



From Strategic Partnership to Strategic Rivalry: Securitizing Turkish-Israeli Relations in the 1990s and 2000s through the Lens of the Copenhagen School

Dr. Abdelsalam Mohamed elhudairi

Department of Political Sciences ,Faculty of Economics ,University of Benghazi

abdelsalam.mohamed@uob.edu.ly

Received: 30/6/2026 Revised: 10/7/2026 Accepted: 26/7/2026

Publication: 18/8/2026

Abstract

This article analyzes the transformation of Turkish-Israeli relations from a strategic partnership in the 1990s to a hostile and antagonistic relationship in the 2000s through the lens of the Copenhagen School's securitization theory. While Turkey was the first Muslim-majority state to recognize Israel in 1949, bilateral relations reached their peak during the 1990s with extensive cooperation in military, economic, and cultural fields, before deteriorating sharply following the collapse of the peace process, the Gaza War (2008-2009), and the Mavi Marmara flotilla incident (2010).

The study seeks to answer a central question: Why has the unparalleled positive nature of relations in the 1990s been replaced by a toxic environment in the 2000s? To address this, the paper employs a dual theoretical framework. First, it uses Realist theory and the military sector of security to explain the 1990s rapprochement. During the Cold War and its immediate aftermath, the Turkish military-bureaucratic elite, as the primary securitizing actor, framed threats such as the PKK, Syria, Iran, and political Islam as existential threats to the secular Kemalist state — the main referent object. This securitization legitimized an extraordinary alignment with Israel as the only democratic, secular, and Western-oriented partner in the region, providing access to military technology and strategic balancing.

Second, the paper applies societal security and Constructivist theory to explain the post-2000s rupture. With the rise of the AKP, the decline of military tutelage in foreign policy-making, and the adoption of the "zero problems with neighbours" policy, the referent object shifted from state sovereignty to collective identity and societal security. The conservative constituency re-securitized Israeli policies toward Palestine as an existential threat to Islamic and humanitarian identity, moving the issue from normal politics to emergency politics and justifying extraordinary diplomatic measures, including the downgrading of relations.

The findings demonstrate that Copenhagen School securitization theory not only explains the divergent security perceptions in the two periods but also reveals the shifting civil-military dynamics in Turkish foreign policy making.

Keywords: Turkish-Israeli Relations; Copenhagen School; Securitization Theory; Societal Security; Turkish Foreign Policy; Civil-Military Relations; Constructivism

INTRODUCTION

Turkish-relationship with Israel in term of foreign policy making of the both countries is an interesting case study to apply Copenhagen School' securitization theory. The

relationship between the two countries can be divided into two eras, which are 1990s and 2000s. Some authors differentiated it to be cold war and the aftermath of the cold war. Turkey pursued a friendly relationship with Israel during the cold war and as at 1990s but became an enemy state later in year 2000s. The questions that come to mind concerning this are; why has the unparalleled and positive nature of relations in the 1990s been replaced with a hostile and toxic environment in the 2000s? How can this difference in the relations between the 1990s and 2000s be explained? In providing answers to these questions, there is need to use securitization theory to understanding the nature of threat to Turkey during the cold war and 1990s, which defined her foreign policy and the changing nature of threat in 2000s, which redefine her foreign policy as well.

Furthermore, this analysis shall be made using realist theory of international relations, which has to do with the national security issues of states and the significance of state' military capabilities in securitizing Turkish friendly relations with Israel during the cold war and 1990s. And secondly, societal security and constructivist theory, which has to do with identity crisis and how the identities of actors influence the foreign policy making of a state shall be use to understand and securitize the changing nature of Turkish foreign policy from friend to enemy in year 2000s. Copenhagen School's theory of securitization not only useful in analyzing the basic features of different periods in Turkish-Israeli relations, but also helpful in stating the specificity of the politics of civil-military relations in foreign policy making. It also provides an insight into the possibility of military top brass having much influence in foreign policy making. It shows the ways by which governments and civil society organizations can reverse this privileged role in their favor. Securitization theory enables us to understand the nature of the military's role in Turkish-Israeli relations and the reasons for the changes in these two periods (Balci A & Kardas T. 2012, p.100).

