

TRANSFORMATION OF NATO IN THE FACE OF TRANSNATIONAL
TERRORISM

A Master's Thesis

by
SEBAHAT BULDUK

Department of
International Relations
Bilkent University
Ankara
September 2009

To my parents and Ertuğrul

TRANSFORMATION OF NATO IN THE FACE OF TRANSNATIONAL TERRORISM

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by
Sebahat BULDUK

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

In

THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

September 2009

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assoc. Prof. Ersel AYDINLI
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Asst. Prof. Tarık OĞUZLU
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Asst. Prof. Aylin GÜNEY
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

TRANSFORMATION OF NATO IN THE FACE OF TRANSNATIONAL TERRORISM

Bulduk, Sebahat
M.A. Department of International Relations
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Ersel Aydınli
September 2009

Transnational terrorism with special reference to the September 11 attacks in 2001 on the territory of the United States has significant impacts on NATO's approach to terrorism at rhetorical, practical and institutional levels. This thesis describes and explains the role of transnational terrorism on NATO's transformation process, which intensified with the end of Cold War era. The Alliance's 1991 and 1999 Strategic Concepts already defined terrorism as one of the risks to the Allies' security. However, NATO began to actively engage in fighting against terrorism after the September 11 attacks. Just after 9/11, NATO for the first time in its history invoked Article 5, which is the collective defense clause of the Washington Treaty. Particularly, the Prague Summit held in 2002 has been catalyst for the transformation of Alliance into an organization that is more adaptive to the new security environment where the threats are less likely to be state-centric. In the assessment, until September 11, 2001, terrorism did not have a priority on the NATO's agenda. Then, after the dramatic assaults, almost every step in the Alliance has been taken in the name of fighting against terrorism. The creation of the NATO Response Force, Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit and further a new "Allied Command Transformation" are several examples in this regard. Basically, 9/11 demonstrated that transnational terrorism constitutes a very serious threat even for a super power, nobody is immune from terrorism and the approach to terrorism as a domestic threat is no longer applicable.

Key words: new terrorism, NATO and transformation, September 11 attacks, Prague Summit, Afghanistan.

ÖZET

NATO’NUN SINIROTESI TERÖRİZM KARSISINDA DÖNÜŞÜMÜ

Bulduk, Sebahat
Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Assoc. Prof. Ersel Aydın
Eylül 2009

Transnasyonal terör, özellikle 11 Eylül 2001 tarihinde Amerika’ya düzenlenen terörist saldırılar başta olmak üzere, NATO’nun teröre yaklaşımında söylemsel, operasyonel ve kurumsal düzeyde önemli değişikliklere yol açmıştır. Bu tez çalışması, NATO’nun Soğuk Savaş sonrasında başlayan dönüşüm sürecinde transnasyonal terörün rolünü tanımlamaya ve açıklamaya çalışmaktadır. İttifak’ın 1991 yılında kabul edilmiş ve 1999 yılında gözden geçirilmiş Stratejik Konseptleri, terörü önceden NATO’nun güvenliğine yönelik tehditlerden biri olarak kabul etse de, İttifak’ın 11 Eylül’e verdiği cevapla, NATO terörle mücadeleye aktif olarak katılmaya başlamıştır. 9/11’den sonra İttifak, tarihinde ilk defa Vaşington Andlaşmasının kolektif savunmayı öngören 5. maddesini hayata geçirmiştir. Özellikle 2002 yılında düzenlenen Prag Zirvesi, NATO’nun devlet eksenli olmaktan uzaklaşan güvenlik tehditleri karşısında, daha uyumlu bir örgüte dönüşümünde bir tür katalist olmuştur. Değerlendirme olarak, 11 Eylül 2001’e kadar terörizm, NATO’nun ajandasında öncelikli bir yere sahip olmamıştır. Dramatik saldırılardan sonra ise İttifak içindeki hemen tüm kararlar terörle mücadele doğrultusunda alınmıştır. NATO Mukabele Kuvveti, Terör Tehdidi İstihbarat Birimi ve yeni “Müttefik Transformasyon Komutanlığı”nın kurulması bu konudaki örneklerden bazılarıdır. 11 Eylül, terörün artık süper güç bir ülke için bile ciddi tehlike arzettiğini, kimsenin terörden muaf olmadığını ve terörün yerel bir tehdit olarak görüldüğü anlayışın artık geçerli bulunmadığını göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: yeni terörizm, NATO ve dönüşüm, 11 Eylül 2001 saldırıları, Prag Zirvesi, Afganistan.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all I would like to render my thanks and appreciation to my supervisor Ersel Aydınli for his support and guidance throughout the research period. His comments and remarks on the initial drafts have been crucial for structuring the thesis. Without his understanding and encouragement, I could not have managed to complete this project. Furthermore, it is a pleasure to thank Asst. Prof. Tarık Oğuzlu and Asst. Prof Aylin Güney for having accepted to take part in my thesis committee.

Special thanks go to my lovely fiancée Ertuğrul Demirci and my parents for their continuous support, encouragement and motivation in really hard times I lived through.

I am really grateful to Tomur Bayer, the General Director of the International Security Affairs and to Ahmet Muhtar Gün, the Vice General Director of OSCE, Arms Control and Disarmament Department at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey for their precious advices and help. Indeed, I benefited from their wide knowledge. I would also like to extend my thanks to Colonel Mete Tahmisoğlu for his support and kind conversations he held with me about my thesis.

I thank TUBİTAK for financing a significant part of my graduate studies.

Last but not least, I am forever in dept to my friends for their support, friendship and inspiration while I was preparing this thesis: Meryem Tığrak, my roommates Özge Wambach, Ceren Baran and Berfin Çıtırıkadioğlu.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
 CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
 CHAPTER II: THE CONCEPT OF NEW TERRORISM WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF TRANSNATIONAL TERRORISM.....	6
2.1 The Concept of Security in a Globalized World.....	6
2.2 Transnationalization of Insecurity.....	10
2.3 Chancing Face of Terrorism.....	13
2.3.1 Traditional versus Contemporary Terrorism.....	13
2.3.2 State Sponsored Terrorism.....	15
2.4 The Effect of Globalization on Transnational Terrorism.....	16
2.5 New Terrorism.....	18
2.5.1 New Security Dilemma.....	18
2.5.2 The Characteristics of New Terrorism.....	22
2.5.3 New Wars in the Age of New Terrorism.....	31
2.6 Al-Qaeda Network with the Outrageous Effect of the September 11 Attacks.....	34
 CHAPTER III: NATO’S APPROACH TO TERRORSIM BEFORE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001.....	40
3.1 NATO and Its Missions During the Cold War.....	40
3.1.1 The Origins of the Alliance.....	40
3.1.2 The Security Tasks of the Alliance.....	41
3.2 NATO’s Tasks and Missions in the post Cold War Period.....	44
3.2.1 Keeping NATO and Redefining Collective Defense.....	44
3.2.2 Arms control and WMD.....	45

3.2.3 Enlargement Policy: Cooperation with Former Adversaries and Other non-NATO Nations.....	49
3.2.3.1 Partnership for Peace (PfP) Initiative.....	52
3.2.3.2 Membership Action Plan (MAP).....	53
3.2.4 NATO and the Balkans: Crisis Management and Peace Operations.....	53
3.2.5 Growing European Independency through ESDP.....	56
3.3 NATO's Approach to the Nature of Terrorism.....	60
3.4 1991 Strategic Concept.....	65
3.5 1999 Strategic Concept.....	67
 CHAPTER IV: TRANSFORMATION OF NATO AT THE RHETORICAL AND PRACTICAL LEVELS.....	71
4.1 Transformation at the Rhetorical Level.....	72
4.1.1 Rhetorical Transformation about Nature of the Threat.....	73
4.1.2 Rhetorical Transformation on the Response to Terrorism.....	77
4.1.2.1 Condemning the Attacks.....	77
4.1.2.2 Emphasizing Solidarity, Unity and Readiness.....	78
4.1.2.3 Comprehensive Approach.....	81
4.1.2.4 A Further Step: Revising Strategic Concept.....	81
4.2 Transformation at the Practical Level.....	82
4.2.1 Military Concept Against Terrorism.....	84
4.2.2 Combating Terrorism in the Mediterranean.....	86
4.2.3 Deployment of ISAF Mission in Afghanistan.....	89
4.2.4 An Assessment of ISAF Mission.....	93
4.2.5 Establishment of NATO Training Mission in Iraq.....	94
 CHAPTER V: TRANSFORMATION OF NATO AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL.....	97
5.1 NATO's Institutional Transformation Efforts After the Cold War.....	97
5.2 NATO's Institutional Transformation After the September 11, 2001...100	
5.2.1 Transformation at the Force Level.....	100
5.2.1.1 Prague Capabilities Commitment.....	100
5.2.1.2 NATO Response Force.....	103
5.2.2 Transformation at the Command Level.....	108
5.2.2.1 The New Command Structure	110
5.2.3 Transformation at the Structural Level.....	113
5.2.3.1 Establishment of Center of Excellence Defense Against Terrorism.....	113
5.2.3.2 Establishment of the Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit.....	115
5.2.3.3 Struggle against terrorism: an item on the NATO-Russia Council.....	116
 CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION.....	119
 SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	129

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Activity profile of New and Old Terrorists.....	30
2. Five Capability Areas agreed with DCI.....	100

ABBREVIATIONS

ACE	: Allied Command Europe
ACLANT	: Allied Command Atlantic
ACO	: Allied Command Operations
ACT	: Allied Command Transformation
AFNORTH	: Allied Forces North Europe
AFSOUTH	: Allied Forces South Europe
ANA	: Afghan National Army
AWACS	: Airborne Warning and Control System
CBRN	: Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear
CFSP	: Common Foreign and Security Policy
CIMIC	: Civil Military Operation
CJTF	: Combined Joint Task Force
CM	: Consequence Management
COE	: Center of Excellence
COE DaT	: Center of Excellence Defense Against Terrorism
CPG	: Comprehensive Political Guidance
CSCE	: Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
DCI	: Defense Capabilities Initiative
DPC	: Defense Planning Committee

DSACEUR	: Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe
EADRCC	: The Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Center
ESDI	: European Security and Defense Identity
ESDP	: European Security and Defense Policy
EU OHQ	: European Union Operations Headquarter
IRA	: Irish Republican Army
ISAF	: International Security Assistance Force
KFOR	: NATO led Kosovo Force
MAP	: Membership Action Plan
MC	: Military Committee
MC DaT	: NATO's Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism
MCG	: Mediterranean Cooperation Group
MD	: Mediterranean Dialogue
NAC	: North Atlantic Council
NATO	: North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NATO PA	: NATO Parliament Assembly
NBC	: Nuclear, Biological and Chemical
NCRS	: NATO Crisis Response System
NIWS	: The NATO Intelligence and Warning System
NPC	: Nuclear Planning Group
NRC	: NATO-Russia Council
NRF	: NATO Response Force
NTM-I	: NATO Training Mission in Iraq
OAE	: Operation Active Endeavour
OCC	: The Operational Capabilities Concept

OEF	: Operation Enduring Freedom
OSCE	: Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PAP-T	: Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism
PARP	: Planning and Review Process
PCC	: Prague Capabilities Commitments
PCI	: Prague Capabilities Initiative
PfP	: Partnership for Peace
PLO	: Palestinian Liberation Organization
RHQ EASTLAND	: Regional headquarters Eastern Atlantic
RHQ SOUTHLAND	: Regional headquarters South Atlantic
SAC	: Strategic Airlift Capability
SACEUR	: The Supreme Allied Commander Europe
SHAPE	: Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe
SPS	: Science for Peace and Security
TTIU	: Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit
UN	: United Nations
UNSCR	: United Nations Security Council Release
WEU	: Western European Union
WMD	: Weapons of Mass Destructions

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Terrorism began to be considered as one of the most critical threats to security in the 21st century. Since terrorism became increasingly transnationalized in time, international cooperation against the challenge has come into front more frequently. In this view, certain international organizations have prevailed to take a stance in the fight against terrorism. NATO has been one of these organizations since September 11, 2001. Accordingly, the Alliance commenced new initiatives in its Summits since 2001 (Prague, Istanbul, Riga, Bucharest and Strasbourg/Kehl Summits) in order to strengthen NATO's role and effectiveness in this struggle.

The aim of this research is not to discuss whether or not NATO will be successful in the fight against terrorism, rather to discuss NATO's transformation efforts in the face of a non state terrorist challenge by looking at its decisions, plans, policies, structures and capabilities. Thus, in order to have a clearer view on NATO's approach to terrorism particularly after September 11, 2001, which can be regarded as one of the most dramatic examples of transnational terror, two different periods are compared, post-Cold War period until 2001, and after September 11, 2001. Looking into these time periods serve the purpose of manifesting NATO's more active involvement in the struggle since September 11.

After the introduction part, in the second chapter, new security environment is analyzed with special spotlight on terrorism through a picture of the world politics that moves from state centric to multi centric order. These two worlds are in a nested context in the process of globalization. Globalization is the prime directive of multi centric world and a facilitator of transformation from traditional security actors (states) into the actors, which are increasingly independent from not only territorial boundaries but also state control and support. Therefore, through the research, evolution of a non-state terrorist actor with reference to the organizers of the September 11 attacks, namely al-Qaeda organization is also handled.

In the third chapter, NATO's tasks after the ending of the Cold War and its approach to terrorism in the concerned period are analyzed. The expansion of NATO to central and eastern European countries, peacekeeping operations in Balkans, arms control issues as well as growing European independency in the framework of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) can be counted among NATO's tasks. With the effect of changing security environment, including the disintegration of the Soviet Union, NATO has gone into a transformation process in order to adapt itself to the new structure despite of the arguments related to the vitality of NATO. As demonstrated in this section, terrorism did not take a prominent place on the agenda of NATO in that period. On the other hand, the NATO's Strategic Concepts issued in 1991 and 1999 declared terrorism among new security threats to the Alliance. Although in the 1999 Strategic Concept, terrorism had been listed on the top of the security threats, NATO did not take any concrete step against terrorism threat until the September 11 scourge.

In the fourth chapter, NATO's transformation efforts in the face of transnational terrorism are reflected in detail at rhetorical and operational levels. Less

than 24 hours after the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States, the Alliance invoked the alliance's Article 5 defense guarantee—this "attack on one" was to be considered an "attack on all." The new role assumed by NATO in the fight against terrorism has been analyzed at rhetorical level through speeches, press releases and news issued at NATO website. From operational perspective, International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in Afghanistan, Operation Active Endeavor (OAE) in the Mediterranean and NATO Training Mission in Iraq (NTM-I) have been studied.

In the fifth chapter, finally, I looked into NATO's transformation efforts in order to improve its capability in its fight against terrorism at the institutional level. New or revised institutional establishments at NATO force, command and structural systems that contribute to the mission of fighting against terrorism, such as creation of the NATO Response Force, establishment of the Terrorism Threat Intelligence Unit (TTIU), the Center of Excellence Defense against Terrorism (COE Data) and Allied Command Transformation are fundamentally investigated in this chapter.

Methodology

Methodologically, the extensive number of written sources has been read throughout the research. Since terrorist organizations are hidden and mostly operate underground, it creates impediments before a transparent and comprehensive analysis. Therefore, my main thesis on features of "new terrorism" relies on assumptions, some publicly known facts and interpretation of collected data. In this sense, the organizational structure of al-Qaeda is defined in various sources, but even intelligence agencies may not be a hundred percent sure about the nature of a terrorist organization.

In the following section, the method of this research is based on the analysis of the effect of transnational terrorism as a non-state centric actor on the transformation of an international security organization that has been primarily founded against a state centric security threat, namely NATO. In this regard, NATO has been studied as a case study that has been based on state centric organizational character in terms of its force and command structures. NATO has an official website where anyone can reach information on a wide range of topics including NATO Reviews, opinions, press releases, declarations and general information on almost every area that NATO involved in. On the other hand, to study NATO as a case carries its own difficulties in itself because of several reasons.

Firstly, NATO is a security organization and some issues are handled in secrecy. So, the Alliance has various levels of confidential ranging from NATO unclassified documents that are allowed to be reached, to NATO restricted and NATO secret documents which are not given permission to be used in any case. Before I was admitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey at International Security Affairs Department, I was not even aware of such kind of distinctions and was able to use only published documents on the NATO website including multimedia. Then, luckily, I was posted to the Department directly responsible for NATO issues and then reshaped my thesis around the knowledge I gained there and documents that do not take place on NATO website. However, since it is not allowed to use NATO restricted and secret documents in any case, it has been difficult for me to sort necessary and allowed portion of knowledge among them.

Secondly, as part of the study, I wanted to learn more about the Center of Excellence Defense against Terrorism located in Ankara as a concrete example of NATO's institutional transformation in the face of transnational terrorism. For that

purpose, I attempted to make interviews at the Center and give an extended place to the abovementioned Center in the thesis. However, my e-mails to the Center resulted in a limited permission and I was just allowed to use the Library of the Center. Since the issues related to security, military and terrorism are sensitive; institutions, documents and decisions related to them are not open to ordinary people and officials who in these areas are suspicious to share certain information regardingly. On the other hand, my third initiative became successful thanks to the General Director and the Vice General Director of my Department and I could have an opportunity to visit the Center and talked with several officers. This visit was really helpful for me to touch upon an institutional build-up directly related to NATO's fight against terrorism mission.

Finally, NATO is a really big and highly institutionalized organization and it is main structure located in Brussels. So, it has also been a kind of obstacle in the thesis to study a case, which has complicated bodies, and its major bodies are settled in another country.

On the other hand, methodologically, studying transnational terrorism by employing a case study method has been beneficial for the thesis in order to demonstrate how transnational terrorism as a non-state security threat affected international system through influencing the transformation process of a security and defense organization which did not take into account terrorism previously, over and above this is an accredited international security organization with a global reach and respect.

CHAPTER II

THE CONCEPT OF “NEW TERRORISM” WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF TRANSNATIONAL TERRORISM

2.1 The Concept of Security in a Globalized World

Ella Krahmann (2005: 4) defines a security threat as “an event with potentially negative consequences for the survival or welfare of a state, a society or an individual.” Traditionally, states posed the major security challenges to each other. Peace was reached through post war politics and wars were usually conducted by national armies against the similar forces of other nations. Thus, structural changes in international system have raised questions over the claims and principles of the traditional realist conception of security. The international system from Second World War to the end of the Cold War was approached and conceptualized with a state centered view. National security has been the main pillar of the traditional perspective and international relations was characterized with the military interactions of sovereign states. States are considered to be the major actors in international politics and international anarchy is the main force shaping the behavior of states. In this structure, it is argued (T. V. Paul, 2003: 50) that non-state actors are

of limited importance in world politics, and even they have to work within the rules created by states. States tend to behave as instrumentally rational unitary actors and are preoccupied with survival, power, and security. Also, states, being unsure about the motivations and intentions of other states, tend to be wary of international cooperation even when they have common interests. Hence, a state-centric perspective points out that non-state actors can only engage in snacking activities in the periphery, they can cause only limited danger, and in general they were not perceived a global security threat of the North America and Europe until the September 11 attacks (Steve Smith, 2006: 33).

During the Cold War, state-centralism dominated the international power structure and the concept of security has been shaped around the rivalry between the two super powers. The bipolar system mainly referred the principal control of the United States and the Soviet Union on military power. There were two main competing blocs that know each other, how they could damage the other part if they violate certain rules. During that period, any non-state challenge could not effectively confront their power and dominance as well as any state. Both the US and the Soviet Union developed massive nuclear weapons capabilities and had the necessary military means to annihilate the other. Since the two states had the second strike capability, it had been almost impossible to launch a surprise attack against the other side. Moreover, the protected nuclear stockpiles, long-range missiles and nuclear warheads led the parties to deter each other. Having seen the catastrophic effects of bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, the fear of a nuclear destruction has well served the aim of deterrence. Therefore, from the virtues of traditional deterrence policy to the contemporary security challenges, transnationalization of insecurity

bolstered in such a globalized world. Barry Buzan (1997: 6) defines this particular period by dividing into two as before 1980s and later:

In the early years of the Cold War, when the concept of national security first came into fashion, the security problem for the West was how to respond to a broad spectrum of challenge from the Soviet Union. By the 1980s, the decline of military-political security issues at the center of security concerns was visible in the growing awareness that war was disappearing or in some cases had disappeared as an option in relations amongst a substantial group of states.

