



A Constructivist Analysis of The Concept of Security Communities with Reference to NATO's Approach To Countering Terrorism in The Post-September 11 Era

11 Eylül Sonrası Dönemde Nato'nun Terörizmle Mücadele Yaklaşımına Atıfla, Güvenlik Toplulukları Kavramına İlişkin İnşacı Bir Değerlendirme

Hasan Ulusoy¹

Abstract

This article examines the concept of security communities and its relevance for collective security formations in the context of the post-Cold War era. Through a theoretical comparison, thanks to its emphasis on the process of identity building among like-minded states, the constructivism in its conventional form is assessed to be better explanatory for the general situation in the aforementioned era. Based on this analysis, NATO's evolution as not only a collective defense alliance but also a security community among its allies will be evaluated with reference to the creation of a collective identity in countering terrorism, in the post-September 11 era. In this context, the trilateral memorandum signed between Türkiye, Finland and Sweden for counter-terrorism cooperation will also be assessed within the framework of security communities.

Keywords: Security Communities, Constructivism, NATO, Counter-terrorism in Post-September 11 Era, Türkiye

Öz

Bu makale, güvenlik toplulukları kavramını ve Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde kolektif güvenlik düzenlemeleriyle ilgisini incelemektedir. Kuramsal karşılaştırma yapıldığında, hemfikir devletler arası kimlik oluşumu sürecine verdiği önem sayesinde, Konvansiyonel İnşacılık, anılan dönemdeki genel duruma daha iyi açıklamalar getirmektedir. Bu analiz temelinde, NATO'nun, sadece bir kolektif savuma ittifakı değil, aynı zamanda müttefikleri arasında bir güvenlik topluluğu olarak evrimi, 11 Eylül sonrası dönemde terörle mücadele bağlamında ittifak içinde ortak bir kimlik oluşturulmasına odaklı olarak değerlendirilecektir. Bu kapsamda, Türkiye, İsveç ve Finlandiya arasında, terörle mücadele konusunda imzalanan mutabakat da güvenlik topluluğu kavramı bağlamında ele alınacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Güvenlik Toplulukları, İnşacılık, NATO, 11 Eylül Sonrası Dönemde Terörle Mücadele, Türkiye

1 Corresponding Author: Hasan Ulusoy Ambassador / PhD holder in foreign policy, Turkish MFA, Ankara.
E-mail: hasulu1970@gmail.com, ORCID: 0009-0007-9341-7858

To cite this article: Ulusoy, H. (2023). A constructivist analysis of the concept of security communities with reference to NATO's approach to countering terrorism in the post-September 11 era. *SİYASAL: Journal of Political Sciences*, 32(2), 297–309. <http://doi.org/10.26650/siyasal.2023.32.1331018>



Introductory Remarks on the Concept of Security Communities

The concept of security communities is utilized in practice for solutions against the issues affecting states' security in the international arena. It has, hence, a lot in common with the idea of collective security *vis-à-vis* security communities in providing security for members. The early attempts of its theoretical evaluations came in the 1950s. After its inception in use in the early 1950's by Richard Van Wagenen, it was not until the leading 1957 study by Karl Deutsch and his colleagues that this theory gained its whole initial theoretical and empirical standing. According to the definition of Deutsch, a security community is to serve as a group of states which had become integrated with each other to the extent that enables the "real assurance so that the members of that community will not fight each other physically but will settle their disputes in some other way" (Adler and Barnett, 1998: 6). Deutsch proposes that states which are involved in a security community not only constitute a basic stable order, but also, actually, a stable peace. He categorized security communities in two types: the amalgamated and pluralistic ones, which are distinguished from each other according to the degree of the integration of the state power. Whereas both have reliable expectations for the potentials of peaceful change, the former performs when states officially get united, while, in the latter, states preserve their sovereignty (Deutsch, et al, 1957).

Nevertheless, regardless of its capacity for the theoretical and practical standing, the idea of security community did not ever generate a vigorous research agenda within his time. Several reasons can be put forward for this. To begin with, the Cold War conditions coupled with "the balance of terror" stemming from the constructed but also perceived fear of nuclear retaliations, did not allow such projects. As claimed, the Cold War was meant to be an era of 'survival' (Krause, 1998: 301). In such a period, implausible amalgamated security community thoughts were outshined by means of other integrationist approaches, for example, neo-functionalism, while the gradual steps came into existence for unifying the western European states. That era was also marked with the gradual failure of the UN, the only multilateral setting to supposedly reign globally, due to the ideological division in the UN Security Council among the permanent member states.

