Security Debates and Alliance against Terrorism

Ramazan Erdağ[*]

Abstract

This article searches the answer that how security could be defined, what the new security studies are and what can be done against global terrorism and how can be assured peace and stability condition? In this context, with new security disputes and perspectives it can be said that security is not an alone issue, it's a collective study and mostly claimed as dilemma. It also can be said that in the new era more international collaboration and alliance are need to supply international security. In this regard this article expounds global alliances' effectiveness -especially NATO- for global security.

Key words: security, terrorism, alliance, cooperation and NATO

---

[*] PhD Candidate, Sakarya University, Department of International Relations, Sakarya, TÜRKİYE, ramazanerdag@hotmail.com

Introduction

During Cold War world lived two super power's competition and armament race. Under this two-pole construction states had to take one side in order to survive. This era's security concept based on nuclear threats. Classical security threats ad armament were basic arguments.[1] State had to be strong and provide security via military force. In the nation-state process this argument was the main concern of the states. But the end of the cold war changed this paradigm. Dissolving of Soviet Union finished the bipolar era and this changed not only world order but also threat perceptions. When new states gained independency against Soviet Union new security matters appeared in the Caucasus and East Europe. Disputes were whether these states could survive or not. If it's taken consideration that Caucasus had a rich energy recourses and East Europe countries fought against each other past, world faced new security and threat areas? Of course Balkan crisis was one of the other important situations.

While these arguments go on we faced a new security case -*9/11*. The attacks in US were the turning point to fight against terrorism. London, Madrid and Istanbul attacks followed 9/11 and *global[2] terrorism* wave started to threat the entire world. All these happenings showed the reality that security case is the primary issue of international relations and can not be tackled without collaboration. In this regard; this article tries to explain how security can be conceptualized and what new approaches of security studies are, and the importance of alliance against terrorism and especially NATO to be one of the most important international organizations for security, and finally tries to summarize the current situation and proposals.

Security Studies

If we start the question what security[3] is, we face lots kind of definitions. For instance; according to Emma Rothschild "…security was seen throughout the period as a condition both of individuals and of states. Its most consistent sense…was indeed of a condition, or an objective, that constituted a relationship between individuals and states or societies".[4] Rothschild also gives the principles of security as; (i) "provide some of guidance to the policies made by governments", (ii) "guide public opinion about policy, to suggest a way of thinking about security, or principles to be held by the people on behalf of whom policy is to be made", (iii) "to contest existing policies" and (iv) "to influence directly the distribution of money and power".[5] Classically security can be defined also "… is the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics".[6]

The main opinion of classical view is "the more security the better".[7] On the other hand Ken Booth stresses the importance of the *emancipation* for security. In his view with emancipation it could be supplied of fleeing of people form the physical threats and providing security.[8] "… security is about survival. It is when an issue is presented as posing an existential threat to a designated referent object (traditionally, but not necessarily, the state, incorporating government, territory, and society). The special nature of security threats justifies the use of extraordinary measures to handle them."[9] Security is also linked to the politics. "'Security' is the move that takes beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics."[10]

As Stephen M. Walt emphasizes "…research in security studies has been heavily shaped by changing international conditions."[11] In this context

the definition of security has gained new meanings in the light of different International Relations (IR) Theories. The important issues of security studies are; in question whose or what's security? Who or what supply security? And to whom or what against security could be supplied?[12] For realist perspective security cases were mainly states axis. According to realist theory the main actor of the international system is state.[13] State has to be strong and have a military force in order to provide security because international system is *anarchical*.[14] Realism sees security as ability of states' preventing and responding against military threats. War is a natural consequence of absence of high authority. Security is first priority of states because there is no meaning of state without security. In other words being secure at the same time equals with being power.[15] Power struggles and competition for security could cause an unsecured situation mostly classified as *security dilemma*.

Nowadays the term of security dilemma is started to use in international relations. "Security dilemma theory tells us that in an anarchic context [;] successfully communicating intentions is difficult, since efforts at self-protection often threaten others."[16] Security dilemma is also used to describe the situation when a state starts to expand capacities for her security this causes another state's securities' descend. It's a threat for the other state while a state can assist this situation for her defense and security the other can understand against her.[17] The dilemma is result form the indefiniteness of the aims of the efforts. Are these studies for armament or security concerns? These double sided justifications and disputes creates dilemma. In sum realism see security as state security and can be provided military power that's why state has to expand her capacity and abilities.