With the failure of realism in predicting the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, critics of realist theories have been elevated. Then, emerging security vacuum was filled by other security concerns in the coming period.

The Gulf war of 1990-91 demonstrated the beginning of a new era in this respect. The American led coalition arriving to Kuwait with the Iraqi conquest of the country indicated the growing global power of America and replacement of bipolarity by unipolarity. In that war, the UN Security Council also endorsed the full operational control to the US, which strengthened the domination of the U.S. power. The term “the American unipolar age” was used in order to characterize that period (Falk, 2005: 197).

Besides the rise of American unilateralism, the post-Cold War period also witnessed a decline in number of interstate wars and the rise of trans-sovereign problems which are called as “new risks” consisting of drug trafficking, transnational organized crimes, refugee movements and international terrorism. In fact, these are not new threats, they all existed during the Cold War, but military conflict between the NATO and Warsaw pact countries overwhelmed these threats and kind of shadowed them (Kostas, 2002). From another perspective (Buzan, 1997: 11), post-Cold War period has also seen deepening effects of globalization and

intensification of international linkages with the emergence of a new security environment where the patterns of conflict moved beyond the border protection:

What can be clearly observed is that the state is less important in the new security agenda than in the old one. It still remains central, but no longer dominates either as the exclusive referent object or as the principle embodiment of threat in the way it did previously.

Hence, the post-Cold War security studies have worked on re-conceptualizing security. Within this perspective, Buzan proposed to broadening the concept of security beyond its traditional limits and looking below and beyond of the state as other referent objects of security and securitization of issues is regarded as the main formula for the broadening of security concept. In this framework, Buzan (1997: 13-14) points:

Threats and vulnerabilities can arise in many different areas, military and non-military, but in order to count as security issues they have to meet strictly defined criteria that distinguish them from the normal run of merely political. They have to stage as existential threats to a referent object by a securitizing actor who thereby generates endorsement for emergency measures beyond rules that would otherwise bind. In other words, issues become securitized when leaders (whether political, societal, or intellectual) begin to talk about them- and to gain the ear of the public and the state- in terms of existential threats against some valued referent object.

In this context, broadening the agenda of security has meant moving from state-centrism to the worlds of transnational non-state actors (Bilgin, 35). The transformation of security from state centric security threat to non-state centric security threat has deepened in the contemporary security environment particularly after the September 11 terrorist attacks when a violent non-state actor attacked the homeland of the superpower and caused mass casualties. There have been two important results of those attacks in international arena. First, the attacks have had direct security implications by causing two wars, in Afghanistan and in Iraq. Second, the attacks put forward that states are no longer the sole key actors in world politics

(Smith, 49). It is argued (Robert Patmann, 2006: 16) that the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon “changed strategic thinking” of the U.S. The most capable country in terms of military was late in preventing the destructive attacks by a transnational terrorist group, al-Qaeda. A strong belief for half a century by the U.S. that no enemy can assault the country because of retaliatory strike was broken after the attacks.

2.2 Transnationalization of Insecurity

Rosenau (2000: 22) explains transnationalization of insecurity as shifting from state centric to multi centric world. Multi centric world means that in a globalized world with a wide range of actors can compete confront or cooperate with each other. Both states and non-state collectivities engage in that system where interaction of state centric and multi centric worlds figures out a new world order. According to Rosenau (2000), this new system is so decentralized which does not allow having a hierarchy under a hegemonic leadership. In alteration from state centric to multi centric world, territory and boundary still poses its importance, but attachment to them weakens. The line between domestic and foreign affairs becomes less separate. The international system is still powerful, but less commanding. In that transformation process there is a decreasing tendency of states to wage war on each other. Rosenau (2000: 23-25, 41) explains his claim that since states are inundated by budgetary constraints and the power of present weaponry technologies, states are less able to mobilize their publics to conquests foreign lands, so increasingly unlikely to organize military actions as a foreign policy tool:

The advent of a multi centric world and its proliferating population of diverse organizations have altered the architecture of political authority, both weakening states and rendering them more interdependent with each other

and thus making it increasingly difficult for them to mobilize their population on behalf of military action.

The organizational structure of non-traditional threats, which are called “recently securitized threats” by Ekaterina Stepanova (2008), is utilized to explain transnationalization of insecurity diverging from state centric threat perception. In her Stockholm International Peace Research Report no.23, Stepanova (2008: 125) reflects on the information age, deeming that network organizations compared to hierarchical structures are more flexible, more mobile, better adapt to changing conditions, and more unwavering at the times of shock and crisis. Stepanova’s conviction (2008: 128-129) is that transnationalization of insecurity is also a result of lack of a central leadership with a strict hierarchy over the members in whom the elements of a network are interconnected, but they are not directly subject to an order from the above. In this way, the spread of these network features causes transnationalization of insecurity resulting in asymmetrical confrontation against the less flexible and less mobile state structures.

When this structure is applied to al-Qaeda, Stepanova (2008: 133) suggests:

It has evolved from a more formalized organization to a more amorphous, decentralized network of cells that spread and multiply in a way that, in terms of organizational form, closely resembles franchise business schemes. These cells share the movement’s transnational violent Islamist ideology, follow general strategic guidelines formulated by its leaders and ideologues and use the name of “al-Qaeda” as a brand but are not necessarily formally linked to it in structural terms.

With regard to the new dimension in international security environment, terrorism in the twenty first century can be considered to be more transnational, involving structures and patterns that are dissimilar from the form of international warfare among states. Increasing threat perception from transnational terrorism is regarded by Philip Cerny (2005: 11-12) as of controversial to state-centric opinion

of realist view. Cerny (2005) recognizes that terrorism is not a new phenomenon in history; however, its interconnectedness with globalization is the key to today's approach of insecurity. Cerny (2005) points out that contemporary security environment is akin to neomedieval society by referring to the emergence of a new security dilemma¹. Cerny (2005: 12) refers by neomedievalism that "we are increasingly in the presence of a plurality of overlapping, competing, and intersecting power structures- institutions, political processes, economic developments, and social transformations- above, below and cutting across states and the states system." In that structure, states represent only one level of the system. According to Cerny (2005), the changing character of traditional security dilemma does not only mean changing from bipolar system to unipolar system but also the transformation of international system includes increasing ineptitude of interstate balance of power system which disregards the role of non state actors. Richard Devetak (2005: 229) also explains "terrorism's globalization of violence marks the latest element of disorder in an international society." In accordance of these approaches (Stepanova, 2008; Cerny, 2005; Devetak, 2005), transnationalization of insecurity signifies that threat perception began to gain a new dimension in international security arena where non-state actors has increased their visibility through violent and indiscriminate attacks. On that other hand, in this transnationalization process, states are not totally disregarded; rather they become not central, but a part of insecurity sources as well as non-state actors like terrorists.

Terrorism has different phases in history ranging from traditional, national to religious, has been transformed, as well, from domestic reach to international

¹ This new security dilemma is an extension of traditional security dilemma of realist theory. In traditional security dilemma, perceived external threats cause insecurity in states and believe that they can be targets of such threats; therefore, they take measures to protect themselves like alliance building, arms building etc. In return these counter reactions can be perceived as a threat by other states. These countermeasures eventually lead to a vicious circle of insecurity among states.

coverage. In brief, transnationalization of insecurity does not only constitute a shift from state centric approach to multi centric view of threat perception, but also a changing face of terrorism from traditionalism to transnationalism, from state sponsored terrorists to more autonomous one. Thus, transnational terrorism in the contemporary world has begun to draw more attention as a source of threat due to its new characteristics, which will be explained in detail in the following pages

2.3 Changing Face of Terrorism

2.3.1 Traditional versus Contemporary Terrorism

In today's world, although the potential of a war between two states decreased, this vacuum has been filled by new security challenges that have more amorphous, less identifiable and even more ominous character. Throughout history, terrorism has been categorized under various names like left wing, right wing, ethnic separatist, secular, state sponsored, religious and "new terrorism".

In the late 1960s and 70s, an upsurge of left wing terrorists in various parts of the world including Europe and Latin America was witnessed. They were usually operating as clandestine actors who were generally under control or acting behest of a foreign government. They had a well-defined command and control structure with selective targeting method (Hoffman, 2001: 196-197). German Red Army Faction and the Second of the June Movement represented revolutionary spirit, which is typical to left wing terrorists. They were against exploitation in capitalist system and interventionist foreign policy methods (Hoffman, 2001: 79-80). Left wing terrorists also had a sort of influence on nationalist terrorism, which came into forefront in the following decade.

The left wing terrorism was followed by another wave of terrorism called “right wing terrorism” including the rise of neo fascist groups. It is questioned that to what extent they are dangerous in comparison to the recent kind of terrorism emerging after the Cold War. For Laqueur (2001: 82), those traditional terrorists whether left wing, right wing or nationalist- ethnic separatist, were not constituting a great danger, because they did not aimed mass casualties. Therefore, it could be argued that in the contemporary age the world is entering a new phase in its history, which has not been more dangerous than any before.

During the 1990s, in the post-Cold War period, the number of religiously motivated groups has increased (Hoffman, 2001). According to Hoffman (2001: 92-93), the tendency to religion as a motivating factor was not surprising after the end of Cold War, because with the collapse of the Soviet Union, communist ideology was discredited and an ideological vacuum emerged. The 1995 sarin nerve gas attack on Tokyo subway by a Japanese religious cult, the bombing of World Trade Center in New York by Islamic radicals, and the assassination of the Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin by a Jewish religious extremist are several examples of religiously motivated terrorists, which have different religious convictions.

Furthermore, potential of the use of mass destruction weapons by terrorists was usually disregarded during the Cold War. The use of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and such devices was explored within the context of superpowers, since a nuclear attack was expected from super powers or their allies, not from non-state actors (Hoffman, 2001: 197).

2.3.2 State Sponsored Terrorism

State sponsored terrorism reflects another phase in the history of terror. It refers to a situation where a government gives active or concealed support, encouragement or help to a terrorist group. Especially, radical states may exploit terrorism referring to “guns for hire” as a foreign policy tool since it can be a low cost way of waging war. It is a fact that acts of violence carried out by terrorists are relatively inexpensive and even risk free if it is committed properly which could deter the threat of reprisal and punishment (Karagöz, 2003: 8). Hoffman (2001: 187-189) also emphasizes that state sponsored terrorists do not necessarily have to be identified with extreme religious, ideological or separatist-ethnic ideas, what they needed was the disposition to perform on behalf of a government (Hoffman, 2001). In terms of public support, as an example, Irish Republican Army (IRA) and Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) usually avoided indiscriminate violence with the fear of alienating their supporters, because excessive violence could damage their claims on legitimacy of their acts. Through that strategy, the group leaders could even had a place at the bargaining table. As Benjamin Simon (2000: 65-66) states that these terrorists demand a lot of people watching them, not a lot of dead people.

Since state sponsored terrorists act on behest of a government, their targeting has to be selective complying with expectations of sponsor. Hence, Hoffman (2001: 190) argues that they choose their targets on a more discriminate scale, and usually target selected people such as exiled opposition figures, political dissidents, journalists and political cartoonists. On the other hand, Paul Ripsman (2004: 375) states that “freelance” terrorists who take their support outside of national boundaries can organize violence attacks even without support of states, as in the example of al-

Qaeda terrorist organization which is mainly funded by a rich Saudi person Osama bin Laden. Main features of al-Qaeda terrorism are listed by Gus Martin (2006: 293):

- holds no territory
- does not champion the aspirations of an ethno-national group
- has no “top-down” organizational structure
- has virtually nonexistent state sponsorship
- Promulgates political demands that are vague at best.

Gus Martin (2006: 301) uses “stateless revolutionaries” term for those terrorists and says: “These movements are essentially “stateless” in the sense that they either have no particular home country that they seek to liberate, or there is no homeland to use as a base, or their group has been sponsored from the land that they are fighting for.” According to Martin (2006), its pan-Islamist ideological motivations transcend the limits that national boundaries imposed on in 1980s and 1990s. Martin (2006: 531) further states, “The new terrorists also became cell based stateless revolutionaries, unlike earlier terrorists, who tended to organize themselves hierarchically and had state sponsors.” This situation brings a critical break in terrorism history by implying that terrorist organizations can act even without state sponsor and can involve in indiscriminate and lethal attacks with any state boundary on them. It further helps the audience to understand why today’s terrorism with its transnational characters created such a horrible effect in the world. NATO, an international security organization, declared fight against terrorism.

2.4 The Effect of Globalization on Transnational Terrorism

This increasing terrorism threat has been reinforced by globalization to some extent. Globalization is defined by T. V. Paul and N. Ripsman (2004: 359) as “the

expansion of socio economic and socio political activities beyond the boundaries of the state to an international and transnational scale.”² Victor Cha (2000) explores in his essay “Globalization and the Study of International Relations” how globalization has altered the way that scholars approached security through interconnecting globalization and security. In the first place, Cha (2000: 393-397) argues that globalization complicated the basic concept of threat in international realm. Agents of states cannot only be state elements but also non-state actors. Global violence and human security concerns have become common issues where the fight is not only between states but also between sub-state units. For Cha (2000: 397), transnationalization of threats has further blurred the distinction between internal and external security. For instance terrorism, which was previously treated as a domestic security concern, is today incorporated into the security agendas of international organizations like NATO.

Secondly, globalization has extended deterioration of state power through expansion of non-governmental, regional and international organizations. This trend led the terrorists to avoid direct contact with state sponsors; therefore, according to Morgan (2004: 37), they started to care less about political support. Lawrence Freedman also underlines the sponsorship by stating that Taliban ruled Afghanistan was a terrorist sponsored state rather than a state sponsor of terrorism (Morgan, 2004).

Thirdly, globalization helped terrorists in easing targeting. In a globalized world, terrorists can more easily and rapidly reach provoking targets, ideas and news, including lessening border controls and spreading of communication technologies

² Globalization is divided as hard and soft globalization in the article of T. V. Paul and N. Ripsman. In hard globalization perspective, globalization can replace the states with global institutions. In soft globalization view, major security challenges are not military threats, but other non-military threats as terrorism, crime and mass poverty. Human security prevailed military security like inter-state wars.

(Morgan, 2004). In this regard, Internet in the age of globalization has the effect of communicative revolution on terrorism. The Internet is “self consciously built to be egalitarian, a place where anyone can have a voice and directly reach anyone else. On the Internet, information can reach anyone directly, disregarding his or her position in the organization. This is in some sense different from the traditional hierarchical form of organization where information passes upward through certain intermediaries” (Marg Sageman, 2008: 120). For Sageman (2008: 131), “the structure of the Internet has become the structure of global Islamist terrorism.” For instance, there are findings that Internet and e-mails were used by al-Qaeda in the process of planning and realizing the September 11 attacks. Morgan (2004) also states that technology gives rise to conduct mass casualty attacks. He (2004: 40-41) claims that the worst single attack before September 11 approximately caused the deaths of 380 people. Therefore, one of the factors what makes today’s terrorism more dangerous is the technological development and its spread to the globe.

Transnationalization of terrorism in the globalized world has also added new dimensions to certain traditional concepts of international relations. In that context, “New Security Dilemma” issue will be analyzed to grasp the effect of transnational terrorism in the anarchic world touching upon the traditional meaning of security dilemma.

2.5 “New Terrorism”

2.5.1 New Security Dilemma

In the context of International Relations, anarchic structure of the international politics is assumed to shape most of the actions and consequences.

Anarchy means the absence of a political authority above that of the sovereign state. In this system, international politics is competitive and in a self-help realm and survives a security dilemma. Hobbes has a central place in the history of security dilemma. He defines “state of nature” as the “state of war”. States wage wars when the benefits of war exceed the costs and risks of doing that. These benefits and costs are decided by the distribution of power in the international system. In traditional security dilemma concept, states main concerns are survival and interest maximization. Furthermore, states are assumed to be “instrumentally rational”, although miscalculations can occur because of uncertain conditions and imperfect information (Infantis, 2006: 14). Thus, states operate under a certain security dilemma and “They cannot be certain about the intentions of the other states, even when the ‘others’ strongly believe for themselves to be reliably benign. Uncertainty about a state’s motives, or the belief that a state is motivated by greed rather than security concerns, will increase another state’s sense of insecurity” (Infantis, 14). It is because that peace under such an anarchic system may not be constant and stable.

Within this context, Ken Booth and Nicholas Wheeler’s definition of security dilemma (Booth and Wheeler, 2008: 4) is

A two level strategic predicament in relations between states and other actors, with each level consisting of two related lemmas (or propositions that can be assumed to be valid), which force decision makers to choose between them. The first and basic level consist of a dilemma of interpretation about the motives, intentions and capabilities of others, the second and derivative level consists of a dilemma of response about the most rational way of responding.

For two writers, the dilemma of interpretation is the result of the need to make a decision under such a condition of irresolvable uncertainty about the motives and intentions of the other party. For instance, in the case of military build-up, the other state intends to know whether this military development is only for self-

protection and defensive purposes, or it is for offensive goals. In the second level of dilemma of response, the main paradox is to decide rationally how to act without falling into the trap of misplaced suspicion and trust (Booth, 5). Moreover, anarchy fuels this security dilemma by leading to increasing hostility and conflict if no state explicitly expresses their benign intentions. In brief, “An increase in one state’s security decreases the security of others” (Infantis, 14); therefore, in such an environment, threat perceptions of states are critical in their defense calculations and security policies.

During the Cold War era, nuclear bipolarity added utmost importance to security dilemma. In Ken Booth’s words (2008: 266), this is because: “world politics have entered a new age of uncertainty, and one whose landscape is shaped by risk, danger, mistrust, fear, uncertain cooperation, doubtful trust and insecurity.” In this period, national security was defined in narrow military terms; western governments had a clear threat perception mainly originating from the Soviet Union. Mutually enduring destruction capabilities of two superpowers, namely the United States and the Soviet Union created a balance of terror. However, the end of the Cold War revealed a different set of threats and dangers, which are global in scope. The security dilemma in the twenty-first century has gained a new shape in this regard.

After the Cold War, the clash of ideological and military dynamics was terminated, and a new age of uncertainty started. The symptoms of this new condition could also include the September 11 attacks, the war on Iraq and global warming etc. (Booth, 2008). In that era of different combination of risks such as terrorism, environmental degradation and global warming, traditional security dilemma has gained another direction, which will “operate at multiple levels and in relation to other referents than the state.” (Booth, 2008: 267). In this sense, it can be

claimed that security dilemma has been globalized in an increasingly interconnected world, which is more vulnerable to the new risks and challenges.

In traditional sense, fear has occasionally been used as an instrument of suppression by governments and a tactic of control by authoritarian states. However, in that new security environment after the Cold War, certain actors like terrorist organizations have used creating fear as a tool to voice themselves, and to pursue their aims in such a criminal way. Today in many parts of the world terror tactics are becoming more common and more fearful. Besides, transnationalized terrorism also feeds other risks and confrontations like regional conflicts and ethnic turmoil. Thus, the danger of unexpected incidents, especially the ones that can cause mass casualties as in the case of the September 11 attacks. Ken Booth and Nicholas Wheeler (2008: 275) encapsulate the new security dilemma approach:

The apogee of the globalization of the security dilemma in this new age of uncertainty are those situations in which fellow citizens from different “identity groups” may no longer be trusted to share the same values, and whom you may fear might be ready to use violence – including suicidal tactics – to further extremist causes. Moreover, in a world where nuclear materials are predicted to be more plentiful than previously, with significant proportions of it being unaccountable, the prospects for a nuclear-armed terrorist will grow.