Furthermore, the realist supremacy in the IR academia ruled over theoretical debates leaving no place for discussions of such communities for ideal peace projects. Besides, as pointed out by Adler, there existed a fragility of the theory itself formed by Deutsch (Adler, 1998: 8).

During the post-Cold War period, the concept became popular again. It is asserted that Deutsch's remarks for a security community appeared mainly convenient once the Cold War ceased to exist. By this peaceful end, policymakers were encouraged to propose ideas aiming for a permanent peace and norms based international system (Adler, 1998). This was no exception. Adler (1998:3) argued it as follows:

"Ends of wars have almost always invited a flurry commentary on the past and hopeful speculation about the future world. But what was unexpected is that statesmen and politicians were referring to the importance of social forces and values nearly identical to those remarked upon by Deutsch - the development of shared understandings, transnational values and transaction flows to encourage community building and to conceptualize the possibility of peace. Similarly, these have found their reflections in the field of theory".

Thus," the revisiting of the concept of security communities can be attributed both to changing approaches of states in the post-Cold War and to corresponding developments in international relations theory that focus on the role of identity, norms, and the social basis of global politics (Ulusoy, 2003:4)".

Adler revisited the concept with particular focus on these achievements. He sought to better explain the concept through his formulation of pluralistic security communities, which he argued to better correspond to the current settings of international relations and the IR theory. Focusing on intersubjective formations such as the importance of identity-building and collective identification, in his book which is named as Security Communities, he mentions the idea of security community as a community of independent states working on the undesirability of contemporary war and on financial, social, politic and moral principles relevant with democracy, economic reform and the rule of law, to ensure their collective security by means of a course, in which candidate states gather on the foundation of common norms and identities. Hence, he described it in such a way that "security communities are socially constructed because shared meanings, constituted by interaction, engender collective identities. They are dependent on communication, discourse, and interpretation, as well as on material environments" (Adler, 1997: 258).

As one can see, identity is the main factor in this process. Collective self-definitions generate internalized patterns enabling persons of various states to identify one another more clearly and therefore react successfully in pursuit of shared interests. Social learning, particularly accompanied by practical and functional activities, facilitates the rise of security communities, as states are inclined to behave in accordance with patterns that common values and identities have established (Adler, 1997: 264).

What composes the security community is thus the common responsiveness to the questions of 'who am I?' and 'who is the other?' That is to say, it is the collective identity, a prerequisite for a workable security community. Constructing collective identities are of significance in the sense that shared identities contribute to creating a shared feeling of security leading to collective security initiatives.

Considering the preceding, one can easily comprehend that common values and collective identities as well as common points of views with regard to perceptions are of particular importance to formulate a security community. Naturally, in this process, the examination of theoretical approaches related to such concepts as identity and security communities is needed..

In view of the brief summary of the concept of security communities, the article's focus will be on NATO's evolution as not only a collective defense alliance but also a security community among its allies, with reference to the creation of a collective identity in countering terrorism, in the post-September 11 era. To better analyze this issue, the social constructivism in its conventional form will be utilized as the theoretical tool with its emphasis on the formation of collective identities, which will be discussed in the following section in comparison with mainstream approaches.

Theoretical Framework

Mainstream Approaches

It is argued that mainstream scholars are mainly not content both with the concept of communities, and with that of security communities. In the understanding of mainstream

¹ scholarship, though states may take part in the rare act of reciprocity for security, it is the anarchical setting of the world order to pave the way for being advantageous over their neighborhood, and for behaving in a self-interested and self-help attitude. Theoretical assessment of the concept of security communities can be made in accordance with theoretical perspectives which explain the absence of war, which security communities aim for. In this theoretical endeavor, realism and constructivism lie at opposite ends.

Realists assert that international relations are related to how power is shared, with less attention to social surroundings. They and their neo-realist variants consider that even if hot conflicts do not occur uninterruptedly, they should be anticipated. Their absence is due to the reason that hegemonies, balances-of-power, deterrence, and alliances can prevent them, however only for a limited time. Here, the advocates of neo-realism assert that the inexistence of war cannot be ensured forever given the anarchical nature of international politics (Adler, 1998, Fearon, 2002 and Adler, 2008).

Neo-liberal institutionalism works on the question of efficient institution-building for survival which can be asserted as similar to constructivism. However, there is a distinction which is argued as follows:

“Their (neo-liberals) commitment to how self- interested actors construct institutions to enhance cooperation prevents them from considering fully how a community might be forged through shared identities rather than through pre- given interests and binding contracts alone, or how interstate and transnational interactions can alter state identities and interests. Indeed, these are covered by the constructivist approach” (Ulusoy,2003;12).