The aim of this paper is to explain in a comprehensive way how Copenhagen School' securitization theory can be used to analyze and understand the nature of Turkish-Israeli relations within 1990s and 2000s, which are regarded to be friendly and enemy. In order to critically examine this research question, attempt shall be made to review concepts like; Copenhagen School' securitization theory, realist theory and military sector of security during the cold car, which suggests the reasons for friendly relations between the two states, societal security sector, which explains the reason for enemy-relations between them, constructivist theory, which explains why identity matters in foreign policy making, securitization of Turkish-Israeli relations, and finally conclusion of the paper.

HISTORY OF TURKISH-ISRAELI RELATIONS

The relationship between the two countries has been part of historical development of Turkey. At the time of the Ottoman Empire when Jewish began to migrate to Palestine land, it was made known that Ottoman provided shelter for the Jews but later began to perceive this as dangerous when the Jewish immigrants started to grow. In 1949, Turkey was the first Muslim majority state to recognize the state of Israel in order to signify its alignment with the Western bloc during the cold war. In 1958, there was a countermove to the establishment of the United Arab Republic (UAR) between Egypt and Syria, Turkey was found out to attempt a secret peripheral alliance with Israel. In 1960s, there was a little change in Turkish-Israeli relations when Ankara turned to a more balanced course between the Western and Arab 'worlds' due to reasons stated as; energy, the economy, and the Cyprus conflict. In 1979, there was an establishment of PLO office in Ankara, then the relationship between the two countries began to

deteriorate, Turkey recognized the Palestinian state (1988). In 1991, both sides reached ambassadorial level (Huber D. 2012, p.1).

According to Ovali & Bozdaglıoğlu Y. (2012, p.14), it must be made known that Turkey's close ties with Israel were the by-product of her relations with the Arabs and the West. From 1949 to 1963, Turkey perceived Israel mainly as a "country, which achieved rapid modernization and progress in a relatively underdeveloped area. Thus, the Israeli educational and industrial establishment, Turkish press began to admire and envy the dynamism of Israeli people. Turks often compared Israel's achievements with the failures of the Arabs. The close relations between Turkey and Israel grew into strategic partnership in the 1990s, mainly led by the Turkish military, and resulted in a series of agreements in the areas of free trade, culture, tourism and, most importantly, military training.

Huber D. (2012) explains further that in the aftermath of the cold war along with the commencement of the peace process between Israel and Palestine, Turkey had a free feeling of the narrow balancing between the two sides. This period led to an open intensification of relations with Israel, which became socially more acceptable in Turkey. The year 1990s constituted a golden years of mutual relations between Turkey and Israel. This is due to a significant reason that should not be ignored when considering the factors that led to friendly relations between the two countries in this year. According to Baskın Oran, the emergence of Welfare Party in Turkey started showing concern by military and bureaucratic elites and this paved the way for the rapprochement with Israel, which was seen by Turkish authorities as the only democratic, secular and Western oriented country in the Middle East (Öztürk TE. 2014, p.69). Some other factors that pushed Turkey to develop this relation with Israel were; First, Turkey was interested in Israeli military technology which Western actors were unwilling to provide it with in light of the Turkish human rights record. Second, the Turkish-Israeli alliance was directed against Syria and Iran, which at the time supported the Kurdistan Worker's Party (PKK). And third, Islamism was perceived as an increasing threat in Turkey, and the alliance was meant to keep Turkey anchored in a Western, secular framework (Huber D. 2012, p.1).

By the early, 2000s, there is another story to tell about the relationship between the two states. The peace process had broken down and with Israeli-Palestinian violence escalating, friendly relations between Israel and Turkey became to be questioned especially to the conservative constituency of the AKP who had the most significant issue regarding to the Turkish Foreign policy with Israel. There was a declination to the military role in politics, which was heading to political issues rather than national security agenda. The AKP government developed its "zero problems with neighbour" policy whereby Turkey came to terms with Syria and Iran, and started viewing American interventionism and the deterioration of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as the main source of instability in the region. Between 2000 and 2008, Turkey has played the mediator role between Israel and Arab countries. In this respect, Israel was not considered to be sine qua non strategic partner of Turkey. Israel in this period was criticized loudly because of its actions. Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan condemned Israel's assassination of Sheikh Ahmad Yasin, the spiritual leader of Hamas, and defined Israeli operations in Gaza as "state terrorism" (Öztürk TE. 2014, p.71).

