-17) This is evidence that Turkey has followed a middle line in its policy and has begun to devote increasing importance to its relations with (Israel).

In the same context, the General Assembly of the United Nations presented a project to prevent the Arabs (and Israel) from making Jerusalem their capital, which aroused the ire of the Zionists against this project due to their adherence to Jerusalem as their capital. They threatened to prevent the entry of any delegate to the United Nations. (Al-Kurji, p. 113) Israel has practiced escalation and its violations of United Nations resolutions, which prompted the United States to discuss Freezing the issue of internationalization, as the United Nations did

not discuss the issue at its sixth session in 1951. (Sami Hakim, 1st edition, 1970, p. 222-223). On the twenty-second of September, the Arab League issued a decision to end its role in the issue of Palestinian refugees, and to liquidate the funds of the Supreme Council for Relief, which was based in Cairo, due to the failure of the Arab countries to fulfill their financial obligations, while bearing the greatest burden The Arab host countries. (Al-Dulaimi, Hossam Ibrahim, 2016, p. 26).

The years 1952-1955 witnessed tension in the Turkish-Egyptian disputes because of Turkey's support (to Israel), which prompted Gamal Abdel Nasser to make a statement in which he said, "Turkey, because of its relations with (Israel), has become unpopular with the countries of the Middle East" (2005, p.14). Ankara Universitesi Turk) on the tenth of July 1952, a secret report of the Royal Iraqi Commission in Ankara stated that "the Jews who immigrated to (Israel) from Turkey" decided to establish a forest called (Ataturk Forest) and to follow the Jews who immigrated from Turkey to Palestine . And the methods of their settlement would win the satisfaction and win over the Turks to their side, and the aim is to satisfy the Turkish government (D.K.W, 2740, 1952, and 61, pp. 117-119) .On the same level, the Turkish Foreign Minister (Fuad Koprulu 1890-1966 Fuat koprulu) spoke. On the twenty-second of February 1953, with a serious statement, he affirmed, "I want to talk about the issue of Jerusalem. We voted at the United Nations meeting against the project to resolve the dispute between the two parties through deliberation and direct discussion between them. We are not opposed to the idea of understanding," adding that the survival of (Israel) is in favor of Turkey . And it will not disappear except with the demise of Turkey or the occurrence of a communist coup in it (D.K.W, 2740, 1953, and 17, p. 24), which provoked President Gamal Abdel Nasser in January 1954 when he described Turkey as a non-Islamic country, and if it was truly Islamic, it would not have adhered to State (Israel) at the expense of the issue of Jerusalem. He added that Turkey always seeks with Israel and the Western countries to control the region and destroy the Arab unity (Yesim, DEMiR, p.171). Thus, Gamal Abdel Nasser took a decision to expel the Turkish ambassador (Hulusi Fuad Tugay 1891-1975 Hulusi Fuat Tugay) from Egypt on the fourth of January 1954 because of the ambassador's misbehavior and his siding with Israel (Wafud, Ezzeddine, 1969, p. 185). On January 5, 1954, the Turkish government responded that the measures taken by the Egyptian government were unacceptable to the Turkish government and a departure from the usual diplomatic norm, and that it did not allow this situation to be repeated in the history of the law .As the Turkish government confirmed, it is unlikely that Turkey will take a similar measure by expelling the accredited ambassador to Turkey (Al-Ahram, Newspaper, 24518, 1954).

And after the establishment of the Zionist entity's military parade in the city of Jerusalem on the fifteenth of May 1955, which was considered a new aggressive step in violation of international resolutions, which focused on consolidating its position in Jerusalem.) p.2, 1954 , - T.C. D.A, G, M, Basbakanlik). On the twenty-sixth of August 1956, the US Secretary of State (John Foster Dulles 1888-1959) proposed the settlement project for the Zionists, as it is the second American project bearing the name (Dulles) after the Middle East Leadership (Project, which stipulated What follows: (Hani Mendes, Issue 78, 1978, p. 78).

First: Take collective action to repel any aggression, and that the United States of America is ready to conclude treaties that limit change between the Zionist entity and the Arab countries by force.

Second: Establishing permanent borders between (Israel) and the Arab countries instead of the borders approved by the Rhodes armistice since 1949.

Third: Finding a solution to the problem of the Palestinian refugees by settling them in the Arab countries by paying the compensation offered by the United States of America.

This aroused the fears of the Arabs, and Egypt categorically rejected that project because it aims to fragment the issue of Jerusalem and secure borders for the Zionist entity (Al-Kurji, p. (142).