Idealism, too, has something to say about security communities, as it acknowledges the importance of state interests (Adler, 1998: 14). Yet, their assumption that there is a single ideal peace that can be achieved by organizations such as security communities is problematic as there is no such peace. Security communities, nevertheless, could serve peaceful coexistence by facilitating for collective identification and perceptions.

Constructivist Approach onto Security Communities

As the matter of the fact, security and its goal for peaceful change need to be constructed through the institutionalization of transnational values, shared identities, intersubjective understandings, and mutual identification. Thus, as to the concept of security communities, all these reveal the functionality of constructivism.

It was Onuf who first used the term “constructivism”. To put it simply, it means “People and societies construct or constitute, each other” (Onuf, 1989: 38). Two distinct underlying elements can be said about this approach: the role of social factors and their effects on not only actors’ behavior but also their identities and interests (Wendt, 1995: 71-81). Instead of refusing the existence of one physical world, this approach asserts that “how the material world shapes, changes, and affects human interaction, and is affected

¹ By ‘mainstream scholarship’, the paper refers to theoretical approaches that have dominated international relations throughout history since the Cold War, i.e. (neo) realists, liberalists (neoliberalist institutionalism), which work on the basis of positivist/rationalist parameters. See K. Krause, ‘Critical Theory and Security Studies’, in *Cooperation and Conflict*, 1998, Vol.33(3) , pp.298-333; also J. Fearon and A. Wendt, ‘Rationalism v. Constructivism’, in W. Carlsnaes (et al), *Handbook of International Relations*, (Sage, London, 2002), pp. 52-73. See also for detailed analysis in Ulusoy, Hasan (2005), “A constructivist analysis of Türkiye’s foreign and security policy in the post-Cold War era”, Middle East Technical University, Department of International Relations, PhD Thesis.

by it, depends on prior and changing epistemic and normative interpretations of the material world.” (Ulusoy,2003; 6). With its focus on the foregoing one can see that the said approach combines theories with the comprehension of current world affairs (Adler, 1997).

Constructivism, focusing on identities in formulating the interests and policies of the state, asserts that under suitable circumstances, actors can create mutual identities and norms helping for a permanent peace (Hopf, 1998: 172). Hence, one can claim that this approach can be utilized for better explaining security communities. Surprisingly when Deutsch formulated the idea of security communities, there was no such theoretical approach in IR. Despite this, his sociological approach, which emphasized social transactions and social communication, had an indelible influence on later developments in constructivism. In the 1950s he promoted a research programme on security communities, which dealt with peaceful transnational collective identities, favouring a positivist epistemology, (Adler, 2013). All of these helps indeed for a better account of security communities as they are formed of collective identities.

Constructivism comes with several variants. This article focuses on conventional constructivism as this variant helps for a complementary explanation of the world led by political realism without refusing the parameters of the mainstream school but adding to them the value of intersubjective formulations such as perceptions in foreign policy. It simply concentrates on the lenses over which IR actors conceptualize and construct their understanding of the outside world and beyond. These metaphoric lenses can be seen as the tools forming state identities.

One should here analyze how constructivism and mainstream scholarship treat the issue in order to account for their perceptions of security. In this effort, Krause (1998:330) proposes a workable methodology in the following lines:

“Threat perception is the primary variable in understanding how the concept of security is taken into consideration. In doing so, the emphasis is on how the critical approaches, i.e. constructivism, correspond to the central claims of the security studies agenda of the mainstream approaches. These claims are as follows: Threats arise naturally from the material capabilities of possible opponents in a self-help world of sovereign states; the object of security is the state, and the security dilemma can be ameliorated but not transcended. To assess these central claims in relation to the constructivist approach, the construction of threats and appropriate responses to these threats, construction of object(s) of security and the evaluation of the possibility for transformation of security dilemma, are focused on.”

Such a comparison uncovers significant differences between mainstream approaches and constructivism. Firstly, the former consider threats as “‘given” whereas the latter accept them as constructed. This derives from the fact that while the former is attached to positivist understanding, the latter finds its roots more in post-positivist and intersubjective philosophy.