The idea behind the new security dilemma is also expressed by Philip Cerny (2005) as “states are increasingly cut across and hedged around by a range of complex new structural developments and sociopolitical forces that, taken together, are leading to the crystallization of a globalizing world order--more correctly, a “durable disorder”--that in crucial ways looks more like the order of late medieval society than like the world of “modern” nation-states.” In particular, there has been a clear shift in the dominant form of violence and conflict from the one characterized by interstate wars to one in which civil wars, cross-border wars, and low intensity or

guerrilla-type wars--including terrorism--increasingly predominate and proliferates. To be sure, civil and cross-border wars are nothing new, and terrorism has been with us throughout human history. However, their interconnectedness and the way they are inextricably intertwined with other aspects of globalization--linkages that cut across states and crystallize below the level of states--is the key to understanding the nature of contemporary security and insecurity. Terrorism reflects deeper and wider structural changes.

As Cerny (2005: 13) states:

Changes in the character of the security dilemma since the end of the Cold War have not resulted simply from the breakdown of one particular balance of power--that is, of the bipolar balance between United States and the Soviet Union. Rather, recent changes profoundly reflect the increasing ineffectiveness of interstate balances of power as such to regulate the international system. International relations are therefore no longer dominated by holistic, indivisible national interests and collective fears for national survival but rather by divisible benefits pursued by pluralistic, often cross-national networks of individuals and groups, whether peaceful, as in the context of "global civil society," or violent, as in the case of terrorism.

2.5.2 The Characteristics of “New Terrorism”

In a multi centric world, security threats perceived from states decreased while non-state actors, particularly terrorists groups have proved their place in this structure. Besides, terrorist organizations evolved in time, and it is now possible to distinguish between old and “new terrorism” concepts. In the contemporary security environment, namely new terrorists seem to pose more threat to international security as observed in the case of the September 11 in which the attacks were directed to the homeland of a superpower. Hence, it is useful to compare “old” and “new” terrorism within the framework of differentiating approach to terrorism that was analyzed under NATO context in the following chapter.

Firstly, Gus Martin defines main characteristics of namely “old terrorism”. Martin (2006: 531) briefly categorize it as being leftist ethno nationalist, leftist ideological motives, selecting surgical and symbolic targets, manipulating media and publicizing incidents, having relatively low casualty rates, identifiable organizational and hierarchical organizational profiles, consisting of full-time professional cadres.

Although terrorism is not a new phenomenon, what makes today’s terrorism more dangerous than previous one is the result of attainment of “new terrorists” to a new quality. According to Krahman (2005: 7), new generation of terrorism appears to have a higher probability, intensity and variety and their features dispart from traditional secular terrorists basically in terms of the organizational structure, methods, means, aims, and members. Richard Devetak (2005: 239) argues that “new terrorism” began with the attempt to destroy World Trade Center in New York in 1993, and it has been followed by other destructive incidents of Oklahoma City bombing, Tokyo sarin gas attack, the East Africa bombings and finally the September 11 attacks in 2001.

On the other hand, since it is difficult to fully reveal terrorist organization due to their hidden existence, according to analyzes, new generation of terrorist groups has a less cohesive organizational structure with more diffuse and fluid bodies and membership (Hoffman, 2001; Devetak, 2005; Krahman, 2005). Hoffman (2001: 207) calls it as an “ad hoc gathering of like minded people.” That indiscernible character of groups is coupled with anonymity of actors, which makes identification of perpetrators difficult, so they can escape from detection (Hoffman, 2001: 208). Furthermore, there is a loose hierarchy and compartmentalization in these organizations, as Steven Simon (2003: 15) calls, they are “non-group groups”. They are organized in cells and not very dependent to the center. Therefore, the less

sophisticated character of “new terrorism” with less organized bodies makes it more difficult to track and interrupt by the governments. Devetak (2005) states that this kind of a structure resembles to a large corporation, which is difficult for law enforcement and intelligent agencies to penetrate into these organizations.

Second, infliction of mass indiscriminate casualties has been observed as another trend in “new terrorism”. In this new generation, rather than attempting to select specific targets for their aims, they are not constrained by certain limits unlike traditional terrorists. They are usually prepared to attack randomly and wanted to cause extensive casualties. On the other hand traditional terrorists have engaged in highly selective activities with discriminated targets (Hoffman, 207). According to Brian Jenkins (2007: 119), there can be several reasons for this indiscriminateness. Firstly, media helps these organizations by creating a view that the level of destruction is crucial in order to get place in headlines. It would not be wrong to argue that today’s terrorists want both a lot of people watching and a lot of people dead. In accordance with that, terrorist organizations follow certain media strategies to be more successful (in their own terms). As Timothy McVeigh, the Oklahoma City bomber, confessed: “we needed a body count to make our point” (Hoffman, 13). Secondly, terrorists realized that innocent civilian targets carry lower risks to themselves in comparison to military targets. Finally, new generation of terrorists is more revengeful and deep fanatics unlike politically oriented terrorists (Morgan, 2004: 31). Hoffman (2001) lists two more reasons for the increasing lethality of terrorism. First one is that terrorists have greater access to more sophisticated weapons. He claims that during the 1980s, as reported, Czechoslovakia sold 10000 tons of Semtex to Libya, 40000 tons to Syria, North Korea, Iran and Iraq (Hoffman, 2001). So, state sponsors of terrorists offer enhanced operational and striking

capabilities to terrorists by helping transformation of terrorist organizations from groups into entities (Hoffman, 14).

Thirdly, “new terrorists” commit more lethal and bloodier activities. As stated by Metthew Morgan (2004: 30) “today’s terrorists seek destruction and chaos as ends in themselves.” This is to say that terrorism has moved from a mean to an end in itself. Although there was a decline in the number of international terrorist incidents during the 1990s, the proportion of people killed in these attacks increased contrarily. According to Research and Development Corporation (RAND) chronology, 484 international terrorist incidents have occurred in 1991, 343 incidents in 1992, 360 in 1993, and 353 in 1994, 278 incidents in 1995. Also, in terms of increasing lethality of terrorism, Jenkins (2007: 118) finds that in the 1970s, the bloodiest incidents caused the fatalities of tens of people. In the 1980s, it was around the hundreds, and in the 1990s, attacks on that magnitude have occurred more frequently. These numbers demonstrate that although international terrorist incidents declined in number, their lethality has increased. So, new generation of terrorists intend to achieve strategic gains as a result of their violence. Even in some weak states, they could overthrow the existing government. But they could rarely create strong political movements. They could neither directly change a government nor alter a national policy. However, in time, they developed more strategically tactics and have got its results (Jenkins, 127). Jenkins (2007: 129) gives the example that in 2004, Iraqi insurgents kidnapped, decapitate or threatened to beheaded foreign national in Iraq from various segments including workers, journalists, and aid officials; they forced the coalition forces to withdraw their soldiers. This tactic has been influential in the countries where there was strong opposition to the war. Philippines pulled out as a result of that tactic.

Fourthly, these more lethal activities have been enforced by the potential use of weapons of mass destruction including nuclear terrorism. In the past, this possibility was usually discounted for traditional terrorists. Political, moral and practical restraints prevented terrorists to use such weapons. However, today, despite the possibilities to use chemical, biological or nuclear weapons, these fears have not been realized to a certain extent. For instance, biological weapon was only used in the anthrax letters of 2001. In the following years, there was the fear of nuclear terrorism, which was heightened as a result of the collapse of Soviet Union, and its stocks were opened to illicit markets. In spite of the fact that the use of nuclear weapons has been a concern, luckily, it has not been carried out in any terrorist attack (Jenkins, 2007: 119). On the other hand, according to Hoffman (2001: 204-205), what makes potential use of WMD as a characteristic of “new terrorism” arises from easy access to the information related to WMD attacks and critical materials through the illicit markets. As stated by William Perny (2001: 225), with the end of the Cold War, the barriers that prevent to acquisition of WMD diminished as well as the know-how and even security controls on these materials have been uncertain. Besides, availability of resources, when defined characteristics of “new terrorism” are combined together, the fear of WMD terrorism seems to be not an aberration. Furthermore, in contemporary world, in order to acquire WMD, terrorists may not be dependent to collaboration with a state sponsor. In “new terrorism”, terrorists may possibly have opportunity to acquire necessary equipments from the stocks of former Soviet Union or from open markets (Simon, 2003: 18-19). It is also argued by Richmond (2003: 306), the potential use of WMD by terrorists may equalize the asymmetry between the state and the non-state actors through increasing their power to kill, even innocent people.

These new characteristics are also associated with the religious characteristic of “new terrorism”. Hoffman (2001: 200) argues that the new generation of terrorism has had less comprehensible nationalist or ideological motivation when compared to traditional terrorists in the form of ideological, ethnic and separatist groups that were usually active in the period of 1960 and 1990. He further states that although religious terrorists involved in 25 percent of recorded international terrorist incidents in 1995, they were responsible for 58 percent of the total incidents (Hoffman, 2001: 201). The Aum sect’s nerve gas attack in Tokyo, assassination of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, Oklahoma City bombing of 1996 and the September 11 attacks are all harbingers of a more lethal character of religiously motivated terrorists. Increasing lethality in religious terrorism may arise from several factors. Firstly, since violence is a sacramental and divine act for religious terrorists, they are not constrained by political or moral factors unlike secular terrorists. Secondly, religious terrorists usually call their enemies “infidels” or “children of Satan” in order to portray their targets as subhuman or unworthy. By using these dehumanizing ways, these terrorists justify their acts of violence and Morgan (2004: 32) also says “for religious terrorists, however, indiscriminate violence may not be the only morally justified, but constitute a righteous and necessary advancement of their religious cause.” Therefore, these terrorists justify their acts in the name of God. Thirdly, secular terrorists prefer violence as a way of correcting a flaw in the system with their frustrated political aspirations, but they continue to consider themselves as a part of that system, whereas religious terrorists do not usually regard themselves a component of the existing system, but as outsiders who seek to create significant alterations in the order, therefore, they can find a vast array category of enemies (Hoffman, 2001: 95). For instance, ETA or PLO believed in state system, and by

employing their violent means they wanted to become part of that system, rather than to be treated as outsiders (Cody Brown, 2007). The terrorists believe that they are engaging in a war that is organized by God to restore the world. (Steven Simon, 2003: 10) Bassam Tibi states (2006: 75) “to be sure, Jihadism in the shape of terrorism is no longer the classical jihad of Islam. It is the outcome of the politicization of religion in Islam.” In this respect, jihadism is interpreted as “the Islamic variety of contemporary terrorism being the current shape of the use of force by irregular warriors in a new pattern of war” (Tibi, 77). The target is the secular nation-state since in universalism of Islam goes beyond to level of nation state. For Simon, this belief leads to the emergence of two competing world order: the prevailing secular Western and the Islamic one that God rules. So, jihadist terrorism is an irregular war for this end. Although Islamic manifestation of this catastrophic terrorism poses a great danger, there are other radical groups from various religions like American Christian Patriot Movement, Israel’s Jewish messianic militants and Japan’s Aum Shinrikyo sect that all share a similar world view with regard to reshape the world (Simon, 2003: 11). Although secular terrorists seek to defend some kind of a disenfranchised population, religious terrorists have their own constituency (Morgan, 2004: 32). Thus, religious terrorists can engage in a total war by not caring any other constituency than themselves since constituency in the outside is consisted of infidels and apostates (Brown, 2007: 20). In general, it is the increasing fanaticism as well as radicalism and irrationality that distinguish “new terrorism” from its traditional types (Brown, 2007: 21).

Furthermore, amateur terrorists constitute another component of new type of terrorism. In traditional form, terrorism also required capability like training and eligibility to access the necessary weapons and knowledge as well as willing and

motivation to act. Whereas today, due to the developments in information and telecommunication technologies, any kind of information is available in Internet, bookstores, CD-ROMs or via mails (Brown, 25). Hence, terrorism has become accessible even to untrained persons. New generation of terrorists can even learn how to make a bomb through Internet and CDs. Besides attractiveness of “new terrorism” to amateurs; sophistication of professional terrorists has increased. Since they learn from their predecessors and analyze their mistakes, they become smarter and more difficult to track. Therefore, they are professionalized to develop countermeasures. Then, these amateur terrorists can be professionalized in later steps (Arquilla et al. 2007: 20-21). This character of “new terrorism” is called, as “two tier of terror one by hard core professionals and the other is amateurs.” (Arquilla et al., 2007: 43).

Moreover, “new terrorism” also differs from the old one in terms of taking the responsibility of attacks. As Hoffman (2001: 208) states that in contrast to traditional terrorist groups who declared their demands and the committed acts explicitly in order to explain their causes, in the form of “new terrorism”, they can avoid declaring responsibility such as the case in embassy bombings.

Finally, “privatization” of terrorism is another characteristic of new generation of terrorism. Terrorist organizations have benefited from state financing in history. In the 1960s, although superpowers and their allies may be more willing to finance terrorism, because that after the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from Afghanistan and end of the Cold War, local conflicts and terrorism has had less strategic interests for the states (Jenkins, 2007: 121-122). According to Jenkins (2007), with the end of the Cold War, several conditions altered the state support of terrorism. For instance, Iraq involved in a war with Iran and invaded Kuwait in 1990,

Libya was bombed by the United States, support and protection to Syria that supports to Palestinian terrorist organizations by Soviet Union reduced. However, since the state sponsorship has declined, it becomes more difficult for states to monitor and control terrorists. For the case of the September 11 attacks, Jenkins (2007: 122) argues that intelligence agencies lacked the preparations of the organization, although they have clues, they could not have a clear picture. Bin Laden's funding and supports of anti American terrorism indicates that influential incidents and mass casualties can be organized without state sponsors. Therefore, "new terrorism" has shifted from stated sponsored actions or directed domestic targets, and they are usually involved in more delocalized and supranational activities. It means that "new terrorism" acts more independent from states and their supports, which make it more dangerous and difficult to contain (Hoffman, 2001: 208). It is interesting that after the September 11 attacks countries focused on a person; bin Laden, not on a state. Gus Martin (2007) also defines the characteristic of "new terrorism" as less dependent on state support in addition to willingness of terrorists to cause mass casualties committed indiscriminately.

Table 1: Activity profile of new and old terrorists

Activity Profile					
Terrorist environment	Target Selection	Casualty rates	Organizational Profile	Tactical/ Weapons Selection	Typical Motives
The old terrorism	Surgical and symbolic	Low and selective	Hierarchical and identifiable	Conventional and low to medium yield	Leftist and ethno centric
New Terrorism	Indiscriminate and symbolic	High and indiscriminate	Cellular	Unconventional and high yield	Sectarian

(Source: Gus Martin, 2006, p.532)

2.5.3 “New Wars” in the Age of “New Terrorism”

“New terrorism” accomplishes with “new wars” concept, which connotes how “new terrorism” with particularly more autonomous character from the states takes a place in the war paradigm of the 21st century. Today’s perceived threat form transnational terrorism does not just evolve around the threat; rather its concrete affects resulted in mass casualties with indiscriminate target selecting reached a new stage named “new wars” that leads main international institutions as well as states to take stance against terrorism threat. For instance, in the case of NATO, the Allies began to implement new measures and have gone into a transformation process in order to meet the new security threat originating from terrorism more effectively.

In the war paradigm of terrorism, it is believed that “terrorist acts arise when weaker parties cannot challenge an adversary directly and turn to asymmetric methods”. (Arquilla et al., 2007: 69) Subsequently, aiming at inflicting casualties, they may act on their own behalf or behalf of a state. However, “stateless” version of war pattern has swelled in the age of “new terrorism” (Arquilla et al., 70). Here, “stateless” can be interpreted in two ways, first is the terrorist organizations involvement in wars more actively, destructively and globally where previously states were the only dominating actors. Second is the decreasing dependency of terrorist organizations on state sponsorship in “new terrorism” model, as illustrated al-Qaeda network. Both of these approaches underline the extended threat from transnational terrorism, which is more independent from state control in the contemporary security environment. John Robb (2007: 3-4) also describes the future of war in this regard as:

We have entered the age of faceless, agile enemy. From London to Madrid to Nigeria to Russia, stateless terrorist groups have emerged to score blow after blow against us. Driven by cultural fragmentation, schooled in the most sophisticated technologies, and fueled by transnational crime, these groups are forcing corporations and individuals to develop new ways of defending themselves. The end result of this struggle will be a new more resilient approach to national security, one built not around the state but around private citizens and companies.

In this “new war” framework, the September 11 attacks demonstrated that it was not just a horrible destruction but also it was proved that huge spending on defense and military force structure was ineffective when it was needed the most in order to save the lives of people. For Robb (2007: 7), it is due to “the fundamental inability of nation states to conceptualize a role that makes sense in fighting and deterring the emerging threat.” Therefore, the real threat, as seen in the rapid rise in global terrorism over the past five years, is that this threat is not another state but rather the “super empowered group” which is provided by rapid technology improvement and global integration. Therefore, this implies a transformation from state to state conflict to a war paradigm where terrorist organizations gained a new, but more threatening role.

The end of the Cold War can be considered an important step in that shift. Robb (2007: 7) again emphasizes with regard to new war concept in the post-Cold War period as:

Wars between states are now, for all intents and purposes, obsolete. The real remaining threat posed by wars between states, in those rare cases when they do occur by choice, is that they will create a vacuum, which these non-state groups can thrive. Every time we shuffle the playing cards with state versus state conflict, we will now find that we are ultimately less well off than before it occurred.

On the other hand, it does not mean that social, religious and ethnic reasons of conflict are over: rather the change is that wars fought for those reasons may not

be between states, but at a lower stage than state units like terrorist organization. Robb (2007: 8) points that his new level is at the realm of “super empowered groups.” In this new context of war, trends in technology help individuals and groups to wage war on states as seen in the propaganda of al-Qaeda with 9/11 in which it is also proved that technology can be used for bad aims.

“New terrorism” confronts the system in a more radical way than traditional terrorists with their methods, aims and motivations. Richmonds (2003: 292) states “old forms of terrorism challenged political and territorial hegemony whereas new forms challenge the very value systems of the liberal international system.” So, “new wars” are more transnational in nature, deterritorialized, non-centralized and can attack symbolic and values of the targeted population (Richmond, 295). In this regard, with the September 11 attacks, terrorists assaulted Pentagon and World Trade Centers that symbolize respectively the military and economic power of the United States.

“New wars” concept in which one of confronted parties can be terrorists or guerillas differs from interstate wars in traditional sense that two opposing armies fight each other. In that new space, traditional norms and rules of war are no more applicable since actors are likely to compose of small groups that communicate, cooperate and carry out their acts without a central command and control, but they push the states into that war (Arquilla et al, 47). So, “new wars” blur of distinctions between offense and defense by bypassing standard boundaries, jurisdictions and lines between state and society, military and non-military, public and private. Therefore, states become uncertain how to respond them either with military, police and intelligence agencies. It is claimed that in the contemporary world these untraditional kind of wars have become more prominent in the security agenda of

states as well as international institutions like the UN, NATO and the EU, particularly following 9/11 (Arquilla et al, 54). Since the September 11 attacks created such deep concerns in international system where terrorists began to penetrate into the politics through massive and indiscriminate casualties, it requires to devote a specific study on the features of the attacks in 2001 attaching it to al-Qaeda network that accepted as organizers of the attacks. While changing international order from state centric to multi centric world has been analyzed touching upon the evolving nature of terrorism in time under the framework of “new terrorism” and “new wars”, the September 11 resulted in more sensitivity to the threat and utmost importance attached to the fight against it as seen in NATO when the Allies, first in its history invoked the Article 5 of its founding Treaty that is of the collective defense clause.

2.6. Al-Qaeda Network with the Outrageous Effect of the September 11 Attacks

The September 11 attacks conducted on the superpower's territory are considered as a benchmark in the evolution of terrorism by impinging on state centric international system from its very basis. The perpetrators and planners of the attack belong to a non-state actor, called al-Qaeda network. On September 11, 2001, three hijacked planes hit the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon outside Washington, Another plane which could not success to target White House crashed somewhere near to Pennsylvania. The attacks shocked not only the United States but also the whole world. President Bush immediately declared national emergency and called for action.