The Gaza War/Israeli Operation Cast Lead in December 2008/January 2009, as well as the 2010 Gaza Flotilla raid aggravated the enmity between Turkey and Israel whereby both wars were perceived by Turkey as improper acts of aggression. Ankara requested an apology from Israel, which to signify a regret of Israeli actions. In

September 2011, after the leaking of the UN Palmer Report,⁶ Ankara downgraded diplomatic relations with Israel, which was aimed at garner support from the Arab states and as well boost Turkey's soft power in the region at the expense of Israel. Since the break in relations was perceived as a strategic move by Turkey, an apology was seen as unhelpful in repairing relations. So as a response to this, Israel improved military relations with Greece and cooperated with Cyprus in exploring gas fields in the Levant basin, giving rise to a worrying new geopolitical dynamic in the Eastern Mediterranean (Huber D. 2012, p.1).

COPENHAGEN SCHOOL'S THEORY OF SECURITIZATION

The end of the Cold War and subsequent developments in the international system marked the emergence of things in order to maximize traditional IR theories, most specifically Realist theory in explaining international security problems. Copenhagen School (CS) is simply a theory of securitization developed by Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver and this school has made one of the most important and, perhaps, the most controversial contributions to the security studies literature. Ovali & Bozdaglıoğlu Y. (2012, p.4) opine CS argues that securitization is indeed a speech-act through which a securitizing actor or actors can identify something as an existential threat to a valued referent object and call for extraordinary measures to deal with that threat.

Copenhagen School (the CS) makes an illustration that a public issue can found itself on the spectrum ranging from non-politicized, (which is the non-state intervention into the issue) to politicized (which is state' intervention and issue becomes part of public policy), securitized issue (when the issue is publicized as an existential threat justifying to have gone beyond normal politics) and desecuritized (which means the issue is not presented as a threat anymore). Politization is defined as a way of making an issue to be opened, a matter of choice, something that decision is made over, and requires responsibility. Securitization is defined as a move from realm of politicized issue to the realm of state security issues. Securitization can be seen as a more extreme version of politicization, which can be extended beyond traditional military issues to include the environment, society and economic sectors. According to the CS, securitization involves three types of units: **referent objects, securitizing actors, and functional actor**. The **referent object** is something which is thought "to be existentially threatened and the referent object for security traditionally was basically the state (Balci A & Kardas T. 2012, p.101).

Securitizing actors (e.g., the political elite, government, pressure groups and the military) are those who "perform the security speech act" with a view to securitize an issue. They perform the act by calling a disputed-politicized issue to be an existential threat to a referent object (the state, ideology and national sovereignty). Securitizing actors can in principle attempt to construct almost anything (e.g., national identity, social groups, individuals and so on) as a referent object. A **functional actor** "is an actor who significantly influences decisions in the field of security" and never become a securitizing actor, which chooses the referent object and calls for the security action on behalf of it. When a securitizing actor defines an already politicized issue as an "existential threat" to a referent object, functional actors also take part in the process. Sometimes functional actor is an "external influencing factor" in the process of securitization or an actor contributing to the speech act of security (Balci A & Kardas T. 2012, p.101).

According to Copenhagen School, Securitization is a three-stage process, which includes the following; First stage has to do with the portrayal of a certain issue as an "existential threat" to a referent object (Williams, 2003:514). Though, the securitizing actor is dominant in this stage, but functional actors and facilitating conditions play

important roles as well in making the referent object seem existentially threatened. This stage alone cannot form a securitization, it just a securitizing move or a securitization attempt. An issue is securitized only if and when the target audience accepts taking the issue out of the boundaries of “normal politics.

The second stage of securitization is a success only when the securitizing actor convinces the audience that the referent object is “existentially threatened. The third stage of securitization here is taken to constitute the expected outcomes of a securitization process, which is the implementing of particular measures to overcome the alleged threat. It has to do with extra ordinary measure taken by the securitizing actor to deal with the threat. Lastly, desecuritization is the reverse process and means, “the shifting of issues out of emergency mode and into the normal bargaining process of the political sphere. It is a process in which particular issues are removed from the extra-political-security realm and enter into (or return to) the realm of normal day-to-day politics (Balci A & Kardas T. 2012, p.102). Turkish-Israeli Relations in 1990s and 2000s shall be examined using this Copenhagen School’s Theory of Securitization in order to analyze the different security sectors that influenced these two periods.