The following differences to the conceptualization are in fact associated with ‘how’ and ‘what’ question. To put it simply, one can assert that the mainstream approaches are generally explanatory in an analytical setting whereas constructivism focuses on clarifying why and how specific decisions causing particular courses of actions are made. In fact, such concepts as the nature of threat, the object of security and the possibilities

of transformation of security dilemma can be better comprehended by asking “how”. However, mainstream scholars explain them without questioning how they are constructed. As one argues, “understanding (constructivist approach) precedes, accompanies, and closes and thus envelops explanation. In return, explanation (mainstream ones) develops understanding analytically.” (Ulusoy,2003;11)

As a matter of fact, the recognized impact of constructivism in security studies has not been rapid either due to the dominance of the mainstream approaches as it was long considered “the theoretically improvised cousin to the sturdy children of international relations” (Krause, 1998: 330). Yet, taking into consideration the aforementioned comparison, one can obviously see that constructivism in fact complements what is lacking in mainstream approaches in security questions. Constructivism also signifies that they are socially built in respect of culture as well as identity.

As one can see from the above discussion, identification is also of the utmost importance both for security communities and for constructivism. Thus, one needs to elaborate on how it is taken up in IR theories. Identity building is a social process. As one comments, “the process of identity formation is of a kind that develops within a social unit” (Yurdusev, 1997: 18). In this context, Krause argues for the following: “Any identification requires a distinction just as any distinction necessitates some identification. This brings us to the dichotomy of the self/other. The self is identified in relation to its position vis-à-vis the other.” (Krause, 1998;312) In other words, “all identities exist only with their otherness. Without the other, the self actually cannot know either itself or the world because meaning is created in discourse where consciousness meets” (Neumann, 1999: 13).

Yurdusev further argues that” identification is of an exclusionary nature for the non-identified. In other words, in the identification of a group of people as a community, this unit is externalized or disassociated from the values, myths, symbols, attitudes and mores of those (non-identified) with whom the unit does not identify itself” (Yurdusev, 1997: 107). Naturally, facing with a threat perception or presence stemming from the “other” unavoidably solidifies the self’s own identity (Yurdusev, 1997: 21).

Constructivism primarily focuses on identity in IR. Mainstream approaches likewise acknowledge identity. However, what makes it different *vis-à-vis* constructivism is that the former assumes to know it *a priori* and considers states to have a unique identity, unchanged regardless of space and time while constructivism supposes that states’ identities can vary, based on their backgrounds such as history, culture, politics, or societal factors (Hopf, 1998: 176). In this regard, one can clearly see that constructivism can better describe security communities as forms of collective identities.

The Concept of Security Communities in the Post- Cold War Context and NATO’s Evolution in Countering Terrorism

Early Post-Cold War Period

The aforementioned framework shows us the importance of constructivism in its conventional form to better provide perspectives for understanding the concept of security communities. What can be said about NATO, *vis-à-vis* new security threats such as terrorism which has dominated the post-Cold War context in security studies?

Based on the preceding review, one can assert that realism maintained its value as the key understanding of world affairs during the Cold War. Yet, its assumptions were refined/developed by novel approaches eventually. In this sense, despite the gradual emergence of critical approaches, the Cold War can yet be perceived as a period of mainstream scholarship.

As one argues, “realism was the dominant discourse from about the start of the late medieval period in 1300 to at least 1989” (Krause, 1998: 303). When the Cold War came to an end, the scene was as follows: the growing criticism of the mainstream school as failing to predict the courses causing the collapse of the Warsaw Pact.

The Cold War, as the symbol of division of the European continent for nearly 50 years, came to an end with the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989. The collapse of the wall also represented the fall of the ideological walls that had been separating the continent for so many years. In the early years of the Post-Cold War period, even politicians and scholars tempted to question the value of NATO, since military alliances dissolve when the common foe, the other, is defeated. Yet, time proved it differently for NATO, with the increase of non-conventional security threats. From this point of view, in addition to many wars and conflicts in only one decade during the post-Cold War period, which added up to more than witnessed in the entire course of the Cold War years not only in its heart (the Caucasus and the Middle East) but also in its nearby (in the territories of the former Yugoslavia), the end of the Cold War has also set new security issues, beside the long-standing concern of a nuclear war amid the two world powers and their plans for large-scale conventional wars. Among these lies international terrorism, which has ultimately made NATO agendas busy, due to its ramifications and links with ethnic animosities and religious fundamentalism, as well as drug and human trafficking, organized crime, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and migration flows.

In fact, they are not totally new problems for international security. Nevertheless, what is new at this point is the impact of globalization on these threats and challenges. Now, in a world where things have outstandingly evolved to be more transboundary and interlinked on each other, due to the impact of globalization, just like in the domino theory, anything taking place in a country or in a region, whether it is a terrorist attack or an ethnic conflict, risks further imposing threats on other areas. Corollary to this, security issues have also become more diverse, less identifiable and less predictable. As a result of all this, such transboundary challenges affect security more quickly, more critically in an ever-expanding magnitude with spill-over impact. These threats naturally require collective reactions as they affect nearly all states in one way or another.