It is worth noting that the Turkish newspaper (Yeni Donia) published an article on the nineteenth of December 1956 in which it stated that Turkey's crime is that it supports Israel. And they do not want Turkey to give its support to a country that has the same interests as Turkey, and that it was not necessary to summon the Turkish ambassador to Israel, but it should be done to summon the ambassadors of Turkey in the Arab countries that organize demonstrations against it. (Ayşe, Erkmen, 2020, p.136) Gamal Abdel Nasser's point of view was in his rejection of Turkish-Israeli cooperation, saying, "The West, which established Israel, could not arm the Arabs to the extent that allows its defeat." He considered that Turkey is Israel's first ally, so the joining of the Arabs to Turkey he will make them allies (to Israel) (Al-Nuaimi, Ahmed Nuri, 1970, p. 151). The Turkish point of view differed from the Egyptian point of view with regard to Turkey's relations with (Israel), as the Egyptian government saw that Turkey and Israel were two bases representing the interests of the West in the region. Especially the ruling elite in it and ready to practice pulling the limbs came with the support of the West and the United States of America (TRoYAcADEmY, 2019, p.187 uluarasi).

On the tenth of December 1958, the United States of America, the Netherlands, Britain and New Zealand called for a study of the refugee problem, so they called on the Secretary-General of the United Nations to study the Palestinian refugee problem and draw up reports for that issue (TRoYAcADEm, . The Secretary-General of the United Nations to solve the Palestinian refugee problem by linking it to the achievement of economic development in the Arab countries, and he agreed with the American administration to provide a compromise solution that can be relied upon until a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Zionist conflict is reached, and the issue of Jerusalem and the refugee problem is one of its outputs. However, this project has been met. Rejected by (Israel), which wanted from him a single solution to the problem of those refugees that could be resettlement, while the Arabs rejected him because he denied the right of return (Al-Sayegh, Fayez, D.T, pp. 18-19; Mounir Al-Hour, (vol. 2, 1986, pp. 60-61).

As a result, the Arab writer Abdullah al-Yafi commented in Palestine Magazine on the twenty-third of June 1959 on Hammarskjöld's project, saying, "There is no mercy for the Arab refugees, nor pity for their families and children, nor the desire to put an end to their misery , which moved some of the major Western countries, especially the United States of America, when they thought the project for the resettlement of Palestinian refugees" (, p.211968, Badeau, Johns) and the Zionists did not hesitate to exploit their friendships and personal relations with Turkey, and there was a remarkable exchange of information and experiences to limit the activity and influence of Gamal Abdel Nasser, especially in the field of Arab unity (the Hour , pp. 62-63) After the end of the rule of (Adnan Menderes 1899-1961), the Prime Minister of Turkey in 1960, Turkey made efforts to open up to the Arab

world, but it did not change its policy towards Israel, and it was showing a somewhat neutral position without addressing who was right and who was wrong. And it does not want to lose its relationship with (Israel) p.26 (Ankara, universilesi) and within the framework of that approach, the discussions that took place within the United Nations on the issue of Jerusalem showed the extent of Turkey's hesitation between its commitments towards the Western bloc and its relations with the Western bloc and Israel, and its keenness to avoid any clash with the Arab countries. And creating a suitable environment for expanding its foreign relations and strengthening its ties with the Arab countries and surrounding it, and in accordance with the program of the Turkish government that took over in May 1960 (Ayşe, Erkmén, p.165) and in light of the continuation of Turkey's relations with the West (and Israel) to the same degree and with what it announced after the coup of the twenty-seventh of May 1960 respecting all its obligations towards the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Turkey's need for the foreign aid it receives from Western countries .On top of it is the United States, as well as its need for a Western defense system, and this policy, which Turkey continued to pursue, had bad reputation in the Arab region, especially Egypt (Al-Nuaimi, p. 151), when Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser issued a decision to sever diplomatic relations with Turkey on the first of December 1961 because of the Turkish position hostile to the Arab cause (Al-Ahram, 27336, 1961) and following the severance of diplomatic and consular relations between the two countries, the Yugoslav embassy in Ankara took care of the Egyptian interests, while the Swiss embassy in Egypt took care of the Turkish interests (Al-Ahram, 27323, 1961) and in the same context he expressed The Deputy Prime Minister of Turkey (Akram Ali Jan), during his meeting with the Iraqi ambassador in Ankara, Talib Mushtaq, on the third of January 1962, expressed his regret for what had happened to him, stating that "Abdul Nasser has recklessly and hastened to sever diplomatic relations between the two countries" (Mushtaq, Talib, 1st edition, 1969, pp. 402-403) After that, the Prime Minister of Turkey (Ismet Inonu 1884-1973 ismet inonu) stated in the press conference held in Ankara in April 1963, in which he stressed that "the political relations between Turkey and Egypt are improving and developing, and relations are proceeding independently and are not affected by other political situations" (Al-Nuaimi, pp. 299-300) 1963, in which it was stated, "If the West advances, does the East sleep?" In another expression, "If Israel works, are we all the peoples of Asia and the Middle East still swimming in ignorance" (Al-Nuaimi, p. 300.)