There are different evaluations regarding the significance of the September 11 attacks to the USA. One of them is made by Andrew Cottey (2004: 32) who states that first time in modern history “political opponents of the West from the Third World successfully attacked the territory of the leading Western powers.” Although al-Qaeda has cells in various parts of the world, it is mostly settled in Afghanistan that has a poor population and deteriorated economic conditions under Taleban’s autocratic rule. Secondly, for the first time in its history aside from Pearl Harbor, Americans were targeted at home which also implied that even hegemonic power is not safe from global terrorism (Karagöz, 2003: 15). It also means that no one is immune from terrorism, even a superpower despite of its huge armies, sophisticated weapons and advanced technologies. So, al-Qaeda network has become the prime example of “new terrorism.” According to Simon (2003: 9), Osama bin Laden, as the leader of al-Qaeda network that is presumably operative in more than 50 countries is the new face of “new terrorism”. Outrageous results of 9/11 due to magnitude of the attacks targeted the places that symbolize the US economic and political power raised the question of a state’s ability to protect citizens that make huge investments to defense and security sectors.

Devetak (2005: 241) portrays the organizational structure of al-Qaeda, perpetrators of the September 11 attacks as loosely organized, hierarchical but not pyramidal which makes the agents to penetrate in it. Al-Qaeda is not a centrally directed organization with the characteristic of network rather than hierarchy. In that structure, individuals are allowed to operate autonomously in case. Devatak (2005) claims that the advantage of that deterritorialized and transnational networking structure of the organization is that if one of the nodes is destroyed, it would not affect other nodes, or is less likely to result in destruction of the whole network.

Similarly, Brian Jenkins (2001: 123) states that “Al-Qaeda seems to be one of the first groups to pattern itself on a lean international business model: loosely run, decentralized but linked, able to assemble and allocate resources and coordinate operations.”

The September 11 attacks also reminded people of the increasing lethality rate in transnational terrorism in the contemporary security environment as analyzed under “new terrorism” concept. In fact, around 3600 people died in 9/11 attacks that showed dramatically unrestricted terrorists in use of force. Devetak (2005) states that previously, terrorist incidents took a limited place among the new security threats for the reason that terrorists are unable to resort incredible attacks with huge number of deaths and injuries in comparison to interstate war, civil conflicts or even infectious diseases. In this respect, on a global scale, number of fatalities from terrorism is stated as varying between 12 and 704 per year between the years of 1968 and 1997. From another view, for Krahman (2005: 5), 9/11 attacks on American territory directed from Afghanistan represent a sort of break in conviction of that terrorism usually affects the immediate neighborhood, rather than distance places.

Religious motivation in Osama bin Laden’s al-Qaeda organization that was radicalized with lethal attacks in 2001 has been verified under “new terrorism” context in multi centric world where threats are not only originating from states. For instance, Osama bin Laden issued a fatwa in February 1998 declaring a total war to the enemy: “The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies- civilians and military- is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it...” (Simon, 2003: 12). Religious character of al-Qaeda also associated with its politicalness. As bin Laden stressed in his speeches that his hatred originates from the presence of the United States in the holy lands of Muslim, the

U.S. support for Israeli state and its support of some Arab states. He really spoke on a specific goal of withdrawal of American forces from the Middle Eastern land (Jenkins, 2006: 10-11).

Furthermore, al-Qaeda network uses the Internet and its forums for recruitment and to disseminate their messages (Phoenix Global Intelligence system, 2006). Today terrorists also apply ready availability of high speed Internet as their communication method. By sending their messages via Internet rather than using human sources, they also make themselves less visible and difficult to be identified. They usually use Internet forums, chat rooms and online phone services as tools. Therefore, Internet has become a widespread form of terrorist network not only for internal communication but also to send out their messages to the world. Al-Qaeda also uses Internet as a part of its media strategy, further has a separate branch in the organizational structure. They broadcast videotapes and footages of Bin Laden and his speeches, which direct his followers. These videos are also aimed to intimidate their opponents. Since cyberspace is difficult to control, it is an opportunistic forum for terrorist networks (Kahlmann, 2005: 115). The September 11 attacks on World Trade Center as a representative of the capital of world economy and Pentagon as the representative of superpowers' military establishment, indicates how al-Qaeda's media strategy works. Therefore, different from earlier examples of non covered terrorist acts in media, al-Qaeda employs a much more sophisticated way of external communication both in terms of tools that use for their communication and the attacks that they carried out.

The transnationalized character of insecurity through terrorist attacks beyond borders has been verified also recruitment of amateurs to the organization from different countries in addition to professional and experienced member profile of al-

Qaeda due to its members' involvement in Afghan war in 1979 or other conflicts (Tucker, 2001: 7). Therefore, it indicates that although al-Qaeda has a professional character, it continues to affect various people around the world and recruit them to the organization that can be professionals of the future. This spreading life span of a transnational terrorist organization makes it even more threatful to the security of states. As Jessica Stern (Morgan, 2004: 39) comments on al-Qaeda's operational structure:

The answer lies in the organization's remarkably protean nature. Over its life span, al Qaeda has constantly evolved and shown a surprising willingness to adapt its mission. This capacity for change has consistently made the group more appealing to recruits, attracted surprising new allies, and—most worrisome from a Western perspective—made it harder to detect and destroy

Finally, in terms of achieving strategic results, The September 11 attacks not only caused thousands of fatalities but also affected the American economy and caused billions of dollars. It also altered the U.S. policies by “global war on terror” framework. It stimulated Afghanistan and Iraqi invasions and caused organizational changes in the government bodies (Jenkins, 2006: 127). As a result of these results after the spectacular attacks on the U.S. soil, 9/11 is considered to be a turning point in the war paradigm of terrorism by bringing it to a peak in terms of fear it caused, damage it gave, hatred it fueled and polarization between Muslim world and others it aimed. Therefore, according to Devetak (2005: 242-243), transnational terrorism that gained new dimensions in the post-Cold War environment affected the political order in a state-centric international system in three ways. Firstly, under “new terrorism” concept, which is especially dominated by religious fundamentalism aims to create a world state, rather than composed of secular, national state entities. Indeed, new generation of terrorists use the word of God in their acts and their ultimate goal is to establish theocratic world governance, and believes that it will bring the peace;

however, their peace understanding is not the toleration to others, rather obliteration of non-believers to their order. Thus, in order to fulfill that aim, they do not avoid killing innocents indiscriminately in massive numbers by violating the norms and rules in international system obliged for states and act beyond the established principles. Secondly, “new terrorism” challenges the Western value system of modernity, and dominance of the U.S. and the West in global distribution of power. Therefore, al-Qaeda’s declaration of war to the United States represents the revolt of terrorists to the international order.

After an analysis of transnational terror in the age of “new terrorism” and the September 11 attacks, the decision of NATO which was originally established against Soviet threat and developed huge conventional forces and nuclear stockpiles, to involve in the fight against terrorism can be considered a crucial decision. This fight is different from traditional sense of war in terms of terrorists’ hidden places, unknown boundaries, unpredicted attacks and irrational character. So, NATO’s determination to take a stance against terrorism threat after the September 11 attacks led the wave of transformation efforts within the Alliance in order to make itself more adaptable to the new security environment. This transformation period also implies how a non-state terrorist challenge, which was disregarded, previously affects a state centric international organization’s operations and structural establishment.

CHAPTER III

NATO'S APPROACH TO TERRORISM BEFORE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

3.1. NATO and Its Missions During the Cold War

3.1.1 Origins of the Alliance

There were deep-rooted ideological, economic and political differences between the United States and the Soviet Union even before the Second World War. These differences were further intensified as a result of their mutual doubts after the Second World War. In that period, power was largely shared between the United States and the Soviet Union with the decline of European powers. In fact, these two camps represented opposing sides in terms of government model, economic policies and ideological views. So, the events preceding the establishment of NATO are in close relation to the end of World War II and the reconstruction of power relations. The reality of the Soviet Union's military power embodied with its expansionist policies led commitment of the U.S. to the Europe. Hence, NATO, as today's central security organization, was originally formed to counter the threat of communist expansion and against intentions of the Soviet Union to extend its influence in Europe. Its founding document is the Washington Treaty that signed on 4 April 1949

in Washington D.C. The Alliance's traditionally stated aim is "to safeguard the freedom and security of its members through political and military means." (The U.S. Department of State, 2006). To this end, NATO has a highly institutionalized political and military structure. Originally, it was founded by 12 countries³ around the idea of collective defense of its members. The main principle of NATO, as stated in the Article 5 of the Charter, is that an attack against one or several members would be considered an attack against all. This provision is the lynchpin behind the concern of indivisibility of security. In the practical expression of this collective effort, the Alliance embodies a transatlantic link in which security of Europe and the North America is tied together. NATO also serves as a consultation forum on security issues of common concern and defense matters. For much of its history, the central focus of the Alliance was to provide for defense and security of its members. Although today collective defense remains the core task, the focus of NATO has undergone a transformation in time (NATO Handbook, 2001: introduction part). The key features of this transformation period are summarized in this chapter, and then emphasize is given to the Alliance's approach to terrorism before September 11 in order to analyze the latter period, how a non-state actor influenced transformation of a state centric organization. The September 11 assaults have been taken as a benchmark as a result of reasons described in the second chapter.

3.1.2 The Security Tasks of the Alliance during the Cold War

NATO's collective defense precautions during the Cold War focused on how to prevent and deter the Soviet aggression. Soviet military technology including the world's first intercontinental ballistic missiles accompanied with the Soviet

³ The United States, Canada, Belgium, Luxemburg, Netherlands, France, Britain, Italy, Denmark, Iceland, Portugal, Norway

declarations on ideological hostility between communism and liberalism bolstered the Western resolve to NATO. Hence, the Soviet Union became a remarkable stimulus for political cohesion in the Alliance. Soviet interventions in East Germany in 1953, in Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968, and in Afghanistan in 1979 and other Soviet involved crisis like Cuban missile crisis and Berlin blockades tended to reinforce further this consensus among NATO members for collective defense (David Yost, 1998: 32). In such a security environment of the Cold War, NATO mainly performed four tasks excluding terrorism among threats to its security (Erdoğan Çatal, 2001: 9-10):

- 1- “The collective defense posture against the Soviet Union
- 2- The reassurance provided to Western Europeans for their security as to make them assume responsibility for their own security and thus enhance alliance burden sharing
- 3- Strengthening and expanding the international community based on democratic principles, individual liberty, and the rule of law in a peaceful international society.
- 4- Building necessary institutional structures within the alliance and the ally states to maintain the achievement of all kinds of relative duties.”

In the list, the Soviet Union is considered to be a serious concern for the Allies’ security. This state centric threat perception led NATO to adopt a military strategy based upon a significant conventional force capability able to defense against any particular massive attack. In that structure, NATO has been heavily depended on conventional forces. Then, the Alliance adopted the strategy of massive retaliation, which can be defined as nuclear oriented defense posture against the Soviet nuclear and military build up. That strategy later paved the way for flexible

response approach consisting of a triad of conventional, tactical nuclear and strategic nuclear weapons to deter and defend against any aggressor. Under the policy of flexible response, huge numbers of sub-strategic nuclear weapons were deployed in Europe.

To sum up, NATO's Cold War strategies were mainly based on conventional and nuclear weapons at tactical and strategic levels in order to deter a massive territorial threat, namely the Soviet Union. Therefore, when the Soviet Union collapsed, the debates on the future of NATO intensified. There were arguments whether NATO would still be necessary, and continue to be a vital organization in the future, since its main enemy was defeated. If the existential threat for the Western Europe and the United State collapsed, what would NATO have performed for? That question was asked in many debates, and there were people who believed that NATO would not be alive in the future or it will cede to a successor like the UN. When the discussion on the NATO's future was continuing, the dismissal of the Soviet Union was followed by the ethnic conflicts in the region and in the former Soviet satellites. Besides, there were doubts regarding Russia's possible imperial ambitions due to its disenchantment in market economy and resentment to the loss of its status (Lawrence S. Kaplan, 1995: 19). As a response to the changing security environment, the Alliance agreed its Strategic Concept in 1991, updated it in 1999 in which NATO refers the new risks and threats to its security.

On the other hand, although many of NATO's distinctive features and capabilities were designed against a state centric security approach, specifically to deter any possible Soviet attack, all of its assets were not confined to that mission. As an example, integrating Germany to the Alliance was NATO's another task during the Cold War period. As John Duffield (1994-1995: 776) states that "the other

countries of Western Europe are eager to see that Germany remains tightly bound within the NATO framework.” To this end, West Germany joined the NATO in 1955 as a sovereign state. It had the right to arm; but was not allowed to create a general staff and agreed to subordinate its armed forces to NATO command. Therefore, Germany has been a major case in NATO’s integrative efforts in that period. Reminding German issue in mind, NATO has developed assets for other tasks as the development of a defense policy and rules and procedures for democratic control of defense matters by civilian staff.

3.2 NATO’s Tasks and Missions in the post-Cold War Period

Fighting against terrorism, as a NATO area of responsibility had not become a case until the September 11 terrorist attacks. In order to grasp the Alliance’s approach to terrorism before September 11, 2001, analyzing what else NATO dealt with after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and how could NATO adapt itself to the new security environment is a necessity.

3.2.1 Keeping NATO and Redefining Collective Defense

The end of the Cold War came with several questions for the Alliance. The Berlin Wall was opened on 9 November 1989 and the Warsaw pact was dissolved on 1 April 1991 following the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Consequently, just in two years, major factors that contributed to the establishment of NATO were gone. The situation brought both a relief and confusion for NATO. The various scenarios and forecasts for the future of NATO came at a time when the Alliance started to deal with a complex set of tasks. In this context, McCalla (2000: 458-459) argues:

Once the Warsaw pact broke up and the Soviet Union dissolved, emphasis shifted towards balance of power concerns with more attention paid to military potential that remained in the former Soviet Union. The threat had been transformed from being direct and deliberate to one that was indirect and perhaps unintended, but a threat nonetheless.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, emerging crisis in Balkans and the periphery of the Alliance demonstrated that Europe is endangered by potential conflicts. Furthermore, the Gulf war and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the South indicated that Europe is also under threat outside Europe besides outgrowing of ethnic clashes in the southern flank of Europe. This has brought an end to the debates on vitality of NATO after the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

3.2.2 Arms control and Weapons of Mass Destruction

In the new collective defense posture, emphasis on countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction has been one of the main issues on NATO's agenda. After outbreak of the Gulf War (1990-1991) with the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait and the UN operations to expel the Iraqi forces from the territory of Kuwait, the Alliance began to focus on proliferation of WMD as one of the main challenges to the security in the post-Cold War environment. The Gulf crisis also manifested that Europe is in danger of potential threats outside Europe (Eckhard Lümbkemier, 1991: 16-17). In 1994, the Foreign Ministers issued a report "Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction" and recognized that WMD and their delivery means can pose a direct military threat to NATO territory, populations and forces (Report on Options for Confidence and

Security Building Measures, Verification, Non Proliferation, Arms Control and Disarmament).

During the Cold War, the use of nuclear weapons was prevented by the prospect of massive retaliation. The nuclear arms race slowed down in the early 1970s with the negotiation of arms control treaties. The security environment of the 1990s enabled nuclear weaponized states to dramatically reduce their nuclear stockpiles. On the other hand, the proliferation of knowledge and technology has enabled other nations to build their own nuclear weapons, extending the overall risks to new parts of the world.

The Gulf war demonstrated the continuing danger of WMD proliferation. However, the Alliance did not see any need to take an immediate action; rather it left the issue to be considered in the international forums dealing with certain proliferations such as Chemical Weapons Convention and Biological Weapons Convention. In 1991 Rome Declaration issued following the 1990 London Declaration, the Alliance did not declare any commitment to counter WMD proliferation; instead it supported international arms control regimes. Then, in 1991 Strategic Concept, the Alliance undertook initiative and declared the need for “missile defenses” with purely defensive in nature against chemical weapons (Yost, 1998: 80). With 1994 Summit, NATO’s political and military efforts intensified and improved against the threat of proliferation. The Alliance Leaders agreed that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means threatens international security, so it has been a concern in the NATO’s security agenda. In the words of the Summit statement (Brussels Declaration: 1994: Article 17):

We direct that work begin immediately in appropriate fora of the Alliance to develop an overall policy framework to consider how to reinforce ongoing prevention efforts and how to reduce the proliferation threat and protect against it.

For that purpose, the Alliance established a Joint Committee on Proliferation. In addition to NATO's concern on proliferation, NATO has also focused on its own nuclear capability in the post-Cold War period. The Alliance radically reduced its reliance on nuclear forces after the end of bipolar confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States. Although its strategy remains one of war prevention, it was no longer dominated by the possibility of nuclear escalation. Its nuclear forces were no longer targeted against any country, and by the way, the circumstances in which they might be used, have been considered to be extremely remote. In this framework, the number of land-based nuclear warheads in Europe has been reduced by over 85 percent. As the NATO Document emphasized at that time "the Alliance will maintain for the foreseeable future an appropriate mix of nuclear and conventional forces based in Europe and kept up to date where necessary, although at a minimum sufficient level." (NATO Topics: the Threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction). So, the organization committed to preserve its military capability at a lower level than the amount in the Cold War era despite the fact that NATO's main enemy has gone. Thus, the Alliance did not abandon its traditional collective defense role since the concerns about Russia's future persisted in the post-Cold War period.

Among the fundamental security tasks of the Alliance, the Strategic Concept document states that "to deter and defend against any threat of aggression against the territory of any NATO member states" (Strategic Concept, 1991: Article 20(iii)). Since the Soviet military capability and build up remained its importance as the security concern in NATO, the uncertainties about Russia's future and long term policies continued.

In the 1999 Strategic Concept, it is also stated that WMD and its delivery means by touching upon the development of new technologies in this sector poses threat to the Alliance's security. The Article 22 (1999) particularly refers to this challenge:

The proliferation of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical (NBC) weapons and their means of delivery remains a matter of serious concern. In spite of welcome progress in strengthening international non-proliferation regimes, major challenges with respect to proliferation remain. The Alliance recognizes that proliferation can occur despite efforts to prevent it and can pose a direct military threat to the Allies' populations, territory, and forces. Some states, including on NATO's periphery and in other regions, sell or acquire or try to acquire NBC weapons and delivery means. Commodities and technology that could be used to build these weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means are becoming more common, while detection and prevention of illicit trade in these materials and know-how continues to be difficult. Non-state actors have shown the potential to create and use some of these weapons.

Similarly, Article 23 of the Strategic Concept (1999) points out that possible usage of technologies in spreading the WMD carries further danger:

The global spread of technology that can be of use in the production of weapons may result in the greater availability of sophisticated military capabilities, permitting adversaries to acquire highly capable offensive and defensive air, land, and sea-borne systems, cruise missiles, and other advanced weaponry. In addition, state and non-state adversaries may try to exploit the Alliance's growing reliance on information systems through information operations designed to disrupt such systems. They may attempt to use strategies of this kind to counter NATO's superiority in traditional weaponry.

So, in the post-Cold War period of 1990s, proliferation of WMD and its delivery means in addition to uncertainties about Russia's future policy on nuclear capability has been another item on the agenda of NATO with serious concern.

3.2.3 Enlargement Policy: Cooperation with Former Adversaries and Other non-NATO Nations

Enlargement has been an ongoing process in NATO since its establishment. With the conclusion of the Cold War confrontation, NATO's open door policy has been extended to the former adversaries. Although there were enlargement waves previously, it is noticeable that the number of countries becoming NATO members is spectacular since the end of the Cold War. In this respect, while four countries joined NATO between the years of 1949-1980s (Turkey, Greece, Germany and Spain), twelve countries became members (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Albania and Croatia) after 1980s and currently Macedonia is participating in Membership Action Plan (MAP), but was not invited joining to NATO during the recent NATO Summit in Strasbourg/Kehl between 2-4 April 2009 due to veto of Greece because of the name conflict between two countries.