The Post-September 11 Period

The September 11 attacks were a turning point in many aspects. These terrorist attacks led to unprecedented consequences for the global affairs in the post-Cold War era (Heisbourg, 2002). In this context, the constructivist perspective can provide a better understanding of how the transformation in NATO has evolved in countering terrorism, which turned out to be the “other” for the “allied selves”.²

2 The following part on the evolution of identification of terrorism as a threat and collective enemy for NATO as discussed here is primarily cited from Ulusoy, H. (2007), “One Policy, Many Identities: The Consistency

The brief history of NATO's position to countering terrorism before September 11 is listed in the below chart.

Table 1
Analysis of NATO Summit Declarations on Terrorism

Summits	Terrorism separately mentioned	Risk/Threat	Terrorism mentioned as a security threat for territorial integrity
1991	No	Risk	No
1994	Yes	Threat	No
1997	Yes	Threat	No
1999	Yes	Threat	Yes

Source: NATO, www.nato.int (as cited from Ulusoy, 2007;155)

As the table above illustrates, political discourses concerning counter-terrorism in the NATO texts reflect an increasing awareness of this scourge as a threat with a high potential to endanger NATO and allies as a whole. However, albeit being adopted at the conclusion of the Washington Summit of 1999 as a security threat that could possibly have a detrimental effect on the territorial integrity of the allies, terrorism as such was not directly linked to the clause of collective defence under Article 5.³ That is to say, the allies were not yet unwilling to focus on terrorism as a threat to be neutralized by the collective defense mechanism of the Alliance if and when necessary.

Furthermore, the references to the co-operation for counter-terrorism were at all times found in the ends of the Declarations, which can be argued as a lack of understanding for the existential importance of counter-terrorism for the Alliance. This perception might be attributed to the lack of progress in the Strategic Concept of 1999 on terrorism, even though the allies were about to gradually face the damages of terrorism for the security of their countries at the said summit.

Hence, prior to the September 11 period, one can only assert the following: Not until the Washington Summit in 1999 was terrorism acknowledged by the Alliance as an asymmetric security threat, likely to affect the territorial integrity of the allies. However, since September 11, the aforementioned perspective has gone through a considerable transformation.

From September 11 onwards, according to this transformation; terrorist acts targeting a NATO member have become listed among armed assaults covered under the clause of the collective defence mechanism in the Treaty which would require the invocation of Article 5. Furthermore, such a decision would need evidence that these armed assaults are orchestrated by foreigners outside the country (Ulusoy,2007).

Hence, during the early days of post-September 11, it was declared that terrorist acts against an ally could be answered by the Alliance by invoking Article 5 as a collective defense measure, on the condition that terrorist attacks were verified as commanded from abroad. In that sense, this was a breakthrough.

Nevertheless, the use of Article 5 was not sufficient to form a joint military operation

of Turkey's Foreign Policy with Special Emphasis on Its Security Dimension in the Post-Cold War Era, A Constructivist Appraisal", The Isis Press, İstanbul, 2007.

3 Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty is the collective defence clause which can be described as an attack against one Ally is considered as an attack against all Allies. Yet, as will be discussed in the paper, it has no automatic mechanism but many caveats.

of NATO, to which all allies were obligated to collectively contribute. In nature, it was a military operation of the USA in the form of a coalition of the willing. As a result, many NATO members only contributed a few support troops and tried to sidle away from combat operations and troubled areas. This hesitant behavior of many allies *vis-à-vis* the attacks of terrorism showed that even though they all were in consensus that there was an armed attack to one of them, they were not ready for a joint military operation involving all of the Allies.

As the case of September 11 showed, the lack of specificity in Article 5 provides for the allies to only abide by their NATO commitment without totally participating in the war effort. In fact, this is due to the wording of the clause governing the collective defence mechanism under Article 5 of the Treaty which does not specify the type of assistance the allies would offer to the attacked party even if Article 5 were to be invoked. This was a result of the insistence of the US to be wary of an automatic military commitment at the time of drafting the treaty (Grennan *et al*,2021).

This loophole in that sense had in fact led to harsh criticisms about the real function of NATO as a military alliance during the Cold War. It was also asserted that Article 5, formulated in the harsh conditions of Soviet threats of nuclear and conventional attacks coming from the Warsaw Pact, was of mostly political and symbolic importance, intended to illustrate the allied unity. The critics would argue: If the Alliance could not jointly react in military means with the assistance of all its allies, why was there such a collective defense clause in the Washington Treaty? Similarly, in the aftermath of September 11, criticism from mainly US circles, even led to such arguments that the Alliance itself faced with a failure as a military and defense organization.