GLOBAL SECURITY STUDIES

Military sector of security was overwhelmingly a matter of the state’s sovereignty, its territorial integrity and its political autonomy during the cold war. The traditional approach or conventional approach to security studies is known as Realist/neo-Realist theory, which dominated military security agenda during the cold war. Realism focuses on inter-state conflicts and all through the cold war era security was conceived as being coterminous with military security as against other states’ military power (Booth, 2005, 2). Realism argues for military power as the main tool of maintaining state’s sovereignty and security is basically nation-state, which is national security. The military strength of a state is further explained as the state’ political instrument of demonstrating strength, fostering counter threats, guarantee of domestic security, deter external attack, maintaining territorial integrity, preserving peace, and acquisition of prestige. Military power is also an instrument using in diplomatic negotiations, and as political propaganda (Saleh, A. 2010, p.230).

Furthermore, Realist approach to security study is significant to this paper in analyzing the reasons why Turkey has to pursue peaceful and friendly relations with Israel despite the fact there is different religion and identity between the two states. This is a question of whether Turkey developed this friendly relationship with Israel for the purpose of Turkey's national security or for Turkish society or Identity during the cold and 1990s? Attempt shall be made to buttress on this later in the paper.

Security studies experienced some changes and complexities at the aftermath of the cold war. It has been argued that the basic definition of security has never changed both during and after the cold war but the conditions at which security needs to address has be broadened from state centric approach to multiple approach. Anderson N. (2012) present an interesting analysis about the emergence of the new threats that led to the decline of military threats in the aftermath of the cold. The wave of globalization has led many analysts to challenge the traditional conception of security (Baldwin 1995, 118; Buzan 1984, 109; Mathews 1989, 162). These authors argued that the conception of security during the cold war is not sufficient to deal with the modern world's security problems. The nature of threat has changed and inter-state conflict that prevails during the cold war whereby threats are perceived from external aggression alone had also changed to Intra-state war whereby threats arose within the geo-political boundary of a state. These are what Marry Kaldor regarded as old war and new war. She argues that old war is a conflict over territory and sovereignty and usually as conflict between states

(inter-state conflict). And new wars entail a matter of fragmentation and/or integration, and a matter of the homogenization or diversification of society. She defines the new wars not to be ideological conflicts but conflicts of identity and they are accompanied by ethnic cleansing, rampant and excessive solidifications of identity, fervent criminality within the conflicts, and civil war (Saleh A 2010, p.235).

In broadening the security conditions at the aftermath of the cold war, United Nation (UN)'s Human Development Report (HDR) in 1994 summarized in seven main categories; Economic security, food security, healthy security, environmental security, personal security, Community security and political security ("UNDP", 1994:24). But Copenhagen School explained it in five categories which is called as security sectors; Military security, Environmental security, Economic security, Societal security, Political security (Buzan and Hansen, 2009:212). Out of this security sectors, two sectors are going to be needed basically for this paper in analyzing Turkish-Israeli relations within this two period of time. Societal sector shall be used in discussing the reasons that precipitated to the unfriendly relations between the two countries during the 2000s. Societal security is defined as the ability of a society to maintain its traditional patterns of language, culture, religion, national identity and customs (Booth, 2005:34). According to Barry Buzan, societal security is defined as the sustainability of traditional patterns of language, culture, religion, national identity and customs. It has to do with the identity conflict and it explains how Identity difference can lead to intra-state conflict. This explains the question of whether Muslim as a religious identity is the reason behind Turkey changing from good relations to bad relations with Israel in the year 2000s? This shall be explaining later in this paper.

Though this paper aims at using two security sectors and two theories of international relations, which are military sector with realist theory and societal sector with constructivist theory. But it shall not neglect the possibility of interconnectedness of security sectors as explain by Barry Buzan. This suggests the fact that security sectors and level of analysis cannot be separated. Security cannot be treated at a single sector and level of analysis. A threat to a particular sector will affect all other sectors and in dealing with this threat, other sectors shall also be used.

CONSTRUCTIVIST THEORY

It originated in 1980s and gained prominence in 1990s when realism, Neorealism and institutionalism failed to explain the end of the cold war (Barnett, 2008). The article written by Alexander Wendt titled "Anarchy is What States Make of It" aimed to build a bridge between those two traditions (Neorealism and Neoliberalism) by developing a constructivist argument (1992, p.394). According to Desch, (1998, p.2) The post-cold war wave of culturalism in security studies is a broad research program with a wide range of research focuses embracing a diverse range of epistemologies and utilizing a broad array of explanatory variables. Constructivism explains the behaviour of states in international system with the application of sociological categories.