The Central and Eastern European states found themselves in a security vacuum after the collapse of the Soviet Union and had fears regarding the possible neo-imperialist aims of Russia. Therefore, ambiguity regarding the possible route of Russian policy and uncertainties in the former Soviet republics created apprehension on the security of NATO member territories. In that context, stabilizing the former Soviet bloc in order to prevent outbreak of hostilities among them has been another closely related task of the Alliance besides the initiatives to integrate these countries into the NATO structure. Since the collapse of the Soviets, many of these countries have undergone a transformation process politically and militarily, if these efforts were failed, the result could lead to domestic chaos, mass migration and armed conflict that might even threat NATO member neighbours. Because these countries

were in reform process with no recent experience in democracy and free market economy, combined with uncertain, but possible external security threat from Russia, leaving these countries unprotected would be conducive to pressure on them to acquire additional military build-up in order to protect themselves. Further, such a development would be perceived as provocative by its nearby neighbours (Duffield, 1994-1995: 770-771). So, there was both a need and unique opportunity to build improved security in the whole Euro-Atlantic area, without creating new dividing lines.

Suppressed nationalist conflicts, ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes reemerged in some parts of the Eastern European countries and Yugoslavia. Therefore, this transformation process regarding the relations with the Eastern and Central European Republics did not follow a linear path. Robert J. Art (1998: 386) points out three predicaments of NATO's friendship policy with the end of the Cold War period. First predicament at that time was about where does enlargement stop? Who gets to join NATO and who does not? Then, another deal was on how large can be a NATO without Russia? The main issue in mind at the NATO summits and meetings is "incorporation some of Mother Russia into NATO would justifiably give rise within Russia to fears of encirclement by, and exclusion from, the West." (Art, 1998: 388). In that dilemma, the Founding Act with Russia and the establishment of the NATO-Ukraine Council without a veto power over NATO's actions has been important instruments to overcome this fear. What will happen to NATO if it takes in a whole lot of new members? has become another difficulty with regard to the functionality of the Alliance?

The London Declaration can be considered as a turning point in this respect. In the 1990 London Summit, the Allies affirmed their resolve to maintain peace and

security with the idea of “a Europe whole and free”. In the declaration, it says (1990: Article 2):

Yet our Alliance must be even more an agent of change. It can help build the structures of a more united continent, supporting security and stability with the strength of our shared faith in democracy, the rights of the individual, and the peaceful resolution of disputes. We reaffirm that security and stability do not lie solely in the military dimension, and we intend to enhance the political component of our Alliance as provided for by Article II of our Treaty.

As stated in the Article 2 (1990), NATO aimed at reaching out the countries of the East. In terms of concrete steps, the Alliance suggested military contacts, regular diplomatic liaison and issued a declaration affirming that NATO and Warsaw Pact nations were no longer adversaries. On the other hand, there were doubts about NATO expansionism to the Central and Eastern countries because that Russia could perceive it as a threat to its security and might feel to be isolated. Such a thought would lead the Russian leaders to reconsider their defense conceptions and redeployment of armed forces (Boczek, 1995: 218-219). Therefore, NATO has tried to improve its relations with the former Warsaw Pact countries without flourishing Russia’s threat perception.

The 1991 Rome Declaration demonstrates the attitude of NATO towards the former Warsaw Pact countries after the disintegration of the Soviet Union by offering a more institutionalized relationship for consultation and cooperation between NATO and these countries. For that reason, the Foreign Ministers of Bulgaria, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and the Soviet Union were invited to join NATO’s Foreign Ministers in December 1991 in Brussels to issue a joint political declaration to launch this new era of partnership and to define further the modalities and content

of this process of enlargement (Declaration on Peace and Cooperation, 1991: Article 11).

3.2.3.1 The Partnership for Peace (PfP) Initiative

At the 1994 Brussels Summit, NATO leaders stated that they “expect and would welcome NATO expansion that would reach to democratic states to our East” (Declaration of the Heads of State and Government, 11 January 1994: article 12). In this respect, the Partnership for Peace (PfP) initiative was launched as a step in expansion process of NATO in the post-Cold War period (The Brussels Summit Declaration, 1994: Article 13):

We have decided to launch an immediate and practical program that will transform the relationship between NATO and participating states. This new program goes beyond dialogue and cooperation to forge a real partnership - a Partnership for Peace.

Through the PfP program and gradual integration to NATO military establishment, the interested states are provided opportunities to fulfill their security needs. In this framework, the essence of the PfP program is a partnership formed individually between each Partner country and NATO, tailored to individual needs and jointly implemented at the level and pace chosen by each participating government. The Framework document sets out several political commitments in that perspective like preserve democratic rules, principles of international law and to fulfill the responsibilities under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as respecting existing borders and to settle disputes peacefully (NATO Topics: Partnership for Peace, 1995).

3.2.3.2 Membership Action Plan (MAP)

At the 1999 Washington Summit, the Membership Action Plan (MAP) was launched to help other aspirant countries in their preparations by providing advice, assistance and practical support through a range of activities. Hence, the MAP process has been another instrument for NATO in enlargement policy of NATO. Although the MAP does not guarantee membership, an annual consolidated progress report on activities under the MAP is presented to NATO foreign and defense ministers at their regular spring meetings each year (NATO Handbook, 2006: 189).

Enlargement policy particularly directed to former adversaries has been another area of focus in the post-Cold War period before 2001. In that respect, to ensure Russia that the Alliance policies would pose no threat to the country became crucial for the NATO policy makers.

3.2.4 NATO and the Balkans: Crisis Management and Peace Operations

Crisis management has been an important task for NATO in its post-Cold War orientation. Up to 1991, the strategic environment in the North Atlantic region was dominated by two superpowers that were each supported by military structures. The period of Cold War ended without NATO's Article 5 having to be invoked. As soon as the Soviet Union collapsed and satellite countries regained independence, past tensions resurfaced and violent conflicts broke out among ethnic groups.

The first major ethnic conflict broke out in the former Yugoslavia in 1992. NATO gradually became involved in support of the United Nations through various air and sea-based support operations-enforcing economic sanctions, an arms embargo and a no-flight zone in Bosnia and Herzegovina - and by providing the UN with

detailed military contingency planning concerning safe areas and the implementation of a peace plan.

The measures proved inadequate to bring an end to the war. In the summer of 1995, after violations of exclusion zones, the shelling of UN-designated safe areas and the taking of UN hostages, the NATO member countries took several decisions resulting in military intervention in support of the UN efforts to bring the war in Bosnia to an end. A two-week air campaign against Bosnian Serb forces were launched by NATO and in the following months a number of further military actions were taken at the request of the UN force commanders. These actions paved the way for the signing of the Dayton Peace Accord on 14 December 1995. The Alliance immediately proceeded to deploy peacekeeping forces to the country in accordance with the terms of a UN mandate, giving NATO responsibility for the implementation of the military aspects of the peace accord. The Alliance's involvement in Bosnia had important effects on its internal adaptation process within NATO. Although in the early phases, both the United States and Europe abstained from intervention, NATO's engagement in Balkans created new overturns in the Alliance operational capabilities. The main discussion by NATO leaders was held on what would be the interests of the Alliance are and what kind of an action had to be employed if NATO intervenes. As Secretary States of the U.S Warren Christopher pronounces "the crisis in Bosnia is about Bosnia and the former Yugoslavia. It is not about NATO and its future." (S. Victor Papacosma, 1995: 269). On the other hand, these debates concluded in NATO with an important decision on behalf of engagement in the crises by adopting new responsibilities in the emerging security environment. Several new arrangements in military and command structures of NATO took place to that end such as the creation of a NATO Crisis Response System (NCRS), the NATO

Intelligence and Warning System (NIWS) and NATO's Operational Planning System (NATO Topics: Crisis Management, 2009).

When the war started in Yugoslavia, the Alliance was trying to negotiate on a new force structure, new concept and reorienting its mission. In this context, the creation of small, flexible and easily deployable forces was depicted in the 1991 Strategic Concept of the Alliance by shifting away from response to a massive attack by conventional armies to crisis management actions. The Concept says (1991: Article 46 (c)):

Appropriate force structures and procedures, including those that would provide an ability to build up, deploy and draw down forces quickly and discriminately, will be developed to permit measured, flexible and timely responses in order to reduce and defuse tensions. These arrangements must be exercised regularly in peacetime.

In June 1992, the Allies declared to their support on a case-by-case basis in accordance with NATO's own procedures, peacekeeping activities under the authority of CSCE by making available Alliance resources and assets. This decision was then extended to supporting peacekeeping operations under the responsibility of the UN Security Council. Furthermore, in the 1994 NATO Summit, the Allies approved the creation of "Combined Joint Task Forces" in order to facilitate these operations in particular, non-Article 5 operations⁴. Therefore, Balkan puzzle was confused again with the outbreak of the events in Kosovo⁵ in 1998. Although Kosovo was not a direct threat to NATO initially, the Alliance members feared that the war can spread to neighboring states, Albania and Macedonia, and may turn to a regional war.

⁴ Non Article V. operations is expressed by David Yost (1998: 76): "that is operations other than those to honor the binding commitment to collective defense in the case of external aggression against the Alliance."

⁵ A constituent part of Serbia with a population of 90% ethnic Albanian

The Alliance, stung by its experiences in the Balkans came to consensus on the necessity of expeditionary out of area operations as a new organizing principle to complement the collective defense mission. As expressed in the 1996 NATO Communiqué, NATO's act of Yugoslavia has given credence to its adaptability to the post-Cold War Europe (Final Communiqué, 10 December 1996). Today, over 14.000 troops from the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR) are still deployed in Kosovo. As seen in NATO's another post-Cold War mission, the Alliance has taken decisions on adapting itself to the new security environment, but in this process, terrorism was not an effecting factor.

3.2.5 Growing European Independency through the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP)

In the 1990s, there was a growing realization of the need for European countries to assume greater responsibility for their common security. In parallel, NATO recognized the need to develop a "European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI)" within the organization that would be both an integral part of the adaptation of NATO's political and military structures. This led to the development of arrangements between NATO and Western European Union (WEU), which, at that time, were acting for the European Union in the area of security and defense (The 1992 Maastricht Treaty). These arrangements laid the groundwork for the subsequent development of the NATO-EU strategic partnership, after the WEU's crisis management role was transferred to the European Union in 1999 (NATO Topics: NATO's relations with the European Union, 2009).

In technical terms, the EU had established its Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) with Maastricht Treaty in 1992. Then, the efforts continued in the

following years, and in 1999, at the European Council meeting in Cologne, the leaders decided to replace Western European Union (WEU) with the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) as the defense part of the CFSP. France and Britain at St. Malo Declaration used “European Security and Defense Identity” term in 1998 in which “autonomous military capacity” term was adopted. In 1999, Berlin plus arrangements were accepted and means, “The EU was assured access to NATO planning and command structures and ready access to the NATO assets and capabilities, provided that the NATO Council approves the mission.” (Alexander Moens, 2002: 40). Although the United States welcomed these developments within the EU, there have been debates on whether the ESDP will be competitor or subordinator to NATO. However, as one of the underlying reasons for an ESDP is to develop a defense and security capacity possibly outside of the NATO alliance to enable autonomous crisis management for situations where NATO is not willing or able to act. Increasing capacity of the EU under the ESDP include not only military, police forces, but also civilian capacities.

The NATO-EU relations mainly built on “Berlin plus agreements” which cover three main elements: the EU’s access to NATO planning, the NATO-European command options and use of the NATO assets and capabilities.

First, NATO guarantees that the EU has access to NATO planning. At the early stages before the EU even knows whether an operation will eventually take place, this may involve a NATO contribution (by SHAPE in Mons) to the work carried out by the EU Military Staff on the definition of options (these are known as "military strategic options"). Subsequently, should the operation take place with use of NATO assets and capabilities, NATO will provide the operational planning required.

Second, the EU may request NATO to make available NATO command option for an EU-led military operation and finally, the EU may request the use of NATO assets and capabilities. To this end, NATO has established a first list of its assets and capabilities that, in strong likelihood, NATO would decide to make available to the EU should the EU need them. In addition, NATO has defined a number of principles as well as financial and legal considerations applicable to the release of its assets and capabilities to the EU. On this basis, a specific EU-NATO agreement setting out the conditions for the use of the NATO assets and capabilities is drawn up for a given operation. That agreement provides opportunity to the EU for a possible recall of assets due to unforeseen circumstances (EU-NATO: The Framework of Permanent Relations and Berlin Plus document, online).

Another important element of the EU-NATO relations is related to the development of military capabilities. At the 1999 NATO Summit, the allies committed to a “Defense Capabilities Initiative” in order to direct European allies to improve their military capabilities and shift their spending from conventional forces to modern information technology, enhanced weapons and long-range transport (Gyarmati and Walker, 2002: 2). Decreasing the capability gap between the U.S and Europe as two sides of the Atlantic has been on the NATO’s agenda in the post-Cold War period. Louis R. Golino (1999: 85) summarizes the internal adaptation process of NATO in the post-Cold War period by stating the aim: “to improve the alliance’s ability to perform post-Cold War roles and missions through a more flexible command structure as well as to strengthen ESDI, or European pillar, in NATO through future Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF) missions.” As NATO Defense Ministers declared in their Meeting on 11 June 1998:

As we build the arch to the 21st century, the CJTF concept will be the keystone. The promise of CJTF is flexibility and organization. It will be the

unifying concept for enabling the Alliance to respond and organize for both collective defense and "new" mission requirements.

At the Washington Summit in 1999, together with the CJTF mission, a new element, namely “Operational Capabilities Concept” has been adopted in regard to advancing the Alliance’s force structure to the new circumstances. As stated in the Report by the Political Military Steering Committee (1999: article 14):

The Operational Capabilities Concept (OCC) aims to reinforce PfP's operational capabilities by establishing additional peacetime means and mechanisms for improving the interoperability of Partner forces and, thereby, the ability of the Alliance and Partner forces to operate together in future NATO-led PfP operations. This would give increased flexibility, predictability about potential contributions, and capability in putting together tailored force-packages to mount and sustain future NATO-led PfP operations.

To summarize, adopting a new strategic concept that emphasized dialogue, cooperation, and crisis management over collective defense in 1991, extending to the East through the PfP program in 1994, moving to end the war in Bosnia and Kosovo, empowering the European pillar through the ESDP initiative and enlarging its membership, by adapting itself to the new security environment with new institutional formations such as the PfP initiative, the MAP mechanism designed for candidate members, development of the CJTF missions and the OCC have constituted the main NATO tasks in the post-Cold War period. So, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, transformation efforts of NATO through enhancing its area of operations and advancing its capabilities mainly were not due to the threat of terrorism which has not been a serious area of concern for the Alliance until 11 September 2001, rather the works have been intensified in order to project the Alliance’s capacity with new institutional arrangements to the new security architecture where former Soviet Republics gained their independence, regional

conflicts broke out in certain countries as well as pressure on the side of the EU that is trying to become a strategic partner for NATO.

3.3 NATO's Approach to the Nature of Terrorism

The dissolution of the Soviet Union has paved the way for a new era in the Alliance's history. In the NATO's latest Summit in Strasbourg/Kehl in 3-4 April 2009, after the eight years of dramatic attacks on 11 September 2001, the Alliance leaders issued a Declaration on Alliance Security in which terrorism is on the top among the new security threats in the 21st century. The Declaration on Security (4 April 2009) states that:

Today, our nations and the world are facing new, increasingly global threats, such as terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and their means of delivery and cyber attacks. Other challenges such as energy security, climate change, as well as instability emanating from fragile and failed states may also have a negative impact on Allied and international security. Our security is increasingly tied to that of other regions.

On the other hand, for a long time, NATO paid no attention to the phenomenon of terrorism. What constitutes a terrorist and in general terrorism has been one of the fundamental disagreements and conceptual problems in NATO. A number of Western countries as well as third world countries experienced terrorism prior and after the Second World War. These terrorist activities were usually considered in conjunction with revolutionary movements, nationalism and with struggle for national, religious and cultural freedom, or with anti-colonialism. Although most of these terrorist acts were national or regional in nature, there have been attacks conducted across the state borders. There were tens of thousands of deaths in the territory of European NATO members and today's EU members due to armed violence between the years of 1949 and 2001 which have far exceeded the

number of people died in the September 11 attacks. This number includes the victims of violence in France (in the metropolity and particularly in the Algerian departments up to 1962 as well as on Corsica), in Turkey (Kurdish and Armenian issues), in UK (related to Ulster), in Spain (Basque separatism), in Germany, Italy and Greece (related to rightist, leftist-revolutionary and anti-Anglo-Saxon varieties) etc. (Philip Gordon, 2002). In fact, prior to 11 September 2001, NATO has not reacted militarily to the matter at all, although terrorist attacked on the territories of the member states and the military and civilian personnel of NATO were targeted by terrorists or taken hostages. Turkey, on some occasions, raised the question of transnational terrorism to the North Atlantic Council in conjunction with the interference from the Iraq. However, Turkey's request from the Alliance to respond against terrorism, particularly the PKK scourge did not result in any concrete action on the side of the Alliance compare to its stance against terrorism after the September 11 attacks. The Alliance invoked Article 5 after a few days from the attacks. At this point, the main issue comes into mind is why Article 5 is invoked for the U.S. not for Turkey that asked for NATO assistance on certain issues regarding terrorism. So, it is questionable whether 9/11 occurred on the soil of any other state rather than the U.S., would NATO give the same kind of responsible. The role of the U.S. in transatlantic relations is impressive in terms of its force and financial contribution to the Alliance operations. Therefore, it could be claimed that the U.S. decision to wage a war against terrorism threat pushed NATO to adapt a more active stance against the threat in line with the approach of NATO's leading power, the U.S.

Even though the 1999 Strategic Concept (1999: article 24) recognized terrorism as a new threat that NATO faced, the Alliance did not show a collective attention and action to this issue until the September 11 attacks. There was little

discussion on the nature, sources and implications of terrorism either in military or political spectrum of the Alliance. Ahmet Muhtar Gün, the Vice General Director of Security Affairs of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, states that without an agreed definition of terrorism, NATO has ardently approached terrorism in concrete terms, since some members view it as a domestic threat rather than a global threat that requires global action. Whereas since 2001, when the world realized that no country even a superpower is immune from terrorism, almost every piece of NATO works has been constructed in the light of fight against terrorism. So, NATO's approach to terrorism has altered with the effect of the September 11 attacks. In this regard, on 18 December 2001, NATO issued "Statement on Combating Terrorism: Adapting the Alliance's Defense Capabilities" as an official text that shape NATO's approach to terrorism. The Statement (2001: Article 2) says:

The Alliance must adapt its capabilities to these changes in the conditions of security and stability. We fully endorse the recent statement on terrorism by Alliance Foreign Ministers. As Defense Ministers, we are especially concerned to ensure that the Alliance's military concepts evolve in keeping with our clearer appreciation of the menace posed by terrorism and that its defense capabilities are adequate for the demands they will face, including military responses to terrorism.

Three main circumstances can be listed in order to explain inaction of NATO in previous terrorist incidents. First, the creation of NATO with the Washington Treaty in 1949 was prompted with the fear of potential massive military threats against their members. It was formulated in the Article 5 and 6 of the North Atlantic Treaty. In these provisions, it was assumed that massive threats could be directed from the armed forces of the hostile states. This supposition keeps out terrorist attacks since they were not regarded at the level of massive military actions. The clauses also suppose that military action might come from the territory of a state as an identifiable actor. Thus, it excludes non-state and not easily marked actors.

Therefore, terrorist attacks were not counted in the NATO's security agenda because its destructive potential was believed to be lower than the attacks of regular military forces, in particular, if the WMD were to be employed (Gordon, 2001: 4). Second, there have been ambivalent attitudes towards terrorism among the members of the Alliance. Even some governments provided funds, logistical support and allowed transfers of explosives. Islamist extremists in Afghanistan and Pakistan including Osama Bin Laden were among those recipients. Thirdly, NATO's institutional structure, decision-making procedure and nature of capabilities have not been designed to prevent and combating terrorism both including domestic and transnational terrorism (Gordon, 6).