Despite all these discussions, the awareness and engagement of NATO in reference to countering terrorism has grown over the years. Since the September 11 attacks, NATO has renewed its strategic concepts twice, in 2010 and 2022 respectively. The official NATO web page states:

“NATO’s strategic concepts are official documents that set out the Alliance’s strategy. The strategy outlines NATO’s enduring purpose and nature, its fundamental security tasks, and the challenges and opportunities it faces in a changing security environment. It also specifies the elements of the Alliance’s approach to security and provides guidelines for its political and military adaptation” (See NATO web pages, strategic concepts).

In short, they illustrate the way in which NATO sees the current international security environment and its potential impact on its future. As said, such documents are renewed *vis-à-vis* perceived challenges and threats in the global security environment and to ensure that NATO fulfils its key purpose and executes its core tasks, making growth and adaptation permanent features of the Alliance (Özdemir, 2022) and (Bağbaşıoğlu, 2022).

In fact, the 2022 Strategic Concept adopted at the Madrid Summit has led to important steps taken by the Allies *vis-à-vis* countering terrorism. Although the 2010 Strategic Concept which was adopted at the Lisbon Summit indicated the increased awareness of this threat, the 2022 text clearly underlined that “countering terrorism is essential to collective defense”, thus stressing the importance of Article 5 of the Treaty. Furthermore, the text points out that “NATO’s role in the fight against terrorism contributes to all three core tasks and is integral to the Alliance’s 360-degree approach to deterrence and

defense” (see NATO Strategic Concepts). In that sense, countering terrorism is mentioned as a whole paragraph under the chapter of core tasks entitled “deterrence and defense” (Gilli et al, 2022). These are the testimony of the new engagement of NATO in countering terrorism, given probably the increased terrorist structures of international scale affecting the NATO allies, such as DEASH and others.

What is also noteworthy in that regard at the Madrid Summit is the reference stated in the Summit Declaration to the trilateral memorandum signed between Türkiye, Finland, and Sweden on the margin of the Summit, which was welcomed by all allies.

This memorandum which is accessible in NATO documents (Trilateral Memorandum), stated *inter alia* that “as prospective NATO Allies, Finland and Sweden extend their full support to Türkiye against threats to its national security. To that effect, Finland and Sweden will not provide support to YPG/PYD (The Syrian branch of PKK), and the organization described as FETO (Fettulah Gülen terrorist organization) in Türkiye”.

Despite having been heavily affected by several forms of terrorism coming from different terrorist organizations, Türkiye has never been given a fair treatment to enjoy the use of Article 5 by its allies in its fight against terrorism. Due to the negative approaches of its allies, Türkiye could not initiate Article 5 against such terrorist attacks which threaten its territories and security, unlike the decision taken for the USA in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks.

Notwithstanding this differentiated treatment to Türkiye, it is true on the other hand that Article 5 in the Treaty does not mean automatic military response by the allies to such armed attacks as argued above. As stated by the provisions in that article, to use this collective defense mechanism, the allies should decide by consensus. If such invocation is initiated, they still need to act by consensus on how to respond to the attack, coalition of willing or joint military response of NATO (see The North Atlantic (NATO) Treaty). Hence, in the failure of such a consensus, the Alliance risks facing a deadlock even in invoking Article 5, as well as deciding on measures of how to respond under Article 5. This is certainly a weakness deep in the organizational system of the Alliance.

As outlined above, NATO has adjusted to the post-Cold War atmosphere with dual models emerging: “one privileging its transformation to an organization of collective security, where cooperative norms would prevail, and the other clinging to collective defense and deterrence calculations” (Von Hlatky and Fortmann, 2020: 568).

In view of the foregoing, with the progress already achieved in NATO, in which the Madrid Summit and 2022 Strategic Concept seem to have contributed much to, one can clearly assert that today NATO has a role in countering terrorism. That is to say, the question of whether NATO should have a role to play in that field has already become redundant. The present question is rather what sorts of role NATO can play in this regard and how it can adopt itself for such a role (Gheciu, 2022 and Müller *et al*, 2022).

Concluding Remarks

The above-mentioned arguments supported by the theoretical framework have attempted to show the relevance of the concept of security communities for NATO and among its allies. First improved by Karl Deutsch, this concept is about forming a

community, by which its members feel better ensured for their own security through collective security.