Though, there are different constructivist approaches but they all argue on the fact that world is constructed socially and actions in this process are governed by ideas and norms. Constructivist share a common concern with how ideas defined the international structure; how this stricter shapes identities, interests and foreign policies of states; and how state and non-state actors reproduce that structure (Barnett, 2008, p.150). Constructivist explains how the identity of actors is socially constructed and shaped the foreign policy of a state. This theory is needed in Turkish-Israeli conflicts basically in the year 2000s to review how the Muslim identity of Turkish political actors determine Turkish foreign policy toward the Arab states and deteriorate its relationship with the west and Israel in particular.

SECURITIZATION OF TURKISH-ISRAEL RELATION

Securitization process involves some components according to Copenhagen School, which are referent object, securitizing actor, existential threat, functional actor and extraordinary measures. These components have been discussed in this paper before and they shall be applied to Turkish-Israeli relations in 1990-1999 and 2000-2009.

Securitizing Turkish-Israeli Relations in the 1990s

Referent Objects: during this period, the survival of Turkish state and secularism could be regarded as referent objects. For the Turkish state elites, external threat perceptions constituted the main factors influencing its foreign policy making in 1990s. Turkish military-bureaucratic elite regarded both internal and external affairs as a conviction that there is an international conspiracy to weaken and divide Turkey. In this respect, the fear of Turkey living in a threatening world necessitated the military sector of the country having privilege role in both domestic and foreign policy making. Turkey's perception of external threat has to do with some certainties enjoyed by its state elites during the cold war and PKK conflict against the security forces in the south-eastern provinces. In this period, the referent object of securitization was not basically the survival of territorial integrity of the state but also for ideological preservation, which was secularism. The security threats to the secular nature of the state were to come from everything related to the 'remnants' of Islamic identity. For the sake of preserving Turkish secular ideology, Israel came as a good example or ideological mirror- image of the secular Turkish state. Through good relations with Israel, Turkish military government would be able to deal with PKK, which was considered to have connection with some Arab States, so they could firstly halt the Kurdish separatists. Secondly, to counter regional support for local Islamic groups, and lastly, to prove their secular credentials in the eyes of their supporters and the West. The relationship with Israel was considered by Turkish military sector as solution to the threat facing the national security of the country.

The Securitizing Actor: The Turkish Military state and Israel could be regarded as the provider of security. Considering the speech act of the Turkish military in the 1990s, It shows that the referent objects discussed were presented as existentially threatened. The main referent objects for the generals were territorial integrity and secularism. According to the speech of General Staff in 1989 pointed out that the main source of external threats to Turkey had shifted from North (Soviet Union) to the South ((Iran, Syria, and Iraq). Chief of the General Staff İsmail Hakkı Karadayı as well pointed to Russia, Iran, Syria, Greece and Southern Cyprus as external threats to the territorial integrity and survival of the Turkish state. In the 1990s, the Turkish military used irtica and external threats as the main reasons for the agreements with Israel. The generals firmly believed that the alliance with Israel would help them to cope with the threats to the referent objects. According to Balci A & Kardas T. (2012, p.105) "Turkey's relations with Israel in the 1990s were exploited by the military and Kemalist elites to fight against the rise of the social forces of political Islam and Kurdish nationalism"

Functional Actors: considering the actors that influenced the success of Turkish securitization process, the role of the media, politician and others could be regarded as functional actors. The mainstream media was resourcefully and efficiently used as a springboard to move issues beyond politics. In the first half of the 1990s, virtually every leading newspaper was full of report concerning the General Staff's redefinition of the source of threats. Though irtica has been considered as threat in the newspapers right from 1980s but the reports on the danger of irtica gained prominence in the 1990s. With the coming to power of the Islamist Welfare Party's (WP), the mainstream visual and print media were full with securitizing comments. In a nutshell, the media acted as

functional securitizing actor in representing the WP government as ‘Islamist domestic threat’ to ‘the secular nature of the state. The activities of me academics, secularist women’s groups and Turkey’s leading trade union confederations could be regarded as functional actors as well. They held many public demonstrations and made statements in tune with the media reports. Also, prominent politicians regularly spoke out about the rise of “the movements against secularism” and contributed to the depiction of irtica as “an existential threat” for the Turkish secular regime. This influenced the Turkish-Israeli relations whereby Israel promised that it is determined to defend Turkey against fundamentalist Islamic movements in the Middle East (Balci A & Kardas T. 2012, p.106-7)