If security studies be evaluated in constructivist theory[18] relations among states, mutual cooperation and norms are important. Constructivists see security to be produced object.[19] Security is produced between actors and structures[20], because mutual relations, perceptions and norms determine the policy. For instance while UK's nuclear weapons does not threat international society a few North Korean nuclear weapons would threat.[21] Social constructivists don't disregard material capacities but stress the importance of social discourses and acknowledges. In this regard the term of *democratic peace*[22] discourse is related social constructivism. Democratic peace approach claims that states which have democratic administrations do not fight each other. Because in democracies people select their administrators by voting and don't want war, leaders and states could not venture fight. This doesn't mean democratic countries fight other administrators.[23] Contrary to realism social constructivists think security of societies is the most important and security can be provided via international relations and norms.

Today's another IR theory; postmodernism[24] shows functions of media, texts and images.[25] States indicate the enemy and anarchical structure in order to ensure internal unity. In this context enemy must be exist always. "However, the real danger always was anarchy and disorder."[26] The existing of unsecured condition would cause people feel move together. With this unity states try to provide security. Media and visual materials are the referent objects of this argument. When people see an enemy picture or a suicide bomber on TV or newspapers this automatically leads a fear. This situation gives the opportunity take steps against threats. In sum theory argues the security of others is important and security is provided against the threats of destroying differences.

The critical view critical security studies (CSS) handles the aspects of security like; terrorism, excruciation, immigrant, impecuniousness, human rights etc… According to Keith Krause "… there can be no security in the absence of authority, the state becomes the primary locus of security, authority and obligation, and the security of 'citizens' is identified with (and guaranteed by) that of the state."[27] "… standard definition of security-to do with *being or feeling safe from threats and danger*-security in world politics can have no final meaning. ….being or feeling safe is experienced and understood in terms of political theories about nations, sovereignty, class, gender, and other facts by human agreement."[28] Shortly critical approaches conceptualize security in *deepening* and *broadening* dimension.[29] For instance Booth sees 9/11 as;

> … colliding with the World Trade Centre on September 11: what it does mean, however, is that one's political understanding of those collisions is navigated via one's own cultural maps and political theories. The material facts spoke that dreadful morning, but not for themselves. They were spoken for the most part by long dead political theorists and philosophers, and we who watched, in horror and amazement, were for the most part merely their mouthpieces.[30]

Security Paradigm: Terrorism

With these different security studies it is understood not being single definition of security. Multiple approaches have revealed security's different dimensions. These new conceptualized security debates started to be argued especially after Cold War, the breakup point of 21st century 9/11 attacks also introduced a new security matter *global terrorism*. With 9/11 global terrorism threat spread the world. Terrorism wave reached to Europe

via the attacks in London, Madrid and Istanbul. In this manner security concerns have become first priority of states. Security plans and precautions have been revised. These workings showed the necessity of global alliance.[31] For example The National Security Strategy of the United States of America[32] explains the current terrorism threat as;

> The United States of America is fighting a war against terrorists of global reach. The enemy is not a single political regime or person or religion or ideology. The enemy is terrorism… The struggle against global terrorism is different from any other war in our history. It will be fought on many fronts against a particularly elusive enemy over an extended period of time. Progress will come through the persistent accumulation of successes—some seen, some unseen. Today our enemies have seen the results of what civilized nations can, and will, do against regimes that harbor, support, and use terrorism to achieve their political goals. Afghanistan has been liberated; coalition forces continue to hunt down the Taliban and al-[Qaeda]. But it is not only this battlefield on which we will engage terrorists. Thousands of trained terrorists remain at large with cells in North America, South America, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and across Asia. Our priority will be first to disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations of global reach and attack their leadership; command, control, and communications; material support; and finances. This will have a disabling effect upon the terrorists' ability to plan and operate.[33]

Key Factor: International Organizations

US and EU's and almost every country's security strategies point out the same idea of global alliance against security. Because, current security risks[34] require collective study. "The first objective clearly expresses the international commitment of the EU to the idea that terrorism can only be

fought in a multilateral way. Indeed, since September 11, one of the priorities of the EU has been the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 1373 on the fight against terrorism (United Nations, 2001)."[35] Well how this alliance will be assured? At this point international organizations as UN, NATO, OSCE, and EU's roles are revealing. These organizations played vital roles in world conflicts areas. In Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Macedonia[36], Afghanistan, Iraq and Lebanon peace keeping operations prevented probable internal wars. UN's diplomatic and political decisions[37] and NATO's military operations has tried to constitute international cooperation against terrorism.