It is worth noting that Gamal Abdel Nasser presided over the Cairo Conference held on (5-10) of October 1964 in Cairo. It was attended by (47) countries as observers and international organizations. Their decisions yielded positive results through the Arab vision of the (Israeli) entity as a racist entity. Gamal Abdel Nasser spoke at the Cairo conference that "the United Nations must accommodate the presence of all peoples, and the United Nations must accommodate justice and peace, for peace without justice cannot live." In confirmation of the Egyptian activity, the conference announced its support for the Palestinian people and the restoration of their full rights for liberation from (Israeli) colonialism At the end of this conference, Gamal Abdel Nasser called for imposing sanctions on (Israel) according to the Charter of the United Nations, and also denounced him for the economic and political support for the (Israeli) entity by the United States of America, explaining that the American plan wants to make (Israel) a starting point for striking the movements Arab liberation in the

Middle East (Al-Salmani, Osama Mahdi, 2020, pp. 25-27). After that, Cairo witnessed tumultuous demonstrations in late November 1964 in protest against the policy of the United States of America. The result of the speech delivered by Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser on the twenty-third of December of the same year. The demonstrators burned the library of the American News Agency in Cairo, which led to the creation of a crisis of confidence between Egypt and the United States of America (Al-Jumaili, Nagham Akram, 2013, p. 545). In this regard, the Secretary General of the Turkish Justice Party (Ahmed Ihsan Karmali) stated in 1965, saying, Turkey's recognition of Israel as a result of our relations with the United States of America, and that our relations with Israel are based on economic and commercial interests. 328 (And after the holding of the Arab Summit Conference in Casablanca in September 1965, kings and heads of Arab states participated in it, including Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser. The necessity of confronting the (Israeli) colonial conferences and supporting the Palestinian people (Al-Mawafi, Abd al-Hamid, 31, 1981, pp. 76-80) and in the context of Arab endeavors, Muhammad Abd al-Khaliq Hassouna, Secretary General of the League of Arab States, participated in the sessions of the United Nations General Assembly in New York in June 1967 In order to reveal the reality of the repeated Zionist attacks in Jerusalem (Al-Ahram, 29563, 1967), and although the Zionist entity did not respond to these mediations, it occupied Jerusalem and officially annexed it on the twenty-seventh of June 1967 (Al-Ahram, 29597, 1967; Al-Qusari, 1970, pp. 11-13).

Egypt denounced those measures and sent to the United Nations a memorandum in which it warned of the seriousness of the situation regarding (Israeli) ambitions in Arab Jerusalem, which constitutes a threat to the Arab countries (Al-Ahram, 29583, 1967). In July of the same year, Egyptian Foreign Minister Mahmoud Riyad visited several Arab countries, including (Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Saudi Arabia) to discuss the issues and decisions that must be taken to confront the Zionist aggression against the city of Jerusalem (Al-Ahram, 29575, 1967; Palestine, Yearbook, 1st edition, 1972, p. 4). As for Turkey, it took a practical position in which it denounced the measures it had taken. Israel regarding Jerusalem, and abstaining from any action that leads to changing the status of Jerusalem (Salman, Mustafa Ibrahim, Issue (15), 2010, p. 266) and the Turkish Foreign Minister (Ihsan Sabri Ehsan 1908-1980 Giglianke L Sabri Ehsan) stated on the twelfth of February 1968 "Israel should not confront the world with a fait accompli in Jerusalem." He also announced his rejection of Israel's decisions to expropriate land because these decisions aim to change the status of the city of Jerusalem and are unacceptable to the international community (OLGUN Kenan, 1967, p.2239).

From the foregoing, the Turkish position was concomitant with the position of the United States of America, due to the interests and agreements associated with both governments. Despite Turkey's compliance with Western policy, it was deviating from that compliance according to the Turkish regional and popular position because of the pressures it (Turkey) was under.

Conclusion:

By reviewing the Egyptian and Turkish visions and positions regarding the issue of internationalizing Jerusalem, the following becomes clear

-Egypt's insistence on confronting the American and British international decisions that are unfair to the Arab people in Jerusalem, preserving its entity and preventing Jewish infiltration into it.