The Existential Threats: These can be regarded as PKK, Kurdish question, Islamic fundamentalist and welfare Party. Considering the attack of PKK in 1990s in the country and its connection with Iran, Syria and Iraq constituted a threat to the national security of Turkish state. For instance, three times more security forces were killed by the PKK between 1992 and 1995 than between 1984 and 1991. Between May 1993 and October 1993, the PKK killed 1,600 people. The conflict situation in the southeastern part of Turkey generated a fertile ground for the military for speaking on and defining threats to the territorial survival of the state. On the other hand, Necmettin Erbakan who happened to be the leader of WP had different foreign policy preferences. His Islamic ideology made him to argue for closed relations with the Muslim Middle Eastern states and destroy the relationship with Israel. He aimed at adopting strong anti-Western and anti-Israeli stand and defined Israel as the most dangerous threat to the Muslim cause. He and his followers often used the religious term “the Jewish State” rather than political or strategic terms in describing Israel. In his representation of Israel, the term “the Jewish state” was persistently articulated and regarded to be “enemy of Islam”, “threat”, “terrorist”, “aggressor” or “murderer” for the Islamists (Ovali & Bozdaglıoğlu Y. 2012, p.17). This led to the conclusion of this paper that the changing nature of Turkish-Israeli relations in 2000s from friends to enemy, which even led the AKP leadership to describe Israel as an “existential security threat” has a strong connection with Islamic Identity of Turkey.

Successful Securitization: This can be regarded as the military agreements signed between the two countries. If having a good relationship with Israel is the strategy to deal threats of Turkish national security. As put forward by Balci A & Kardas T. (2012, p.106). It was “a securitization process” that elevated relations between Turkey and Israel to a potent strategic partnership in the 1990s. The peace accord was signed when Military was in charge of the Turkish government and only national security issues became important to them. The agreement was signed by General Çevik Bir and his Israeli counterpart as it was considered to be a solution to the “existential threats” to the ideological and territorial survival of the Turkish state so due to this, the military was able to bypass the civilian government (WP) in signing the agreement.

Sectors of Security and Interconnectedness in Turkey-Israeli Relations in 1990s

Actor: Turkish state

Level of Analysis: Unit/state

Security Sectors: Military

Theory: Realism and Neorealism (It has been explained before in this project and how this influence Turkish foreign policy during this period).

Effect on other Sectors:

Military Sector: this is the basic sector that decided the Turkish foreign policy during this period. The relationship between the two countries was considered as a way of

securitizing the threat to Turkish national security. The relationship was also in favour of Turkish military strength.

Political Sector: Turkish foreign policy during this period caused some political insecurities, whereby Turkish political legitimacy was to be a decision whether it would turn its back to Arab world and face the West or face the Arab world against the West in terms of external recognition of its political legitimacy. Turkey as well experienced lot of internal oppositions to its political stability whereby civil society and civilian politicians formed remonstrated against Turkish violation of human rights toward Kurdish people and its alliance with Israel.

Societal Sector: Turkey is a Muslim majority state whereby the identity of the country against its foreign policy friendly relations with Israel. This foreign policy was considered as sacrificing Turkish societal identity for the sake of its national security. Several sources show that Kurdish identity was not really a threat to Turkish people due to the fact that Kurdish people have been part of Turkish history whereby they have been living together for several years. But Turkish foreign policy during this period was a way of securitizing Muslim identity, which was considered as a threat to Turkish secular state. So what really matters was not Turkish society identity but only the survival of Turkish state.

Economic Sector: Though Turkey government sacrificed a huge amount of money to purchase advance military technologies from Israel and training of air forces, which constituted insecurity in economic sectors. But some free trade agreements were also signed between the two countries, which served as economic advantages.

Environmental sector: training of forces and testing of advance ammunitions were the basic military agreement between the two countries, which would create insecurity in environmental sector.