NATO has a civil and military structure. The North Atlantic Council (NAC) is the supreme political decision making body in which each of the all member states has representatives on. Key decisions for the military means are taken at the Military Committee (MC) and in this structure; The NAC has the authority to approve the proposals of the MC. Consequently, the member states have two opportunities to influence the decision of the Alliance through the process. At NATO, "silence consensus" is applied in which the representatives do not need to declare their vote in favor of a decision; rather they can reach a consensus when no government states its objection. This decision-making procedure puts also costs on the Alliance in order to reach a consensus in time while people were losing their lives. Therefore, in the case of terrorism, there are certain difficulties to declare terrorism threat as a mission for the Alliance since the governments hold diverging approaches on it (Paul Gallis, 2003: 1-6). Richard Nelson (2004: 32) states:

Over the past three years, NATO has reached consensus on the serious nature of the threat and the fact that terrorism knows no boundaries. International terrorism is now understood to be a single problem with many manifestations, whereas in the past terrorism was viewed more as a series of discrete

national phenomena with the result that differences between terrorist groups were highlighted.

In the 1991 Strategic Concept, NATO leaders recognized that “Alliance security must take into account of the global context” and stated “other risks of a wider nature, including proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, disruption of the flow of vital resources, and actions of terrorism and sabotage.” (The Strategic Concept, 1991). In its 1999 Strategic Concept, the Alliance moved the threat of terrorism to the top of the risks listed previously.

In that internal process of recognizing terrorism as a threat to international security, the September 11 attacks have manifested the concrete example of that threat even in the soil of super power. As a reaction to the terrorist incidents, NATO invoked the Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, the collective defense clause in which an attack on one member country will be considered an attack on all members of the Alliance. Since then, the Alliance sought to factor threat of terrorism into its doctrines, concepts, capabilities and partnerships. Prior to the September 11 terrorist attacks, NATO did not react collectively against terrorism threat. Before that, there has been no incident with such a mass casualty on the territory of one of its members, in particular, in the territory of the United States as the leading power. Even, these kind of considerable consequences did not occur when military or civilian personnel, peacekeepers, tourists or diplomats became targets of terrorists including taking hostages elsewhere. Then, terrorism has become a standing issue on the agendas of both the North Atlantic Council and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council with regular consultations in order to ensure a unified response to the fight against terrorism.

3.4 The 1991 Strategic Concept

NATO's Strategic Concept is a crucial document setting out main principles and values that the Alliance is based on including current works and responsibilities as well as possible duties and missions in the future. Up until, NATO agreed on two Strategic Concepts in 1991 and 1999. Since the risks and threats of the 21st century, and the developments after 1999 such as the September 11 terrorist attacks and the Alliance's decisions to launch missions in Afghanistan have required a review of the current Strategic Concept and identification of possible additional roles that the Alliance might undertake in today's security environment. A crucial step was taken during NATO Summit in Strasbourg/Kehl in this regard by reaching a consensus on revising Strategic Concept. "The Declaration on Alliance Security" document issued in that Summit briefs the Allies' position on the matter better (Declaration on Alliance Security, 2009):

We are committed to renovating our Alliance to better address today's threats and to anticipate tomorrow's risks. United by this common vision of our future, we task the Secretary General to convene and lead a broad-based group of qualified experts, who in close consultation with all Allies will lay the ground for the Secretary General to develop a new Strategic Concept and submit proposals for its implementation for approval at our next summit.

It can be expected that NATO will address new risks and threats in a comprehensive manner and will approach terrorism in this respect. On the other hand, NATO's approach to terrorism before the September 11 attacks is analyzed in the following two parts by referring the 1991 and 1999 Strategic Concepts respectively.

With the 1991 Strategic concept, the Allies recognize that the security challenges and risks that NATO faced today were different in nature than the threats of the past. They agree on that the risk of a surprise, full-scale armed attack on

NATO's European fronts has been reduced substantially. However, it states: "the risks to Allied security remain multi-faceted in nature and multi directional, which make them had to predict and assess." (Rome Declaration, 1991: Article 7). The Allied leaders accept that the security of the members is less likely to be threatened by a calculated aggression against the territory of the Allies; rather they may result from undesirable consequences of social, economic and political instabilities including ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes. Although these risks do not directly threaten the Alliance's security, they may lead to crisis detrimental to the European security and stability (1991: Article 9). Even though the Concept stresses the new kind of risks and challenges to the Allied members, it does not isolate the case of the Soviet Union since it has still had the large conventional forces and its nuclear capability can be comparable only to the United States (Article 10, 1991). Therefore, the Soviet military capability, build-up and nuclear arsenal constituted a significant factor that need to be addressed in the Alliance security agenda. In Article 12 (1991), the Allied leaders recall the Article 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty against any armed attack on the territory of the Allies. However, the following part of the article states, "Alliance security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, disruption of the flow of the vital resources and actions of terrorism and sabotage (1991: Article 12).

In general, although the Allies recognized the potential of other risks and crisis, they put them in a secondary position in the hierarchy of the security list since they believed that the magnitude of these risks would be lesser than an armed attack to the territory.

Then, in the 1994 Brussels Summit, there is only one paragraph regarding international terrorism. The Brussels Summit Declaration (1999: Article 19) says:

We condemn all acts of international terrorism. They constitute flagrant violations of human dignity and rights and are a threat to the conduct of normal international relations. In accordance with our national legislation, we stress the need for the most effective cooperation possible to prevent and suppress this scourge.

In the 1994 Summit, the Leaders only condemned terrorist acts, but did not suggest a unified strategy against the terrorism. This declaration indicates that terrorism was still not in the first order among NATO's security concerns.

3.5 The 1999 Strategic Concept

Terrorism gained an incredible concern in the late 1990s due to the increasing lethality of the attacks, which became apparent in statistics of between the years of 1990 and 1996. For instance, a total of 50,070 people were killed in the combined indigenous terrorist incidents (against fellow citizens or foreigners within the terrorists' country's borders) and international terrorist attacks around the world. This nearly doubles the 28,110 who lost their lives in comparable incidents in the 14 years between 1970 and 1983 (Hoffman, 1999). Again the same document states a research results conducted by two American economists using time series techniques (Hoffman, 1999: 23):

Despite a decline in transnational terrorism of nearly fifty incidents per quarter during some of the post-Cold War era, terrorism still presents a significant threat. This conclusion follows because each incident is almost 19 percentage points more likely to result in death or injury as compared with the previous two decades.

The terrorist attacks in Saudi Arabia in 1996 (Khobar towers were attacked by terrorists which is a housing complex that were being used to house foreign military personnel), in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 (U.S. Embassy bombings, hundreds of people were killed in simultaneous truck bomb explosions at the United States embassies in the East African capital cities of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya) illustrate this shift in terrorism, away from its traditional emphasis on discrete, selective attacks toward a mode of violence that is now aimed at inflicting indiscriminate assaults. Lord Robertson, NATO's former Secretary General, issued a statement at NATO-Russia Conference in 2002 stating increasing threat of terrorism:

From Kenya and Tanzania, to New York and Washington, to Bali, to Djerba and again Kenya, and of course to Moscow and other Russian cities, all of these terrorist attacks were intended to cause maximum civilian casualties. They all struck at the international community as much as at the immediate victims. And all illustrate a grim fact of the post-Cold War era – that terrorism has been transformed. It has mutated, like a virus, into the primary security threat of the 21st Century. If we are to counter this threat effectively, we must also transform our response.

As a critical event within NATO, terrorism has been initiated to incorporate into Alliance security agenda with the 1999 Strategic Concept. Article 24 of the Strategic Concept says:

Any armed attack on the territory of the Allies, from whatever direction, would be covered by Articles of 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty⁶. However, Alliance security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including acts of terrorism, sabotage and organized crime and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources.

⁶ Article 5: the Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party of the parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Article 6 identifies the context of the acts and territory that will be treated under Article V consideration

However, it cannot be claimed that terrorism became a central issue of NATO at that time since a collective action decision was not adopted as the case in the September 11 attacks despite increasing lethality and indiscriminate nature of the attacks. The 1999 Strategic Concept points out terrorism, but it omits the struggle against terrorism in the list of the Alliance new tasks. Terrorism issue has been categorized as a subchapter under the secondary risks together with sabotage, organized crime, and uncontrolled movements of large number of people etc. On the other hand, the 1999 Strategic Concept treated the proliferation of NBC weapons and the vulnerability of information system as a more important issue. Although the Concept pointed at the non-state adversaries, they did not directly link it to terrorist organizations.

In conclusion, the end of the Cold War brought the need to reform the structure and the attitudes of NATO in the face of new challenges. The dissolution of the former adversaries- the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union- was followed by new threats in security scenes. When the East-West confrontation ended, it was accompanied by other conflicts like ethnic and local wars in the former Yugoslavia. By the way, in the 1990s, the Western militaries reduced the scope of preparedness for a major war, whereas started to increase non-military activities in order to provide and maintain security in the Euro-Atlantic area. Then, the Alliance identified two major tasks in order to enhance the security and stability. First one is crisis management operation aiming at standing ready, case-by-case and by consensus, in conformity with Article VII of the Washington Treaty⁷ and intending to engage

⁷ Article 7: This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security available as <http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/txt/treaty.htm>

actively. Second is to develop partnerships in order to promote cooperation and dialogue with other countries in the Euro-Atlantic area.

After that period, terrorism has been more in forefront in the contemporary environment. Together with the 1991 and 1999 Strategic Concepts, the Alliance mentioned other risks to the international security including terrorism. However, until the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Alliance had not taken a collective action decision against the threat. In this regard, the historic decision taken by NATO to invoke Article 5 of the Washington Treaty and extend its assistance to the United States following 11 September 2001 marked the beginning of a new impetus in NATO's transformation process that affected almost every aspect of Alliance activity. Therefore, NATO's transformation process in the face of a non-state terrorist challenge is the case in the following two chapters.

CHAPTER IV

NATO'S TRANSFORMATION AT THE RHETORICAL AND PRACTICAL LEVELS IN THE FACE OF TRANSNATIONAL TERRORISM

“We condemn in the strongest terms all acts of terrorism, whatever their motivation or manifestation. Our nations remain determined to fight this scourge, individually and collectively, as long as necessary and in accordance with international law and UN principles. Terrorists are using a variety of conventional weapons and tactics, including asymmetric tactics, and may seek to use Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) to threaten international peace and security. We attach great importance to the protection of our populations, territories, infrastructure and forces against the consequences of terrorist attacks. We will continue to develop and contribute to policies to prevent and counter proliferation, with a view to preventing terrorist access to, and use of, WMD. We will also continue to support our program of work to develop advanced capabilities to help defend against terrorist attacks, including through the continuing development of new technologies.”(Bucharest Summit Declaration, 2-4 April 2008).

After serving 59 years, as the primary instrument for transatlantic cooperation in defense and defense related issues, the Alliance has become a vehicle for anti-terrorist campaign. NATO has so far been the only organization to apply military means to this end. Frank Cilluffo (2001: 12) tells, “We are faced with a myriad of threats, smaller in magnitude and harder to see and counter. Because these new threats are by their nature dynamic, amorphous and moving targets, efforts to combat them must be flexible, comprehensive and coordinated.” Even after the September 11 attacks, the number of NATO member countries targeted by transnational terrorists rose to three (Spain, Turkey and London). These attacks confirmed the gravity of the

problem for the Alliance by stipulating to develop new strategies and policies to deal with this new strategic challenge. In this regard, the September 11 attacks have been a kind of stimulus for the Alliance's transformation attempts.

The September 11 attacks in New York and Washington were echoed not only in the United States, but also in the entire world. Just immediately after the attacks, NATO for the very first time in its history invoked the Article 5 of the collective defense clause of the Washington Treaty of 1949 in order to demonstrate the Alliance's solidarity against terrorism threat. Since then, the rhetoric of the Alliance has put more emphasis on the campaign against terrorism and developing new operational capabilities to this end. This declaration was followed with other firsts in operational area for NATO. In this vein, the Alliance conducted actively its first military operation outside the European zone by guarding the airspace of the United States with Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS), deployment of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan and taking new roles in existing NATO operations in Bosnia and Kosovo for the fight against terrorism. Further, naval forces were deployed to the Eastern Mediterranean on 6 October 2001 under the Operation Active Endeavour. So, in this chapter, the transformation efforts of the Alliance at rhetorical and practical levels will be analyzed. For the rhetorical approach to terrorism after the September 11 attacks has been searched through NATO basic texts, ministerial communiqués, press releases and speeches.

4.1 Transformation at the Rhetorical Level

Nearly all the NATO doctrines and concepts have been revised after the September 11 terrorist incidents. The Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism

(MC DaT), which was agreed at Prague Summit in 2002 has been one of the basic documents in this regard. Defense against terrorism became an integral part of the NATO's policies thereafter. In a break from the past, rhetorical approach to terrorism in which NATO was unlikely to act outside the Euro-Atlantic area, the Military Concept agrees that "Work on the assumption that it is preferable to deter terrorist attacks or to prevent their occurrence rather than deal with their consequences and be prepared to deploy as and where required to deal with particular circumstances as they arise." (NATO Issues: NATO's Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism, October 2003). On the basis of the North Atlantic Council Decision, the Concept foresees the military action possible if requested or authorized by the UN Security Council.

4.1.1 Rhetorical Transformation about the Nature of the Threat

In the North Atlantic Council (NAC) meeting on 10 June 1982, the Allies stated that the method of preventing terrorism could be decided in accordance with the Allies' national legislation (NAC Meeting, 1982), since it was considered that fight against terrorism was in the national realm of the states, not an international matter that is needed to be handled at global context. At the American Enterprise Institute's New Atlantic Initiative conference, Lord Robertson also points the issue of globalization of terrorism threat by saying "Terrorism has mutated from a nation-specific problem of law enforcement into a lethal threat to national security and international stability." (Speech by Lord Robertson, June 25, 2002: paragraph 2). In this statement, Secretary General also stressed that today's threat is different from the past enemies; they are not rational and predictable. They are not prepared to balance the interests; and they are not even extremist fanatics, driven by hatred and not

conducting their operations beyond rationality and predictability unlike terrorists (2002: paragraph 4). Secretary General further states regarding the nature of new threat (paragraph 3):

The willingness of today's terrorists, and their backers in rogue regimes, to kill indiscriminately has transformed terrorism into the greatest security challenge of the new century. Al Qaida planned to kill tens of thousands on September 11th by turning airliners into deadly missiles. There can be no doubt that if they gain access to other, even more potent weapons of mass destruction, they will use them without a second thought.

In another press statement declared on 20 September 2001 by the Secretary General, the Alliance confirmed the information that individuals who perpetrated the attacks belonged to the world wide terrorist network of al-Qaeda, headed by Osama Bin Laden and reiterated its determination to collectively contribute to this fight (NATO Update: "U.S. High Officials at NATO HQ", September 20, 2001). Besides, in the North Atlantic Council meeting on 6 December 2001, the Ministers agreed that the September 11 terrorist attacks was an outrage against the entire world (NATO Press Release 2001(159): Article 2). The Allies' statement on meeting this challenge that is deemed to be important for the Alliance security can be reviewed an indication of the Alliance's new threat assessment following the terrorist attacks on the U.S. soil.

In this framework, the speech by NATO General Secretary Lord Robertson at the conference on International Security and Fight against Terrorism confirms the changing attitude of the Alliance towards threat of terrorism. He says: "The new security challenges in the international arena threaten us all - North America, Europe, Central Asia, the Mediterranean region, and beyond. Terrorism is no longer a domestic problem. It is now a threat to international security." and "Terrorism is clearly such a common security challenge." (NATO Speech: by NATO Secretary

General Lord Roberson, June 14, 2002). As an example, in the North Atlantic Final Communiqué of 1984, the Alliance views terrorism as a threat to democratic institutions, not to the entire international system and its values. It states: “they reiterate their determination to take effective measures for the prevention and suppression of such criminal acts, which are a threat to the democratic institutions they are pledged to defend, to stability and to the conduct of international relations.” (the NAC Final Communiqué, 29-31 May 1984). In the North Atlantic Council Meeting Declaration participated by the Heads of State and Government on 29-30 May 1989, global challenges were listed, but terrorism did not take place in the list. In the abovementioned declaration, it says: “In the spirit of Article 2 of the Washington Treaty, we will increasingly need to address worldwide problems which have a bearing on our security, particularly environmental degradation, resource conflicts and grave economic disparities. We will seek to do so in the appropriate multilateral fora, in the widest possible co-operation with other States.” (The NAC Declaration, May 1989, Article 32). This statement is another example of proving that terrorism was not reflected on the NATO’s agenda as a critical issue before September 11, 2001.

In a statement issued on 18 December 2001 on Combating Terrorism, the Alliance expresses its seriousness in this new role by saying that “The Alliance is already in a position to contribute significantly to the struggle against terrorism due to the ongoing transformation of its forces, military structures, and defense planning procedures that has been under way since the end of the Cold War.” (NATO Press Release (2001)173: Article 3).

On 18 December 2001, NATO Defense Ministers tasked the NATO Military Authorities to prepare a Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism. The

Concept was approved by the North Atlantic Council and then endorsed by Heads of State and Government at the Prague Summit on 21 November 2002. In the threat assessment section of the NATO's Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism NATO's Threat Assessment on Terrorism further identifies (MC DaT, 2002):

- “Although religious extremism is likely to be the source of the most immediate terrorist threats to the Alliance, other motivations for terrorism could emerge from economic, social, demographic and political causes derived from unresolved conflicts or emerging ideologies.
- In addition, although state sponsorship of terrorism is currently in decline, political circumstances could lead to its rise, providing terrorists with safe havens and considerable resources.
- Although the predominant form of terrorist attack remains the creative use of conventional weapons and explosives, terrorist groups are expected to strive for the most destructive means available, including Weapons of Mass Destruction.”

The Comprehensive Political Guidance (CPG), which is a major policy document that sets out the framework and priorities for all Alliance capability issues, planning disciplines and intelligence for the next 10 to 15 years, declares how NATO perceives the threat of terrorism particularly after the September 11 terrorist attacks. The CPG was agreed on 21 December 2005 by the 26 NATO member countries. It was endorsed by NATO Defense Ministers at their June 2006 meeting at NATO Headquarters in Brussels, and – at the highest political level – by NATO Heads of State and Government at the November 2006 Riga Summit. In the CPG, NATO describes the threat of terrorism increasingly global and more lethal in nature, with the risk of spreading weapons of mass destructions to the terrorist hands.

NATO's rhetorical approach to terrorism is also manifested in the Bucharest summit held in 2008. According to the Bucharest Summit Declaration issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of North Atlantic Council on 3 April 2008 (NATO Press Release (2008)049, April 3, 2008):

Many of today's security challenges cannot be successfully met by NATO acting alone. Meeting them can best be achieved through a broad partnership with the wider international community, as part of a truly comprehensive approach, based on a shared sense of openness and cooperation as well as determination on all sides. We are resolved to promote peace and stability, and to meet the global challenges that increasingly affect the security of all of us, by working together.

4.1.2 Rhetorical Transformation about the Response to Terrorism

4.1.2.1 Condemning the Attacks

NATO's response to terrorism came just after the attacks. On 12 September, NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson condemned the attacks "in the strongest possible terms" and firmly highlighted "the need for the international community and the members of the Alliance to unite their forces in fighting the scourge of terrorism." (NATO Press Release 2001(122), September 12, 2001). However, even before the September 11 attacks, NATO issued press releases on terrorism. As the case in 1985 press communiqué, NATO also referred to terrorism by condemning increasing acts of terrorism worldwide. They further noted their concern over the threat of terrorism to their citizens and stressed the need for cooperation (the NAC Final Communiqué, June 1985). Hence, condemning terrorism in the strongest term and emphasizing the international cooperation in fighting with the threat are not so new expressions in the Alliance's history. On the other hand, the difference of the NATO's approach to terrorism after the September 11 assaults on the U.S. soul has

been in the area of concrete steps taken by the allies in order to put the rhetoric into practice. Accordingly, Press Release of 2001(122) issued on September 12, 2001 underlined the urgency of response to the attacks and the members' resolve to win the battle. Therefore, the message conveyed to the United States was "we are with you and you will not get away with it."