NATO's enlargement and development is an important issue of international relations. "While debates in the late 1980s often revolved around whether NATO would, could, or should survive, they now centre around the implications of its centrality, and its current and (possible) future enlargement. While disputes remain concerning the wisdom of NATO's policies, the place of the Alliance at the centre of contemporary relations seems beyond dispute."[38] After dissolving Soviet Union new independent states started to join NATO and EU. These former east block countries' joining especially NATO was a threat to Russia because she didn't want NATO in her borders.[39] Because Warsaw Pact was dissolved the perceptions were the dissolving the NATO, but contrary to this NATO enlarged and this process "NATO is the key site in the rearticulation of security and the securitization of culture."[40]

NATO also assumes the responsibility of linking between North America and Europe. Alliance against terrorism and declaration the desire of a peace keeping life are tried to implement under the construction of NATO. Nowadays the necessity of such an organization shows itself in the

light of new security concepts.[41] Also the highest risk is instability. To prevent conflicts and establish stability NATO gives the importance to democracy and freedom. The more widening these values bring the more peace and faith. In this regard new members of NATO want to share these values and develop their security. Thus alliance would constitute a security community.[42]

NATO's role in fighting against terrorism is described as "The North Atlantic Council, the Alliance's principal decision-making body, decides on NATO's overall role in the campaign against terrorism. Specific aspects of NATO's involvement (e.g. co-operation with partners) are developed though specialized bodies and committees…. On the military side, Allied Command Operations is in charge of NATO's counter-terrorism operations, while Allied Command Transformation is leading the transformation of the Alliance to face today's new security threats, including terrorism."[43] In this context in Prague summit in 2002, NATO members agreed on a consensus to fight against terrorism through the Partnership Action Plan.[44]

In addition sanctions and military interventions the academicals side of fight against terrorism is also on agenda. In this regard with NATO's new expansions and reorganized structure the centers of excellence have started to be founded.[45] The aims of these centers are to develop education and training, enhance the ability of joint study, and improve doctrines and concepts. In this context Centre of Excellence Defense Against Terrorism[46] has been established in Turkey in 2005. Since beginning of establishment the centre of excellence has been going on the works like that symposiums, courses, and conferences. These centers will give the opportunity of researching area of problems and giving new solution proposals.

Conclusion

In the new century world faces new concepts of security. With the changing threat perceptions and different approaches in studies, it's getting harder to define security. The end of the Cold War and 9/11 attacks are two turning points for international order. Especially 9/11 and the attacks in Europe have emerged a new method to fight against global terrorism. That was the necessity of alliance. Alliance for security -such as issues border controls, illegal immigrants, restricting the weapons of mass destruction, sharing intelligence- is the key factor to success. A state's alone efforts cannot be sufficient to overcome terrorism. Because the terrorism is [called] as *global*, fight against it must be a collective study. In this regard international organizations are important objects of alliance. Especially NATO's factor in international conflict areas is a strong deterrence instrument. The effectiveness of NATO and enlargement process is the steps of [global] alliance. Alliance is compulsory to fight against global terrorism and establish stability. States have to take part in alliance and work together symmetrically. In other words to achieve these goals it also be needed that; condemning terrorism and terrorists, cutting off the linkages of the terrorists and financial sources, developing cooperation and collaboration, frankly implementing international laws and respect the rights of others.

NOTES

[1] These claims were mainly arguments of Realism. Realist thought see international arena anarchical that's why states have to struggle each other to survive and this competition would normally lead a war. For Realism and Realist Thought see. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations : The Struggle For Power And Peace*, rev.by. Kenneth W. Thompson, New York, Mc Graw Hill, 1993; and Kenneth N. Waltz, 'Realist Thought And Neorealist Theory', *Journal of International Affairs*, 1990, Vol. 44, Issue 1, p.21-38.

[2] "A [G]lobalized world is one in which political, economic, cultural and social events become more and more interconnected, and also one in which they have more impact., John Baylis and Steve Smith (ed.), *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to international relations*, 2001, Oxford University Press.

[3] "The key question in security analysis is, who can 'do' security in the name of what? For a time, experts could get away with analyzing only 'sates,' and system was then the sum of the states. Regional security meant the sum of national securities or rather a particular constellation of security interdependence among a group of states." Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap De Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, 1998, Boulder: Lynne Reinner, p.45.

[4] Emma Rothschild, 'What is Security', *Daedalus*, 1995, 124(3) 53-98.

[5] Rothschild, Ibid, 56-58.

[6] Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap De Wilde, Security: A New Framework for Analysis, 1998, Boulder: Lynne Reinner, p. 23. According to the classical security complex theory "… security… for thinking about the political and military sectors, states were its referent objects. Security regions therefore had the following characteristics: (1) They were composed of two or more states, (2) These states constituted a geographically coherent grouping (because threats in these sectors travel more easily over short distances than over long ones, (3) The relationship among these states was marked by security interdependence, which could be either positive or negative but which had to be significantly stronger among them than between them and outside stares. (4) The pattern of security interdependence had to be deep and durable (i.e., much more than a one-time interaction), although not permanent." Buzan et. al., Ibid, p.15.