Conclusion: It can be concluded that sectors of security are strictly connected with each other whereby separation of one sector would be difficult (interconnectedness of sectors). Threat to a sector affects all other sectors and securitization of these threats would require the use of all other sectors. Security in real sense of meaning comprises of all sectors and all the level of analysis, separation of the sectors for analysis is only for methodological advantage.

Securitizing Turkish-Israeli Relations in 2000-2009 (Desecuritization of 1990s)

In the early 2000s, the agreement was still valid and effective whereby well functioning and military personnel of Turkey still continued to visit Israel on a regular basis. Later, the politician began to criticize the military relations with Israel for the sake of Turkish regional relations. On the other hand, year 2000s can be regarded as a desecuritization of Turkish Military relations with Israel and a securitization for the Turkish politicians. The transformation of Turkish foreign policy especially under the new foreign minister, Ahmet Davutoğlu was remarkable. He has been Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's chief advisor for foreign policy and who was later appointed as the minister of foreign affairs in 2009. He was so concerned about Middle Eastern affairs, especially in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The emphasis on the Palestinian issue has to do with religious/Islamic connotations, which inevitably put Turkey against Israel. Turkey decided to play three basic roles in the region during these years, which are "regional leader", "regional protector" and "defender of Islam" (Ovali & Bozdaglıoglu Y. 2012, p.19).

Turkey as a regional leader explains that the foreign policy orientation of the AKP has a very strong regional emphasis. Davutoğlu's "Strategic Depth" doctrine emphasized that leadership role encompasses two important elements, which are geographical and historical. He emphasized on the fact that Turkey has to play a central

country role, “resting on both its geopolitical position and Ottoman heritage, had to resume a leading role in the Middle East and the Muslim world at large.” Secondly, Turkey as a regional protector can be explained according to Tayyip Erdoğan explanation that Turkey’s responsibility is to protect Muslim communities in the adjacent territories stating the reasons for Turkey’s engagement in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Thirdly, Erdoğan also explains on Turkey as a defender of Islam role in Turkish foreign policy, whereby the AKP government identified the Turkish self with the Muslim cause and assumed a responsibility to protect Muslims from any form of violence and repression. The new activism in Turkish foreign policy, which prioritized close relations with radical Islamic states and groups in the Middle East, marked the fall of its securitization with Israel (Ovali & Bozdaglioglu Y. 2012, p.21). In this respect, 2000s can be regarded as desecuritization, which led to the fall of referent object, securitizing actors, functional actors etc.

The Fall of Referent Object: there was a decrease in perceiving threats against the state ideology and territorial survival. Abdullah Öcalan that was the leader of PKK then and he was captured on the 15 of February 1999, which led to the decline of terrorist acts by the PKK and led to the gradual recovery of relations with Greece and Syria. On the domestic ideological front, threats to the secular nature of the state were also less significant when the WP was closed down by the Constitutional Court in January 1998 and later replaced by Virtue Party, which secured only 15.4 percent of vote in general elections of 1999. As a result of this, the referent objects of the 1990s lost their effectiveness in legitimizing the military’s moves in Turkish-Israeli relations.

Fall of Securitizing Actors: in this new era, political actors began to criticize the military’s dominant role in defining national threats. For example, Mesut Yılmaz, the then prime minister, criticized “irtica as an existential threat” to the secular character of the country by stating that irtica was a pretext to maintain the military’s power, position and large budget share. This period could be regarded as desecuritization attempts to cut the ‘constructed’ link between perceived threats and the referent objects. Turkish political authority extensively disapproves and condemned the state of Israel when she committed internationally deplored acts. Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit overtly accused Israel of “applying genocide on Palestinians in 2002. Military began to lose their position in the country as a securitizing actor and civil politicians began to gain prominence in providing citizen with the danger inherent in Turkish-Israeli relations.

The Facilitating Conditions: This is for successful desecuritization on the side of the military but securitization process on the side of the civil politicians. The earthquake of 1999 reduced tensions with Greece. The capture of PKK leader then was a facilitating condition changing the nature of threats to the referent objects. Another important point was the failure of peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians at Camp David, followed by the Al-Aqsa Intifada in 2000, gave a golden opportunity for civil actors in Turkey to speak out against Israel and criticize its policies, especially those towards Palestine. Similarly, the Israeli-Lebanese War in 2006 and the occupation of Gaza at the end of 2008 changed the domestic political climate.