-The Turkish position fluctuated because it was looking at the issue of Jerusalem through the window of Western interests, because the economic support it was getting outweighed its own interests in the Arab region, so it was difficult for Egypt to enter into Western alliances.

-The Turkish position on the issue of internationalizing Jerusalem was reflected in accordance with the policy of the United States of America

-Turkey showed some consensus with the Egyptian position as a result of pressure from Turkish public opinion.

References:

First: A- Unpublished Documents (Royal Court Files)

- 1- D.C.W, Royal Court Files, File No. 2737/311, Report of the Iraqi Royal Commission in Ankara No. T/3/181 on February 31, 1948,
- 2- D.K.W, Royal Court Files, File No. 2738/311, Iraqi Commission Reports on July 18, 1949,
- 3- D.K.W., Royal Court Files, File No. (2739), Report of the Iraqi Royal Commission in Ankara No. S / 3 / 495 \ on November 5, 1950.
- 4- KWD And, Royal Court Files, File No. 2740, Letter of the Iraqi Royal Commission in Ankara, No. S \ 511 on July 10, 1952,
- 5-D.K.W, Royal Court Files, Book of the Iraqi Royal Embassy in Ankara, No. S \ 3 \ 119 on February 26, 1953,

(B- Published Documents (Iraqi Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- 1-The Iraqi Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Report of the Iraqi Commission in Ankara No. \ T \ 3 \ 239 on April 26, 1948,
- 2-The Iraqi Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Report of the Iraqi Commission in Ankara No. \ T \ 2 \ 166, on April 7, 1949,

Second: US State Department Documents (published)

- 1- FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES,1946 , THE NEAR EAST AND AFRICA, VOLUMEVII , Involvement Of the United states in the Arab- Zionist controversy , concerning the future status of Palestine P, the question of Jewish immigration into Palestine,
- 2- FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES,1946 , THE NEAR EAST ANDAFRICA, VOLUMEVII , Involvement Of the United states in the Arab- Zionist controversy , concerning the future status of Palestine P, the question of Jewish immigration into Palestine,

Third: Theses and University Dissertations

- 1- Al-Dulaimi, Ahmed Sager, (1988) Turkish-Israeli Relations 1948-1980, a master's thesis (unpublished) submitted to the Institute of Asian and African Studies, Al-Mustansiriya University.
- 2-Al-Salmani, Osama Mahdi Ibrahim, (2020) The positions of Iraq and Egypt in the Non-Aligned Movement towards Arab issues (1970-1992), PhD thesis (unpublished), College of Education, Ibn Rushd, University of Baghdad.
- 3-Al-Dulaimi, Hussam Ibrahim Hamad, (2016) Developments of the Palestinian Cause in the League of Arab States (1973-1989), Master Thesis (unpublished), College of Education and Human Sciences, University of Anbar.
- 4-Al-Korji, Yahya Muhammad Zayer, (2000) The Palestinian Issue and the United Nations Organization (1947-1956), (unpublished master's thesis), College of Arts, University of Baghdad.

Fourth: Arabic and Arabized books

- 1- Al-Nuaimi, Ahmed Nuri, (1970), Turkish Foreign Policy after World War II, Dar Al-Hurriya for Printing, Baghdad,
- 2-Akram Zaiter, (1986) The Palestinian Cause, Dar Al-Jeel Publishing House, Amman,
- 3-Alan Palmer, (1992) Encyclopedia of Modern History 1789-1945, part 2, translated by Yusuf Muhammad Amin and Sawsan Faisal Al-Samer, Dar Al-Ma'mun, Baghdad.
- 4- Al-Shujairi, Jassim Muhammad Abd, (2017), Turkey's position on the Arab-Zionist conflict (1947-1967), 1st edition, Adnan Library, Baghdad.
- 5-Khairi Hammad, (1962), Issues in the United Nations, Commercial Office for Printing, Distribution and Publishing, Beirut,
- 6-Sami Hakim, Jerusalem, (1970) The Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop, 1st Edition, Cairo.
- 7-Crying, Taher Khalaf, (2001) From Partition to Oslo 1937-1995, House of General Cultural Affairs, Baghdad,
- 8- Al-Sayegh, Fayez, The Hammarskjöld Project and the Palestinian Refugee Issue 1959, Beirut, Dar Al-Fajr Al-Jadeed, Dr. T.
- 9- Al-Qasri, Muhammad Fayez, (1970) The Question of Palestine Between the Fog of Politics and the Smoke of Battle, The United Company., Beirut,
- 10-Talib Mushtaq, The Papers of My Days, (1969) Memoirs of an Iraqi Ambassador to Turkey 1958-1965, Volume 2, Edition 1, Dar Al-Tali'ah for Printing and Publishing, Beirut.
- 11-Izz al-Din Wofoud, (1969), The Question of Jerusalem in the Periphery of International Relations, Beirut.
- 12-Al-Rawi, Izz Al-Din, (1959) The Great Conspiracy, Al-Shafiq Press, Baghdad.
- 13- Falah Khaled Ali, (1980) Palestine and the British Mandate (1939-1948), 1st Edition, The Arab Institute for Studies and Publishing, Beirut.
- 14- Munir Al-Hour, and Tariq Al-Mousa, (1986) Settlement Projects for the Palestinian Cause 1947-1985, 2nd Edition, Amman, Dar Al-Jalil for Publishing.