4.1.2.2 Emphasizing Solidarity, Unity and Readiness

The Alliance has started to emphasize more frequently its solidarity in fight against this scourge after the September 11 attacks. NATO Secretary General states, "Securing our future is the collective effort of many, aimed at ensuring the security of many more." in his opening remarks at Bucharest Summit exhibition on "Securing our Future/Defense against Terrorism" (Bucharest Summit opening remark, 2 April 2008). Secretary General articulated in a speech delivered at American Enterprise Institute's conference the way of responding to terrorism threat by saying (NATO Speech: Tackling Terror: NATO's New Mission, June 20, 2002):

However, national solutions have never been enough on their own. The history of my own country shows that the mirage of 'splendid isolation' leads inevitably to bloody engagement. Far better to work with friends to avert a crisis than to find yourself alone with the crisis on your doorstep and your friends all looking the other way. So the second priority for all free countries is to build and maintain the friendships that are critical to winning our common war against terror.

The message of uniting has also given during the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council meeting on 13 September 2001 and taking action to punish the perpetrators of the attacks were declared with the words of "NATO and Russia are united in their resolve not to let those responsible for such an inhuman act to go unpunished." (NATO Press Statement: "NATO and Russia united in resolve against

scourge of terrorism,” September 13, 2001). The Alliance’s act to not be silent has found expression in several statements and press releases in terms of the readiness of the NATO for further assistance (NATO Press Releases 124 and 126, 2001).

Fighting against terrorism became the most prominent issue on the agenda of NATO at the Prague Summit held in 2002. In the summit, the Alliance leaders recognized the new mission of NATO in the field of terrorism by agreeing on that terrorists might obtain nuclear, biological and chemical weapons in order to attain their objectives. In the summit, the leaders more specifically highlighted the Alliance’s new focus on this fight and new tasks (Press Release (2002) 127, November 21, 2002). One of the important decisions taken during the summit was the establishment of a “Strategic Command for Transformation” in the United States and will be responsible for the transformation of the military capabilities and interoperability in the organization (NATO Press Release (2002)133, November 21, 2002). Therefore, NATO’s rhetorical expressions in terms of uniting against terrorism and readiness of the organization to take part in this battle demonstrate the Alliance’s transformation efforts in the face of a non-state terrorist challenge.

During the Cold War era, there were rare attempts to consider terrorism on the NATO agenda. One of these exceptions was NATO’s “Declaration on Terrorism” on 10 December 1981, which declares the Allies’ condemnations on prevention and suppression of terrorism by referring the attacks on diplomatic personnel and consular missions with other criminal offenses. (Declaration on Terrorism, 10 December 1981)⁸. In those statements, any concrete initiative was not

⁸ Ambassador Tomur Bayer stated that for the first time, a paragraph was devoted to terrorism in a NATO communique. Terrorist incidents in Paletsine and Afghanistan were influential in that. Then, in 1994 communique, NATO again referred terrorism, but with the insistence of Turkish delegation. Paragraph in 1982 communique was replaced word by word in 1994 communique.

mentioned; rather just increasing cooperation in this field was highlighted. The rhetorical approach of NATO regarding response to terrorism is also manifested in the below statement (Press Release 2003 (065), June 12, 2003):

Responding to terrorism is a critical challenge for which our military forces must be prepared. Recent events have again shown that terrorism remains a grave threat to our citizens, forces and territory, as well as to international security, and we reiterate our determination to combat it as long as necessary.

NATO anchored to demonstrate its expression of readiness in concrete terms. In a speech delivered by Lord Robertson dated to 4 October 2001 (NATO Speeches: 2001) just three weeks after the attacks, he stated the Alliance's support and solidarity by announcing the eight measures in order to expand respond in the fight against this scourge including "intelligence sharing and cooperation, provide assistance and directly support operations against terrorism, provide access to the ports and airfields on the territory of NATO nations".

NATO leaders also issued a statement that identifies its new mission in this struggle after the United States of America and the United Kingdom began military operations as part of the global campaign against terrorism. Lord Robertson states that the campaign to terminate terrorism has reached a new stage, which will be followed at many fronts; and the Alliance reiterated its eagerness to take role in this mission (NATO Press Release (2001)138, October 8, 2001). Therefore, through this rhetorical transformation, the Alliance gradually designates its new role in the changing security environment. In this context, NATO agreed to deploy five NATO AWACS with their crews to assist the United States with counter terrorism activities.

4.1.2.3 Comprehensive approach

In the Istanbul Summit Communiqué issued in 2004, it is stated that NATO's fight against terrorism would continue to be multi-faceted and comprehensive, including political, economic, diplomatic even military means if necessary since the last bombings have shown terrorism pose a threat around the world (NATO Press Release (2004)096, June 28, 2004). Secretary General Lord Robertson states in a speech delivered in Vienna in 2002 that "We agreed that NATO should be ready to deploy its forces "as and where required" to carry out such missions," NATO's declaration to deploy its forces "as and where required." This clause also illustrates to what extent NATO expanded its mission by giving an end to the "out of area" debate. Moreover, NATO has already provided its assets to certain states, but on the basis of "case by case"; however now the Alliance uses "as and when required" by making obvious its decisiveness in the fight against terrorism.

4.1.2.4 Further Step: Revising Strategic Concept

The NATO leaders negotiated on that adapting itself to the new security environment also requires a strategic document of NATO named "Strategic Concept" which was updated in 1999. Since the year 1999, international environment and perceived risks and challenges have gained new dimensions and transnational terrorism has been prioritized especially after the September 11 attacks. At the last Summit held in Strasbourg and Kehl on 4 April 2009, the Secretary General Lord Robertson was tasked to develop a new NATO Strategic Concept. The Summit also tasked the Secretary General to convene and lead a broad based group of qualified

experts who will lay the ground for the new Alliance Strategic Concept. This will be done with the active involvement of the North Atlantic Council.

The Strategic Concept can be defined as “the authoritative statement of the Alliance’s objectives and provides the highest level of guidance on the political and military means to be used in achieving them.” (NATO News: NATO to launch a public debate on the Strategic Concept, June 7, 2009). Since it describes NATO’s fundamental security tasks and basis for the implementation of Alliance policies, possible importance attached to the threat of terrorism and fight against it will be the basic source for the Alliance transformation efforts in this regard. It is therefore, if one of the key policy documents of the Alliance were revised by taking into account the threat originating from transnational terrorism more seriously than the previous Concept of 1999, it would be guidance for NATO to implement the decisions on the issue.

4.2 NATO’s Transformation at the Practical Level

The “war on terrorism” as the United States described it, is different from the traditional sense of force-to-force warfare of the 18th and 20th centuries. However, prior to the September 11 attacks, NATO did not give a military response to terrorism although terrorists attacked the territories of several NATO states such as in Turkey related to the Kurdish question and in Spain related to Basque separatism. NATO did not also use military force when the civilian or military personnel including peacekeepers, diplomats or tourists became targets of terrorist attacks outside the area of the North Atlantic zone. Only Turkey on certain occasions raised the question of threat of transnational terrorism related to the issue of interference from Iraq (Anton Behler, 2004-2005: 162).

After the U.S. decision of intervening Afghanistan to destroy al-Qaeda bases, the American administration initially relied on its own forces, only a handful of countries like England involved in the war. The NATO forces entered the country two years later when the Taliban regime was destroyed. With ISAF mission⁹, NATO has evolved into a new stage in its history in the mission of combating terrorism and transformation started to be more operational. Transformation of the Alliance structure and capabilities at practical level in the face of terrorism threat has been examined through NATO missions and functions in Afghanistan, Iraq, the Mediterranean and the Balkans. According to Behler (2004-2005: 166), the shift in the Alliance approach to terrorism can be explained by the uniqueness of the attacks occurred in the U.S. territory.

Considering the increasing threat posed by the transnational terrorism, anti terrorism activities began prevailing in NATO agenda with the implementation of a new Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism and the Prague Capabilities Commitments (PCC). In this context, the Defense Against terrorism program (MC DaT, 2003) identifies four roles for the Alliance in military operations:

- “Anti Terrorism, essentially defensive measures.
- Consequence Management, which is dealing with, and reducing, the effects of a terrorist attack once it has taken place.
- Counter Terrorism, primarily offensive measures.
- Military Co-operation.”

⁹ Total Number of ISAF Troops: 64,640 (31 May 09).

• Forty-two nations participate in ISAF: Albania, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and the United States of America.

Among them, these anti-terrorist actions include:

- “Sharing of intelligence
- NATO-wide standardized threat warning conditions and defensive procedures
- Assistance in air and maritime protection.
- Assistance to a nation wishing to withdraw its citizens or forces from an area of increased terrorist threat.” (NATO’s Concept for the Defense against Terrorism, 2003).

4.2.1 The Military Concept against Terrorism (MC DaT)

During the Prague Summit (2002), NATO leaders also adopted a Prague package in order to increase the Alliance’s effectiveness in the fight against terrorism challenge. A “Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism” is one of them, which underline the NATO’s readiness to act against terrorism. With the approval of the Military Concept, defense against terrorism became an integral part of the missions of the Alliance’s forces. In a break with past assumptions that NATO was unlikely to act outside the Euro-Atlantic area, the Military Concept envisages “forces may be deployed whenever and wherever necessary, on the basis of a decision of the North Atlantic Council.” (NATO Issues: MC DaT, October 2003).

After 9/11 attacks to the United States, the NATO military authorities developed the Alliance’s Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism. NATO heads of states and governments adopted it during Prague summit. The Concept explicitly states that NATO faces a real threat from terrorism, so NATO has to be ready to conduct military operations where required (NATO Issues: MC DaT, October 2003). The Document is significant since it draws the path and describes

methods of NATO's fight against terrorism mission. Therefore, Military Concept can be considered as a guideline in the Alliance's transformation efforts in the face of a non-state violent terrorist challenge. Since the Allies agreed on a Concept specifically devoted to struggle against terrorism despite of absence of a consented definition of terrorism, it shows that urgent need for an action and response to terrorism led the leaders to take concrete steps against terrorism. The fact that NATO did not take into account terrorism seriously before 9/11, the Military Concept is a milestone due to its way of approach to terrorism by moving from rhetorical condemnations to tangible sanctions. So, under the Concept, there are four pillars for NATO's military operations to defense its members and territories against terrorism, which are anti-terrorism (defensive/passive measures), consequence management, counter terrorism (offensive/active measures) and military cooperation. So, it can be said that NATO's Military Concept is a significant document in the context of enhancing the counter-terrorism activities of NATO following the September 11 attacks. In accordance with the new concept, the first role for NATO is anti-terrorism. In that stage, defensive and passive measures are used together with limited response and containment. Then, another role for NATO is counter-terrorism that consists of offensive measures. In this regard, NATO can conduct counter-force operations either in lead or in support. The most significant initiative of counter terrorism role is the creation of the NATO Response Force (NRF) and development of strategic lift capabilities¹⁰. Finally, as declared in the new Concept, NATO has increasing relations and cooperation with international organizations like the UN, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the EU and partnership interactions with other non-NATO members through Partnership for

¹⁰ Both initiatives are examined in detail under chapter V, institutional transformation section.

Peace (PfP), Mediterranean Dialogue (MD), Russia and Ukraine (Akdoğan, 2009. 21)

Today, taking its reference from new Military Concept, NATO has launched operations under the mission of fight against terrorism in the Mediterranean, Afghanistan and contributing to the stabilization and security of Iraq.

4.2.2 Combating Terrorism in the Mediterranean

After the Cold War, the locus of threat and risks has shifted in the Alliance from central theatre of Europe to the Europe's periphery and beyond its borders. Although a direct military attack against NATO territory may not be expected, indirect and ambiguous threats to the security of the Alliance such as proliferation of WMD and terrorist incidents are still presence. Therefore, the Alliance has gone through an adaptation and transformation process since the end of the Cold War period. In that process, the "out of area" debates have come into forefront in the Alliance's meetings. However, that contentious issue ended with the launch of Operation Active Endeavour (OAE) that revitalized the NATO's interest in the Mediterranean. The southern and the eastern Mediterranean began to receive special attention after the dramatic incidents in the USA. For a document sponsored by the Italian Parliament in collaboration with the NATO information and press centre, the reason of the interest is because that "the suspects are from the region and the "root causes" of the crisis are clearly linked to the region's security dilemmas." (Abdel Monem Said Aly and Mohamed Kadr Said, 2002: 3).

NATO is not a totally new actor in the Mediterranean. The approach of the Alliance to the Mediterranean security between the years of 1945 and 1990 based on keeping the Soviet Union out of area, because of the USSR's goals and communist

nature of its system (Matthew Nimetz, 1999: 51). It can be argued that NATO paid limited attention to the issues in the Mediterranean that are not related to the Soviet threat.

NATO's focus on the Mediterranean region goes back to the 1960s when Ad Hoc Group on the Mediterranean was established at political level. Then, the Alliance's interest in the southern Mediterranean and the Middle East was reiterated in the 1991 Strategic Concept and then, in 1994 meetings where the NAC decided to establish contacts with non member Mediterranean countries on a case by case basis in order to contribute security of the region. Then, in 1997, at Madrid summit, the NACC decided to establish the Mediterranean Cooperation Group (MCG) that will replace the Ad Hoc Group on Mediterranean, as a further step (Stephan Larrabee et al, 1998: 46-49). At that time, the primary objective of the NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue has been political- "to achieve a better understanding of NATO's policies and activities while simultaneously exploring the security needs of the Dialogue countries." (Stephan Larrabee et al, 2000: 22). Therefore, NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue has had a political agenda to date in which information exchange has been at the heart of the Initiative via the Mediterranean Cooperation Group. According to Mohamed Kadr Said's assessment, combating terrorism was not on the agenda of NATO at that time, whereas Arab Dialogue countries preferred to start such kind of hard issues including terrorism and Arab-Israeli conflict (Nelson, Richard, 2004). So, it can be evaluated that NATO's approach to the southern and the eastern Mediterranean where are the most problematic parts of the area has shifted after the fateful attacks on September 11, 2001 from the policies of dialogue, treaties and confidence building to more pre-emptive and interventionist policies

After the resentful attacks, NATO's Standing Naval Force Mediterranean was deployed in the eastern Mediterranean on 6 December 2001, a day before the launch of Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in Afghanistan. Upon the request of the United States, this measure was taken, aiming at "to provide a deterrence presence and surveillance in strategic international waters at a key moment." (Robert Cesaretti, 2005). The operation was subsequently named as "Active Endeavour" and its mandate and force composition have been regularly revised in order to counter terrorism effectively throughout the Mediterranean. Furthermore, together with the deployment of AWACS aircraft to the United States and Active Endeavor operation, for the first time, NATO's assets have been deployed in support of an Article V. operation. In February 2003, the operation was extended to escorting merchant shipping from the Allied member countries through the Straits of Gibraltar because of the possible terrorist attacks while passing the narrow water road. However, the escorts were suspended as a result of the decline in the requests from the countries. In April 2003, the scope of the OAE was expanded to include compliant boarding operations in accordance with the international law. Then, in March 2004, NATO expanded the reach of OAE to the entire Mediterranean. (NATO Briefing: Response to Terrorism, March 2005). In another argument, the expansion of operation including the Mediterranean has also been related to Madrid bombings that reminded the seriousness of this scourge (Voice of America, 2004). These forces provide visible presence in order to respond rapidly if required. In the context of operation, the Mediterranean is patrolled by frigates and corvettes provided by the Allies on a voluntary basis. Therefore, according to Cesaratti's assessment who is the commander of Active Endeavor, "In the course of the past four years, NATO's first Article-V, collective-defense operation has evolved from a small-scale deployment

providing a modest military presence in an important stretch of sea into a comprehensive, continuously adapting counter-terrorism operation throughout the Mediterranean.” (NATO Review: Combating Terrorism, autumn 2005).

Launch of the OAE represents another dimension in NATO’s transformation process in the face of non-state terrorist challenge by renovating its presence in the Mediterranean from measures against the Soviet threat to counter terrorism. Therefore, in addition to deployment of ISAF mission to Afghanistan as a totally new area of operation for NATO, committing itself to fight against terrorism in the Mediterranean altering its prior existence in the area to anti-terrorist operation is another important development in this regard. These two cases in NATO history are indicators of the concrete steps of the Alliance’s transformation process after the September 11 attacks. Further, it cannot be ignored that NATO did not become silent after the abovementioned incidents in the U.S. despite of the challenges it faced within the Alliance, such as national caveats issue.

4.2.3 Deployment of ISAF Mission in Afghanistan

Under the Taliban rule, Afghanistan has been a place of exporting terrorism, instability and crime to its neighbors and to the rest of the world. The country has also been a base for al-Qaeda, perpetrators of the September 11 attacks. In August 2003, upon request of the UN and Afghan Government, NATO took responsibility for ISAF. So, ISAF was created by the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1386, on December 20, 2001¹¹. The ISAF mission was created in accordance with the Bonn Conference of December 2001 and its tasks are detailed in a Military

¹¹ ISAF is mandated under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Eleven UN Security Council Resolutions – 1386, 1413, 1444, 1510, 1563, 1623, 1659, 1707, 1776, 1833 and 1868 of 23 March 2009 – relate to ISAF.

Technical Agreement of January 2002 between the ISAF Commander and the Afghan Transitional Authority. ISAF was initially led by lead nations: the UK followed by Turkey and the joint lead of Germany and the Netherlands. NATO's engagement in Afghanistan is proof-positive of its transformation from a static, Cold War orientation to an organization capable of dynamic and flexible response and geared to meet modern security challenges to the Allies.

ISAF mission carried in Afghanistan is regarded as NATO's first "out-of area" operation beyond the Europe. Hence, the mission and its success in the area can be a test case for the Alliance representing the Alliance's capability to adopt itself to the new security environment where transnational terrorism produces concrete dramatic results. George A. MacLean, who is a professor and the Head of the Department of political science, at University of Manitoba, Canada, states three reasons why the ISAF mission is considered to be a vital test for the future NATO (Interviewer Tomas Stavelko, 2008):

First is that the success or failure of ISAF, as the first long-term combat mission, will largely determine the future viability of more integrated command and control and interoperability of an enlarged alliance. The second reason is that ISAF is the first application of Article 24 of the 1999 Washington Summit, which identified international terrorism as a threat; and, the third, the hybrid model used by ISAF (combat, peace building, public relations, civil-military relations, counter-terrorism) is a model that may be employed in future operations.

Furthermore, NATO extended its presence in the country through Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) which are a mix of civilian and military personnel, whose main purpose is expected to extend security to the whole Afghanistan (NATO in Afghanistan report, 2009: 13). As a further step, NATO decided to establish NATO Training Mission in Afghanistan (NTM-A) to help the Afghan National

Armed Forces (ANF) during its Strasbourg/Kehl Summit in 2009 (NATO in Afghanistan report, 13).

Fighting terrorism has not been an easy task for NATO as seen in the mission deployed to Afghanistan when some of the Allies imposed national caveats on their forces. Lifting the restrictions on troops was taken into consideration in NATO Summits held in Riga and Bucharest by calling the countries to provide further flexibility to their national troops. Persuading several countries for contributing to the ISAF has been a critical issue for the NATO leaders at the outset of the mission. Therefore, some Allies contribute to the command with certain restrictions. As stated in the CRS report issued for the Congress, some countries may prohibit forces from engaging in combat operations or from patrolling at night. Furthermore, some countries may not allow their forces to be deployed in volatile regions of the country. In concrete words, the former NATO SACEUR General James Jones expressed: “it is not enough to simply provide forces if those have restrictions on them to limit them from being effective.” (NATO in Afghanistan Document, 2009: 9). At the NATO Riga Summit in 2006, national caveats were handled as a trouble before the ISAF commands. Particularly, the United States, Canada, Britain and the Netherlands that have deployed forces in the most unsettled parts of Afghanistan, try to persuade other countries at least to aid them in the case of danger. In this context, some degree of flexibility has been permitted to the forces over the rules of engagement. For example, the French government reduced its caveats and allowed its forces to assist the other troops in the case of emergency in Kabul and the elsewhere. Furthermore, Germany, Italy and Spain have taken similar decisions in the case of assistance to the ISAF. However, Turkey has not changed its position and does not allow its forces to be used in combat (NATO in Afghanistan, 2009). The

issue of restrictions on the forces was also considered at the Bucharest Summit in 2008 with special criticism to Germany due to its excessive protection measures on its forces. The debate regarding the national caveats was further addressed in the European Parliament and the report issued says (European Parliament: "Stabilization of Afghanistan: challenges for the EU and the international community, June 2008): "that a major strengthening of political will and commitment is necessary, and that this should be followed up not only by a willingness to provide additional combat troops in the most difficult areas, unrestricted by national caveats." So, the national caveats on ISAF forces have posed difficulty over the success of the mission. Statement about these challenges also stated by Robert E. Hunter (2006), who is Guardian journalist:

The bad news is that the 40,000 foreign troops in Afghanistan are not enough. A few Afghan provinces, including those along parts of the border with Pakistan and its Taliban sanctuaries, have little or no ISAF presence and no provincial reconstruction teams. Abysmal air and land transport limit the ability to move fighting forces to where they are needed most. Several countries, including NATO allies, have imposed "national caveats" that limit where their troops can be deployed or the tasks they undertake. So, before any operation, commanders must determine which troops can take part and in what capacity, hampering both efficiency and effectiveness.