[7] Buzan et. al., Ibid, p.29.

[8] Ken Booth, 'Security and Emancipation', *Review of International Studies*, 1991, Vol, 17, p.313-326.

[9] Barry Buzan, Waever, Ole and Jaap De Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder: Lynne Reinner, 1998, p.21.

[10] Barry Buzan et. al., Ibid, p.23.

[11] Stephen M. Walt, "The Renaissance of Security Studies", 1991, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2, p.228.

[12] Tuncay Kardaş, "New Perspectives in Security Studies", *Bilgi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2006/2, Değişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

[13] See, , Kenneth N. WALTZ, "Structural Realism after the Cold War", Ed. G. John Ikneberry, *America Unrivaled; The Future of Balance of Power*, 2002, Cornell University Press, London, Kenneth N. WALTZ *Theory of International Politics*, 1979, McGraw-Hill, , Stephen M. WALT "The Progressive Power of Realism", *The American Political Science Review*, 1997, Vol. 91, No. 4, s.931-935.

[14] *Anarchy* is not chaos situation it excessively refers the uncertainty condition, that is to say there is no authority over states. See. Terry Terriff et al., *Security Studies Today*, 1999, Cambridge: Polity Press.

[15] Poverty is the most important object of security. Of course this argument refers being material and military power. If a state can achieve being power this provide state the possibility of preventing and responding the threats and *deterrence* ability. For power and state see. Ka LIN and Eero CARROLL, "State Institutions, Political Power and Social Policy Choices: Reconstructing The Origins Of Nordic Models Of Social Policy", 2006, *European Journal of Political Research*, 45: 345-367, Andrew Pepper , "State Power Matters: Power, The State And Political Struggle In The Post-War American Novel", 2005, *Textual Practice*, Vol. 19 No. 4, 2005, p.467-491.

[16] Jennifer Mitzen, "Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma", 2006, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 12, No. 3, p.354.

[17] Philip G. Cerny, "Terrorism and the New Security Dilemma", 2005, *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 58, Issue 1, p.9-33-58.

[18] Social constructivist theory is mostly started to be used in IR theory since end of the Cold War. Mainly arguments of theory are the possibility of social constructions of politics under anarchy. Social constructivists also stress the importance of peace and democracy.

[19] Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[20] "… a structure is a set of relatively unchangeable constraints on the behavior of states.", Ted Hopf, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory", 1998, *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 1, p.172.

[21] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics", 1992, *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2, p.391-425.

[22] For democratic peace debates also see. James Bohman, "Beyond the Democratic Peace: An Instrumental Justification of Transnational Democracy", 2006, *Journal Of Social Philosophy*, Vol. 37, No. 1, p.127-138., Bruce Russett, "Bushwhacking the Democratic Peace", 2005, *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 6, p.395-408., Fred Chernoff, "The Study of Democratic Peace and Progress in International Relations", 2004, *International Studies Review*, Vol. 6, p.49-77., Barbara Farnham, "The Theory of Democratic Peace and Threat Perception", 2003, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 47, p.395-415., Bruce Russett and Zeev Moaz, "Normative and Constructural Causes of Democratic Peace", 1993, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 80, No. 3, p.624-638.

[23] Afghanistan and Iraq wars are examples of this argument.

[24] Postmodernist theory alleges that all the periphery conception is not neutral. You can not understand the world without a tool, instrument. "… postmodernists argue that there is no single truth, no single ideology, no single text, no particular authority or set of values that in claiming absolute truth deserves unquestioned loyalty and abedience.", Michael Sheehan, *International Security*, London: Lynne Rienner, 2005, p.136.

[25] David Campbell, *Writing Security*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.

[26] Michael Sheehan, Ibid, p.137.

[27] Keith Krause, "Critical Theory and Security Studies: The Research Program of 'Critical Security Studies'", 1998, *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 33, No. 3, p. 309.

[28] Ken Booth (ed), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, Lynne Rienner, 2005.p.13.

[29] Ken Booth, Ibid, p.14-15.

[30] Ken Booth, Ibid.