The fact that the security community and its aim of peaceful change might be established through the institutionalization of mutual identification, transnational values, intersubjective understandings and shared identities, shows the relevance of constructivism in formulating the concept of security communities. Constructivism, with its focus on constitutive norms and identities in shaping state interests and policies, allows for possibility that under the proper conditions, actors can generate shared identities and norms that are tied to a stable peace. Thus, it is argued that security communities can be better understood with the premises of constructivism. It is because constructivism, which recognizes the importance of knowledge for transforming international structures and security politics, is best suited to explain how international community can shape security politics and create the conditions for a stable peace. In this context, given its focus on identity-building and the sense of living together, albeit power is not unrelated, the constructivist approach, by better clarifying how identities are generated, serves as a complementary theoretical tool to provide holistic analyses of world affairs. In doing so, its focus on the role of shared values and collective identities is indeed instrumental for collective security efforts and the formation of security communities.

In a security community, states perceiving common threats construct collective identities against a commonly perceived/identified enemy. In this respect, the comparison between mainstream scholarships and constructivism in its conventional form clearly shows that the latter is theoretically more equipped to analyze the relevance of security communities at present, thanks to its focus on the construction of collective identities.

From the aforementioned perspective, NATO can be considered a form of security community built on the principle of collective security. This means that members of this community will come to the assistance of other member states, even if their own territories remain secure. This is contrary to military alliances, considering that alliances are mostly time-bound and can be dissolved when they are no longer needed or useful. One can say with confidence that throughout the years, NATO has evolved into a community of states that share views and are united not only in contrast to their adversary, the Warsaw Pact, but also by their determination (as declared in the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949) “to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law” (Cottey, 2014 and Willa-Olszanecka, 2021).

During the heydays of Cold War NATO, the allies were able to closely embrace each other within the sense of a true security community (firmly committed to defend each other against a common enemy while enjoying trust and respect for each other) given the threats posed by the Soviet Bloc which was identified as the other of their common self in NATO. In the Cold War era, the ‘other’ was the East for the West and vice versa. In the post-Cold War, international terrorism came to the agenda of NATO allies following the September 11 terrorist attacks. To a certain extent, this has led to a transformation, albeit slow and gradual, in NATO as its strategic concepts have attested to.

NATO has identified that countering terrorism is essential for its collective defense as terrorists threaten the security of populations, forces, and territory of the allies (NATO Strategic Concept 2022). Thus, it is only normal to expect that the allies should trust each

other in their fight against terrorists. As argued, “trust is the key concept in defining a security community. It can even be considered as a common denominator of the security-community” (Väyrynen, 2023: 362).

This could provide a sound reason why Türkiye was opposed to the adhesion of candidate countries, Sweden and Finland. As can be clearly seen in the 2022 strategic concept, in a collective defense alliance where allies firmly commit to counter terrorism since this is declared as essential to their collective defense, they should expect the same from each other in reference to countering all kinds of terrorist organizations which may find refuge in their lands. To put it more simply, Türkiye was to feel confident about these countries’ undertaking *vis-à-vis* its own security threats and thus needed to be convinced in that regard if NATO is to be still considered a security community in which all allies enjoy mutual confidence and trust as well as security among themselves. This case can be seen in fact as a good indication of the sense of how security communities within a collective defense alliance where based on trust, a stable peace is ensured among the allies, should work at present.

In view of the foregoing one can see the relevance of constructivism in better explaining the issues in NATO leading to a new collective identity of states *versus* terrorism to provide collective security among each other in the sense of a security community while functioning as a collective defence alliance.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

References

- Adler, Eç (1997). Imagined (Security) Communities: Cognitive Regions in International Relations. *Millennium*, 26(2), 249–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298970260021101>.
- Adler, E., & Barnett, M. (Eds.) (1998). *Security Communities*, Cambridge Studies in International Relations, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511598661>.
- Adler, E. (2002). “*Constructivism and International Relations*.” *Handbook of International Relations*, Eds: Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, Beth A Simmons, Sage Publication. 2002. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608290>
- Adler, E. (2008). The Spread of Security Communities: Communities of Practice, Self-Restraint, and NATO’s Post-Cold War Transformation. *European Journal of International Relations*, 14, 195, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066108089241>.
- Adler, E. (2013). Constructivism in international relations: Sources, contributions, and debates. *SAGE Handbook of international relations*, 2, 112-144.
- Bağbaşıoğlu, A. (2022). “Implications of NATO’s 2022 Strategic Concept on its Enlargement & Partnership Policies and Türkiye’s Position: Challenges and Opportunities”, SAM Papers, No:22, November, <http://sam.gov.tr/pdf/sam-papers/SAM%20Papers-No.-22.pdf>.
- Cottey, A. (2014). “NATO transformed: The Atlantic Alliance in a new era”, *Rethinking Security in Post-Cold-War Europe*, William Park, G. Wyn Rees (Eds), Routledge, pp. 43-60.
- Deutsch, K. W.; et al. (1957). *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Fearon, J., & Wendt, A. (2002). “Rationalism v. Constructivism”, in W. Carlsnaes (et al), *Handbook of International Relations*, (Sage, London, 2002), pp. 52-73.
- Gheciu, A. (2022). “Protecting NATO’s security community”, NDC Policy Brief, No.10 - May 2022, <https://www.ndc.nato.int/news/news.php?icode=1705>.
- Grennan, E., & Toros, H. (2021). 9/11 as a policy pivot point in the security community: a dialogue. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 14(4), 438-440, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2021.1982123>.
- Gilli, A., et al (2022). “Strategic Shifts and NATO’s new Strategic Concept”, Ndc Research Paper, No. 24, June 2022, <https://www.ndc.nato.int/news/news.php?icode=1716>.