15-Najda Fathi Safwat, (2017), *This Day in History*, Volume Four, Dar Al-Saqi, Beirut, p. 1.

16-Naji Alloush, (1975), *The Arab Resistance in Palestine 1917-1948*, 3rd Edition, Dar Al-Tali`ah, Beirut,

17-Hani Mandes, (1978), *Settlement Projects*, Palestinian Affairs Council, No. 78, May.

Fifth: Newspapers

1-Al-Ahram, newspaper, (Cairo), issue (22754), December 14, 1948.

2 -Al-Ahram, newspaper, (Cairo), No. (24518), January 5, 1954.

3-Al-Ahram, newspaper, (Cairo), issue (27323), on October 2, 1961.

4-Al-Ahram, newspaper, (Cairo), issue (27336), on October 15, 1961.

5-Al-Ahram, newspaper, (Cairo), Issue (29563), November 19, 1967

6-Al-Ahram, newspaper, (Cairo), No. (29575) on December 1, 1967.

7-Al-Ahram, newspaper, (Cairo), No. (29597) in December 1967.

8-Al-Ahram, newspaper, (Cairo), No. (29583), December 9, 1967.

Sixth: Scientific Journals

1-Al-Mawafi, Abdul Hamid Muhammad, (1981), *The Arab Summit Conference as a Method for Joint Action (1964-1978)*, Arab Future Magazine, Issue 31, Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut.

2-Al-Jumaili, Nagham Akram, (2013), *The Historical Development of US-Egyptian Relations (1952-1979)*, Medad Al-Adab Magazine, Issue (5), Iraqi University,

3-Mustafa Ibrahim Salman, and Dhari Sarhan Al-Hamdani, (2010), *Turkey and the developments of the Palestinian cause*, the International and Political Journal, Issue (15), Al-Mustansiriya University, Yearbook of the Palestinian Cause for 1969, 1st Edition, Publications of the Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut.

Seventh: Turkish Sources

1- Ankara Universitesi Turk Lnklap Tarihi Enstitüsü Araturk yohi Dergisi (Ortadoğu Krizleri ve Türkiye) Yrd. Doc. Dr. Sabit DuMAN.Mayis- kasım 2005,

2- NAİLE ERDEM, TÜRK SİYASAL HAYATINDA SAĞ DPARTİLERDE BÖLÜNME; 1960- 1980 , YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ , MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ , KAMU YÖNETİMİ ANABİLİM DALI, AĞUSTOS- 2020 ,p. 125

3- OLGUN, Kenan, TÜRKİYE/ТУРЦИЯ, TÜRK BASININDA 1967 ARAP-İSRAİL SAVAŞI,

4- Yesim DEMİR , ANKA Enstitüsü Danışma Kurulu üyesi, Turkish Foreign Policy in the Axis of the Arab- Israel conflict since 1960, TESAM Akademik Dergisi , Sayı (1997).

5- - Ayşe Erkmen ,MISIR IN KARİZMATİK LİDERİ NASIR , NASIR DÖNEMİ MISIR VE TÜRKÜYE MISIR İLİSKİLERİ, DECEMBER,2020

6- TRÖYACADEMY uluslararası sosyal Bilimler Dergisi Uluslararası Gelişmeler Tarihinde Türkiye- İsrail İlişkileri(1945- 1960) .2019

- 7- T.C.D.A, G,M, Basbakanlik, Kanunlar Ve Kararlar Tetkik Dairesi Baskanlig, TURKiye BUYUK Mille MECLisi, document , 1954.

Eighth: English Sources

- 1- BADEAU, Johns, the American Approach to the Arab World U.S.A.,1968,P.290;
Hadawi,Arab-Israeli Conflict, .
- 2-SNETSiNG, Truman ,the Jewish Vote & the Greation of Israel, U.S.A.,Hoover
Institution Press,1974,