Functional Desecuritizing Actors: Same functional actors for the securitization at 1990s changed the motive to desecutization in 2000s. Turkish media became an intermediary functional desecuritizing actor. For example, Cengiz Çandar, an influential columnist claimed that “Turkey cannot afford the shame to be the number one ‘military partner’ of the aggressor ‘military machine’ raising the anger of the region’s people” in the first days of the Al-Aqsa Intifada. Turkish Media coverage of Israeli atrocities against Palestinians constituted another functional actor for

desecutization of 2000s. The Turkish media extensively covered Israel's assassination of Hamas's spiritual leader Sheikh Ahmad Yassin in 2004, the Israel-Lebanon conflict in 2006, and the three-week invasion of the Gaza Strip by Israeli armed forces from the end of December 2008 until January 18 the following year. These created a public protests against Israel and enabled some civil society organizations to take more cognizance of Palestinian question. This led to many civil society organizations calling on the Turkish government to take action against Israel. Eğitim-Bir Sen (Education Personnel Labor Union) spokesperson Ali Kırır summarized the widespread feeling: "we ask the authorities to remove all agreements with Israel. No agreement with a terrorist state is more valuable than humanity or one drop of our Muslim siblings' blood. In this respect, Muslims identity began to shape the Turkish foreign policy.

The Successful Desecuritization: Year 2009 could be regarded a total collapse of the influence of the military over Turkish-Israeli relations. AKP government took control and Erdoğan publicly criticized Israel over its operation against Gaza at the World Economic Forum in January 2009, Turkish-Israeli relations began to hit the rock. When Ehud Barak, the Israeli defense minister, visited Turkey in January 2010 to reduce tension between the two countries, Turkish Chief of the General Staff İlker Başbuğ, President Abdullah Gül and Prime Minister Erdoğan declined to meet with him.

CONCLUSION

The article basically focused on Turkish-Israeli relations within 1990s and year 2000-2009. This is done to examine how realist theory explains the state-centric approach and military sector of security. And how this theory can be used to justify the friendly relations with the two countries during the cold war and 1990s when Turkey was under military control. This explains the fact that national security agenda is the only focus of the military sector, whereby military regime wouldn't mind to do anything possible to protect the state against any threat to national security. Islamic Identity was considered to be a threat to Turkish secular state as well as Kurdish question with the support of PKK terrorist attacks to the country. This made Turkey to have military relations with Israel though the two states shared different identities. The second phase of their relationship was examined within 2000 to 2009, and this constituted bad relations between them. This was due to the rise of civilian politicians influencing the foreign policy of the country. The military collapsed at some point, the political actors found their identity to matter in making foreign policy and Islamic identity changed the nature of relationship between the two countries. With the use of constructivist theory, the paper argues on how identity of actors shape the foreign policy of a state and how societal sector of security defines the significance of identity in securitizing the state. In conclusion, two theories (realism and constructivism) were used to analyze different securitization of Turkish-Israeli relations in 1990s and 2000-2009. These two theories necessitate the use of two security sectors in the paper, which are realism for military sector and constructivism for societal sector. They are both applied in securitizing the relations between the two countries. It was a securitization using realism and military sector in 1990s and later became a desecuritization of military sector and realism in 2000s for the securitization of societal sector and constructivist theory.

REFERENCES

- Balci A & Kardas T. (2012). The Changing Dynamics of Turkey's Relations with Israel: An Analysis of 'Securitization. *Insight Turkey*. Vol 14(2), p.99-114).
- Huber D. (2012). Turkish-Israeli Relations in a Changing Strategic Environment. *Global Turkey in Europe*, p.1-2.
- Ovali & Bozdaglıoglu Y. (2012). Role Theory and Securitization: An Agency Based Framework for Decoding Turkey's Diplomatic Offensive against Israel. *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations*, Vol14, p.3-4, 9-19, 21.
- Saleh A (2010). Broadening the Concept of Security: Identity and Societal Security. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, Vol. 6, (4), p.235.
- Öztürk TE. (2014). Religion as a Factor in Israeli - Turkish Relations: A Constructivist Overlook. *Alternative Turkish Journal of International Relations*, p.69-71.
- Barnett, M. (2008) _Identity and Alliances in the Middle East_, Peter Katzenstein (ed.), The Culture of National Security. *New York: Colombia University Press*.