- Heisbourg, F. (2002). Anatomy of the New Terrorism: Interview. *Entretien, Le Débat*, 119, 98-107. <https://doi.org/10.3917/deba.119.0098>.
- Hlatky, S., & Fortmann, M. (2020). "NATO enlargement and the failure of the cooperative security mindset", In *Evaluating NATO Enlargement: From Cold War Victory to the Russia-Ukraine War*, pp. 531-561, Cham: Springer International Publishing, <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41311-020-00240-w>.
- Hopf, T. (1998). The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory. *International Security*, 23(1), 171–200. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2539267>
- Krause, K. (1998). *Critical Theory and Security Studies. Cooperation and Conflict*, 33(3), 298-333.
- Müller, L. M., & Beeson, M. (2022). "From collective security to the construction of regional security communities: regional security governance in a global context", *Handbook on Global Governance and Regionalism*, Edited by Jürgen Rüländ and Astrid Carrapatoso, pp. 307–322.
- NATO-The North Atlantic Treaty (1949), Washington D.C. - 4 April, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm.
- NATO Strategic Concepts, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_56626.htm.
- NATO Strategic Concept (2022), Heads of State and Government at the NATO Summit in Madrid, 29 June 2022, https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2022/6/pdf/290622-strategic-concept.pdf.
- NATO Trilateral Memorandum (2022), Heads of State and Government at the NATO Summit in Madrid, https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2022/6/pdf/220628-trilat-memo.pdf.
- Neumann, I. B. (1999). *Uses of the Other: 'The East' in European Identity Formation (NED-New edition, Vol. 9)*, University of Minnesota Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttv1zn>
- Onuf, N. (1989). *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*, University of South Carolina Press.
- Özdemir, E. (2022). "Changing NATO Priorities and New Security: Analysis of Strategic Concepts 1949-2022" in *NATO Priorities and Caucasus- Status Quo And Changes*, International Collection of The Papers of The Scientific-Practical Conference, ISBN-978-9941-8-5017-2, https://eta.edu.ge/uploads/konferenciebis_krebulebi/NATO.pdf.
- Ulusoy, H. (2003). "Revisiting Security Communities After the Cold War: The Constructivist Perspective." *Perceptions, Vol VIII*, Issue 3, 161-196.
- Ulusoy, H. (2005). *A constructivist analysis of Türkiye's foreign and security policy in the post- cold war era*", Middle East Technical University, Department of International Relations, Phd Thesis.
- Ulusoy, H. (2007). "One Policy, Many Identities: The Consistency of Turkey's Foreign Policy with Special Emphasis on Its Security Dimension in the Post-Cold War Era, A Constructivist Appraisal", The Isis Press, İstanbul, 2007.
- Wendt, A. (1995). Constructing International Politics. *International Security*, 20(1), 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2539217>.
- Willa, R., & Olszanecka, N. (2021). NATO: Building A Security Community in the Face of Covid-19 Pandemic. *European Research Studies Journal Volume XXIV* Special Issue 1, 269-280, <https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/2041>.
- Väyrynen, R. (2023). *Stable Peace Through Security Communities? Steps Towards Theory-Building. In: Raimo Väyrynen: A Pioneer in International Relations, Scholarship and Policy-Making, Pioneers in Arts, Humanities, Science, Engineering, Practice*, vol 28. Springer, Cham. (pp. 345-365), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-13627-6_13.
- Yurdusev, A. N. (1997), *Avrupa Kimliğinin Oluşumu ve Türk Kimliği: Türkiye ve Avrupa*, A. Eralp (Ed.). İmge Kitabevi, Ankara.