[31] As mentioned European Security Strategy a single county can not struggle with terrorism. EU also perceives terrorism a huge threat against her. "Terrorism puts lives at risk; it imposes large costs; it seeks to undermine the openness and

tolerance of our societies, and it poses a growing strategic threat to the whole of Europe. Increasingly, terrorist movements are well-resourced, connected by electronic networks, and are willing to use unlimited violence to cause massive casualties. The most recent wave of terrorism is global in its scope and is linked to violent religious extremism. It arises out of complex causes. These include the pressures of moderni[z]ation, cultural, social and political crises, and the alienation of young people living in foreign societies. This phenomenon is also a part of our own society. Europe is both a target and a base for such terrorism: European countries are targets and have been attacked. Logistical bases for Al Qaeda cells have been uncovered in the UK, Italy, Germany, Spain and Belgium. Concerted European action is indispensable.", "A Secure Europe in a Better World", (2003), *European Security Strategy*, Brussels, 12 December, p.3.

[32] It's first published in September 2002 and known as Bush Doctrine.

[33] *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, September 2002, p.5.

[34] If we look at the world wide current conflicts and dispute areas in sum; in Africa, the problems are mainly internal tribal conflicts, starving and nation building studies, in Latin America lack or weak military security and regionalism, in North America military and political security concerns, in Middle East Arab-Israel conflicts, in South Asia, struggles between India and Pakistan (like Kashmir problem), in Southeast Asia, Western interest especially Singapore and Malaysia, in East Asia, power balancing among China, Japan, Korea et. al., Former Soviet Union, Russian and post-Soviet impacts over former Yugoslavian states. Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap De Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, 1998, Boulder: Lynne Reinner, p. 124-137.

[35] Laurence Thieux, "European Security and Global Terrorism: the Strategic Aftermath of the Madrid Bombings", 2004, *Perspectives*, Vol. 22, p.61.

[36] Turkey recognizes Republic of Macedonia by its constitutional name.

[37] Especially United Nations Security Council's decisions are effective because these decisions are obliging. Every member state has to obey and implement these decisions.

[38] Michael C. Williams and Iver B. Neumann, "From Alliance to Security Community: NATO, Russia, and the Power of Identity", 2000, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2, p.357.

[39] NATO's enlargement is also an example of security dilemma; NATO sees enlargement as a security intention, but Russian sees as a threat to her.

[40] Michael C. Williams and Iver B. Neumann, Ibid, p.364.

[41] "The question of what security was (or, alternatively, who or what now constituted 'threats') was at the core of NATO's post-Cold War dilemmas. Different answers to the question generated different visions of the future of the Alliance, and when viewed through traditional strategic lenses none looked promising for that future…. Security, too, came to be re-envisioned in cultural terms. Positively, security is identified with the cultural and civilisational principles now held to be the foundation of NATO itself. Negatively, threats are seen as emerging from the absence of such conditions. The challenge that NATO faces in increasingly portrayed not as a particular state or group of states whose adversarial position is dictated by the geopolitical logic of the balance of power.", Michael C. Williams and Iver B. Neumann, Ibid, p.369.

[42] "…NATO which stress its essential nature as a democratic security community must consider the new kinds of power made possible very that very identity. This is no way means that material power is unimportant, indeed it is doubtful that NATO could have played the role it has without its capacity for military strength and its reputation as such. But NATO's power cannot be reduced to this. Indeed the power of the Alliance in the post-Cold War period derives in considerable part from the ability to maintain its military dimension while at the same time combining that dimension with a powerful cultural and political narrative that overcame the challenges faced by a purely military representation of the Alliance.", Michael C. Williams and Iver B. Neumann, Ibid, p.386.

[43] NATO Official web site, http://www.nato.int/issues/terrorism/main_bodies.html, accessed at 27 December 2007.

[44] "The principal objectives of the Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism are to: [a] Reconfirm the determination of EAPC States to create an environment unfavorable to the development and expansion of terrorism, building on their shared democratic values, and to assist each other and others in this [endeavor]. [b] Underscore the determination of EAPC States to act against terrorism in all its forms and manifestations and their willingness to co-operate in preventing and defending against terrorist attacks and dealing with their consequences. [c] Provide interested Partners with increased opportunities for contributing to and supporting, consistent with the specific character of their security and [defense] policies, NATO's efforts in the fight against terrorism. [d] Promote and facilitate co-operation among the EAPC States in the fight against terrorism, through political consultation, and practical programmes under EAPC and the Partnership for Peace. [e] Upon request, provide assistance to EAPC States in dealing with the risks and consequences of terrorist attacks, including on their economic and other critical infrastructure.", http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b021122e.htm.

[45] The establishment of Centers of Excellence has been decided in Prague Summit in 2002.

---

[46] In Centre of Excellence Defense Against Terrorism, in addition Turkey; Romania, United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Germany, Holland and United States personnel serve.