The main reason stated by the governments who are unwilling to raise troops is their reluctant populations. For instance, after the Bucharest Summit in 2008, Italy pledged for lifting its caveats and showed willingness to deploy more forces in the areas of intense conflict. The UK also promised for an additional 200 forces to its entire troop's level. Furthermore, France announced to send 720 combat troops (NATO Press Release (2008)049, April 3, 2008). Nevertheless, ISAF mission has been a concrete step to convey forward the Allies' message of declaring fight against terrorism by invoking Article 5 of the Washington treaty.

4.2.4 An Assessment of the ISAF in Afghanistan

Today, 60% of the country is considered relatively stable despite the challenges in the southern Afghanistan and the parts of the East to the ISAF mission due to the terrorist activities. However, the overall number of security incidents in the entire country has increased in recent years, the reason for that is the expansion of ISAF and ISAF led Afghan National Army operations to the areas formerly considered to under the auspices of extremists. According to data, in 2007, 70% of security incidents were confined to 10% of Afghanistan's 398 Districts. These districts contain less than 6% of the Afghan population (Progress in Afghanistan Document, Bucharest Summit, 2-4 April 2008: 4).

Increasing effectiveness of the Afghan National Army (ANA) is another positive development among the tasks that were assumed by NATO in Afghanistan. According to the report published after the Bucharest Summit in 2008, the ANA is becoming professional, well trained and equipped in providing the security of the country. Particularly, there is no an Afghan national army in 2002, but today it totals around 50.000 and every two weeks, 1.100 Afghan soldiers graduate from the Kabul Military Training Center. The role of ANA in leading the security operations has increased; particularly the ANA has had a crucial place in freeing Musa Qala from the Taliban extremists in 2007. The ANA currently has a leadership role in approximately 25% of the military operations in Afghanistan.

ISAF's operations also provide opportunities for reconstruction and development in the country. For instance, 4.000 km of roads have been built where there was only 50 km in 2003. Besides, access of the rural households to electricity has significantly increased. ISAF has completed 1.080 civil-military cooperation (CIMIC). The following statistics has been taken from the document issued after the

Bucharest Summit meeting (Progress in Afghanistan, 2008). By the end of 2007, 6.4 million children were in school, including 1.5 million girls. This is the highest number ever in the history of Afghanistan. In Kabul alone, there are five universities, comprising 14 faculties and 10,000 students. There were only about 900,000 children attending schools five years ago, and no girls, for whom education was illegal. Construction work of 1,816 schools commenced in 2007. Secondly, since 2002, 16 million vaccinations against childhood diseases have been administered, contributing to a 26% decline in infant mortality in the last five years. In 2007, there were about 103 hospitals and 878 health centers across Afghanistan. More than 80% of the population has access to health care, as opposed to 8% under the Taleban rule. 440 irrigation canals were built over the last five years (Progress in Afghanistan Report, 2008). Therefore, ISAF mission deployed in Afghanistan is the concrete example of NATO's transformation effort in the face of a non-state terrorist challenge by taking responsibility of a non-traditional warfare. Although the mission is faced with difficulties, it can be still considered that NATO has showed political determination and solidarity to assume such a risky operation against an unpredictable and hidden threat

4.2.5 Establishment of NATO Training Mission in Iraq (NTM-I)

In the Prague Summit Declaration on Iraq, NATO heads of states and government declared their full support for the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 1441¹² and pledged their assist in support of the efforts of the UN

¹² 1- Called for the immediate and complete disarmament of Iraq and its prohibited weapons.

2- Iraq must provide UNMOVIC and the IAEA full access to Iraqi facilities, individuals, means of transportation, and documents.

for the compliance with the UNSCCR 1441 (The Prague Summit Statement on Iraq, 21 November 2002). Although the Alliance stated their full support for the UN efforts and declared that it remained an Alliance policy, there was no discussion about NATO's involvement in Iraq at that time. Therefore, when the campaign against Iraq was launched, the NATO had no role in the decision or in its conduct.

Al-Qaeda continues to conduct terrorist attacks in Iraq besides other terrorist organizations that exploit the unstable situation in the country. Al-Qaeda's goal in Iraq is stated as the expulsion of occupation forces and the establishment of an Islamic state of Iraq. It is claimed that their intent is to achieve it through creation of instability and disorder in the country by using extreme and violent means. In addition to al-Qaeda's presence in Iraq, in February 2003, after Turkey's request to protect its borders from any possible attack that may come from Iraq referring the Article 4 of the Treaty¹³ and following year, with a request from Poland of supporting to its leadership in the coalition of international sector in Iraq, NATO began to evaluate involving in Iraq in order to stabilize country by defeating terrorists and improve Iraq's institutional capability by providing advising service to the Iraqi Ministry of Defense and the Iraqi Security Forces (Rick Lynch and Phillip Janzen, 2006: 30).

NTM-I has exposed similar challenges when political consensus taken at Istanbul Summit was hindered by political disparities over deployment and operational restrictions and caveats. At practical level, NATO also discusses its transformation process through dialogue with different sectors. In this regard, a security conference was organized on 4-5 June 2009 focusing on NATO's role for

3- States that the Security Council has repeatedly warned Iraq and that it will face serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations. (<http://www.state.gov/p/nea/rls/01fs/14906.htm>)

¹³ Article IV: The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened. (Washington Treaty).

the 21st century. As part of the activities marking the Alliance's 60th anniversary, prominent international security experts, politicians, think tankers, academics and media participated the conference and discussed the relevance in the new security environment at a time when the Alliance is involved on three different continents with stabilization and peacekeeping operations in Afghanistan and Kosovo, a training mission in Iraq, an anti-terrorist operation in the Mediterranean and a counter-piracy operation in the Gulf of Aden, off the Horn of Africa and Somalia.

For an assessment, NATO's current operations such as ISAF mission in Afghanistan, Operation Active Endeavour and NATO's Training Mission in Iraq are all clear demonstrations of the Alliance's transformation efforts in operational area after invoking Article 5 of its founding Treaty. In order to put the rhetorical statements into practice that condemn the attacks, give the messages of unity, solidarity and readiness against transnational terrorism and point out a new comprehensive approach against the threat, through the mentioned operations in different areas. However, it would be acceptable that such a transformation process will not be linear and easy-going, thus, the challenges that NATO faced particularly agreeing on the role of a mission and responsibilities of the troop contributing countries, the Alliance face certain disparities. On the other hand, in any case, NATO continue its operations and try to fulfill its responsibilities in this fight against terrorism and tops the issue high on its agenda as seen in the Bucharest and Strasbourg/Kehl Summit.

CHAPTER V

THE TRANSFORMATION OF NATO AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

5.1 NATO's Institutional Transformation Efforts After the Cold War

After the fall of the Berlin wall and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, there seemed to be less and less need for comprehensive integrated military structure directed against an expansionist Soviet threat. The need for transformation is also articulated at NATO headquarters. NATO General Secretary Lord Robertson stated in November 2003: "I put it bluntly, the overwhelming part of the Alliance's soldiers are useless for the kind of missions we are mounting today." (Brendon L. Wilson, 2003: 1).

The formal initiative for the transformation of the Alliance came with London Summit held in 1990 with the London Declaration "On a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance" in which it was recognized that NATO, an alliance for collective defense, must adopt and adjust to the new circumstances. Reduction in the armed forces by the European states was a response to the new security environment without a Soviet threat. This changed method of collective defense found expression in SACEUR's Mobile Counter Concentration Concept. It deals with the question of

'how the same tasks could be fulfilled with fewer troops'' which is considered as an alternative to forward defense strategy that has been obsolete with the reunification of Germany (Rob De Wijk, 1997: 13-46). So, in the initial years of the post-Cold War period, lowering the troop's level has been a concern in the Alliance besides the vitality a transatlantic Alliance debates.

Although institutional transformation of NATO goes back to before the September 11 attacks, its transformation in the face of a non-state terrorist challenge has been bolstered and fastened by those dramatic assaults in 2001. Since the Alliance has already started to transform and modernize its military and defense capabilities as a response to changing security environment in which risks and challenges are more likely to originate from non-traditional threats, creation of the Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTFs) and the launch of the Defense Capabilities Initiative (DCI) have been concrete examples of those steps. The CJTF concept was endorsed during the Brussels Summit in 1994 as a kind of solution to the need of more flexible and rapid deployable of forces at short notice in the new security environment. A CJTF is defined as "a deployable multidimensional, multi-service formation generated and tailored for specific contingency operations." (Antony Cragg, 1996: 7). In addition to the CJTFs, the operational gap between the United States and the European allies during the Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo operations revealed the requirement for military and institutional modernization. The issue of interoperability has been more serious in the contemporary security environment as a result of divergences, at least meaning to relations among the militaries emerged during Balkan crisis. With these considerations in mind, the United States suggested for a new defense capabilities with a focus on technology and interoperability (Robert Hunter, 2002: 4-7). In this respect, the Defense

Capabilities Initiative (DCI) was launched in 1999 focused on five crucial areas which are interoperability, deployability, mobility, sustainability, sustainability and effectiveness of the military forces of the Alliance as a response to the operational necessities in Balkans and the difficulties that NATO faced in that period (The Key to the Prague Summit; an agenda for change, 2002: 25-31). So, the DCI was launched in order to ensure NATO's readiness for every eventuality.

Before September 11, 2001, these two main initiatives were anchored as a response to emergence of non-traditional threats in the Euro-Atlantic zone. Mr. Ahmet Muhtar Gun who is the vice Director General in the department of Arms Control and Disarmament in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey states that although these conceptual initiatives and institutional establishments are not directly linked against a non-state terrorist threat previous to 9/11, they have been revised in this regard after the attacks on the U.S territory. As an example, the Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC) commenced aimed at improving the DCI in light of the events on September 11. So, the September 11 attacks have shaken NATO's strategic landscape. Since then, transformation has not been just an item on NATO's agenda; rather it has been a defining feature of the Alliance today. As Mr. Gun states that before 9/11, even there have been debates whether terrorism is an issue that can be carried out to the Alliance, however today, it is agreed on that NATO is the right place that terrorism will be discussed. After September 11, 2001, NATO executed its concepts and tools in the fight against terrorism mission. Mr. Gun illustrates the situation with a phrase that "You throw a stone to the Alliance and it spreads to thousands of circles." He expresses that NATO firstly began with a conceptual preparation period through its statements regarding the seriousness of threat of terrorism, Military Concept against Terrorism and Partnership Action Plan against

Terrorism, accordingly NATO started to put forward institutional initiatives in order to support this conceptual ground. In that continuing transformation process at institutional level in the face of non-state terrorist network, new establishments within NATO since 2001 have been analyzed.

Table 2: Five Capability Area agreed with DCI

<i>FIVE CAPABILITY AREAS</i>				
Deployability and Mobility (getting forces to the crisis quickly)	Sustainability and Logistics (supporting forces in the field)	Survivability (protecting forces)	Consultation, Command and Control (giving forces maximum awareness and control)	Effective Engagement (Improving forces' cutting edge capacity)

Figure: DCI web page

5.2 NATO's Institutional Transformation After the September 11 Attacks

5.2.1 Transformation at the Force Level

5.2.1.1 The Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC)

In June 2001, NATO underlined the deficiencies in DCI process and a NAC report stated: "Although progress has been made in certain areas, further efforts are required to achieve the necessary improvements." (Kugel, 2003: 23). In the same

year, the September 11 attacks occurred in the United States and then, Washington commenced the Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) on 7 October 2001 as a response to the attacks, which is not under NATO auspices. Operation Active Endeavor (OAE) launched in the western Mediterranean, and then extended to the whole Mediterranean is the first operation under Article 5. As Philip Gordon (2002: 36-38) pointed “the Afghanistan campaign revealed large capability gaps between the war fighting capabilities of the United States and its allies and reinforced the perception in some quarters in Washington that it is easier to conduct operations alone than allies who have little to offer militarily and who might hamper effective decision making.” This has brought the risk for NATO to be out of order debate once again after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. During the OEF, it became apparent that terrorism would be a serious threat for the Alliance in the future. At Prague Summit in 2002, the main topic has been terrorism. In the Summit NATO leaders agreed to develop a new Military Concept, a Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism and five CBRN defense initiatives. In addition, they decided to reorganized military command structure and establish a NATO Response Force. So, it led to launch of another round of initiatives on capability improvement. Hence, the Prague Capabilities Initiative (PCI) was set out at Prague Summit in 2002.

These commitments adopted during the summit in Prague have had more concrete initiatives from nations on specific areas. Under the Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC) member countries made firm political commitments to improve capabilities in more than 400 specific areas, covering the following eight fields:

- Chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear defense;
- Intelligence, surveillance and target acquisition;
- Air-to-ground surveillance;

- Command, control and communications;
- Combat effectiveness, including precision-guided munitions and suppression of enemy air defenses;
- Strategic air and sea lift;
- Air-to-air refueling;
- Deployable combat support and combat service support units. (Improving NATO's Capabilities Document, available online at <http://www.nato.int/issues/capabilities/evolution.html>).

Among these commitments, strategic air and sea lift capacities are crucial for the Alliance in order to deploy member states' forces and equipment quickly whatever and whenever necessary. This has been important for NATO since it started to undertake missions in distant places in Afghanistan and Iraq after the September 11 incidents. The Vice Director General Gun emphasizes that working on enhancing strategic air and sealift capabilities is of particular importance in the Alliance to transform its static forces to a more mobile character. At the 2004 Istanbul Summit, specific agreements on an enhanced set of measures were also concluded between countries in order to improve the Alliance's strategic lift capability (NATO issues: Strategic Lift, 27 November 2008). As a concrete example, a Strategic Airlift Capability (SAC), which has been operational by January 2008, was launched for the acquisition of necessary equipment with a Memorandum of Understanding signed between ten NATO countries and two partner countries (Finland and Sweden). As stated in NATO press release that "the SAC is a significant step forward in the ability of NATO nations to respond a critical shortfall in the Alliance capabilities" in its struggle against terrorism (Press Release 124 (2008), 1 January 2008). Furthermore, an accord on intelligence sharing has been another important input aiming at

strengthening NATO in the fight against terrorism. In this regard, the Alliance leaders consented upon to create a special “Counterterrorism Technology Unit” to lead and coordinate efforts for antiterrorist measures. Some of these measures are countering improvise explosive devices, detection, protection and defeat of Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) weapons, protect harbors and ships from explosives (Colonel Ömer Akdoğan, July 2009: 20).

5.2.1.2 The NATO Response Force (NRF)

The Creation of the NATO Response Force (NRF) is one of the results of NATO’s counter terrorism mission that is defined under Military Concept against Terrorism. As stated in Prague Summit declaration, NATO agreed on to create a NRF “consisting of technologically advanced, flexible, deployable, interoperable and sustainable force including land, sea and air elements ready to move quickly to wherever needed, as decided by the Council.” (The Prague summit Declaration, 2002: paragraph 4). The Ministers of Defense approved the concept in 2003. NRF is a rapidly deployable multinational unit, consisted of land, air, maritime and Special Forces from NATO member countries. At Riga Summit in 2006, it was declared that NRF has been fully operational with 25.000 troops. These forces are designed to be able to deploy after five days’ notice and preserve its presence for 30 days or longer if necessary. The NRF also consists of forces from European states; therefore, it also helps Europeans to develop more procurement policies. In this respect, According to Jeffry P. Bialos and Stuart L. Koehl (2005, 2), the Allies’ goals by the creation of the NRF can be articulated as:

- “Strengthened the bonds between the United States and its NATO Allies –nations that cannot and do not fight together are less likely to work cooperatively in other areas.
- Give NATO a capability to act rapidly and lethally in out of area conflicts, and in so doing, strengthening its raison d’être as a military alliance that can handle the 21st century security threat.
- Be a catalyst for focusing and promoting both the transformation of the Alliance’s military capabilities to meet these threats and improved interoperability between the multinational elements of the NRF.”

In the first goal, when we looked at the background of the formation of this initiative, the overwhelming focus by the United States and NATO on European capability acquisition, reflected in the Defense Capability Initiative (DCI) and the Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC), has resulted in more attention in *interoperability* between U.S. and allied forces. Indeed, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld proposed the NRF Concept; the need for such a force was embraced in the White House’s “U.S. National Security Strategy,” issued in September 2002:

NATO’s core mission—collective defense of the transatlantic alliance of democracies—remains, but NATO must develop new structures and capabilities to carry out that mission under new circumstances. *NATO must build a capability to field, at short notice, highly mobile, specially trained forces whenever they are needed to respond to a threat against any member of the alliance....* To achieve this, we must...ensure that the military forces of NATO nations have appropriate combat contributions to make in coalition warfare...take advantage of the technological opportunities and economies of scale in our defense spending to transform NATO military forces so that they dominate potential aggressors and diminish our vulnerabilities; streamline and increase the flexibility of command structures to meet new operational demands and the associated requirements of training, integrating, and experimenting with new force configurations; and maintain the ability to work and fight together as allies even as we take the necessary steps to transform and modernize our forces.

Jeffrey P. Bialos and Stuart L. Koehl (2005: 2) further state in their analysis regarding the NRF:

The central concept was to create, over time, an advanced, primarily European force for high-intensity conflicts that would catalyze force transformation and capability acquisition in Europe, promote Transatlantic force interoperability, and provide Europe with out-of-area capabilities to match its new strategic direction and reorient.

During the NRF leaders meeting at Allied Air Component Command Headquarters Ramstein, Germany, it was agreed on that “the NRF serves as an engine for the Alliance’s continuing transformation in order to adapt itself to the 21st century security needs, which is to require a more proactive alliance at great distances.” (SHAPE News, 4 May 2007). Since the NRF has a crucial place in the Alliance’s transformation process, making the Force more operable and improve its capabilities in the fight against terrorism have been an item on NATO agenda. In this regard, US General John Craddock (2007), Supreme Allied Commander Europe said:

The NATO Response Force is a ready, agile and flexible force, which I believe is crucial to the health and success of our Alliance in the coming years. As a key element of our NATO military culture, the NRF can enable the Alliance to better meet the threats to security and stability in the 21st century.

The NRF would assume the responsibility of operations ranging from humanitarian and crisis response missions to counter terrorism and embargo operations. As concrete examples, NRF undertook its first full-scale exercise with Steardfast Jaguar in Cape Verde in 2006. Furthermore, the components of NRF also took place in Athens Summer Olympics, supported elections in Afghanistan in 2004 and assisted to humanitarian relief in Pakistan in 2005 (NATO Briefing; Operational Capabilities, 2006). Expressed by NATO’s Supreme Allied Commander Europe General James Jones (NATO Response Force: How did it evolve, 2008):

NATO will no longer have the large, massed units that were necessary for the Cold War, but will have agile and capable forces at Graduated Readiness levels that will better prepare the Alliance to meet any threat that it is likely to face in the 21st century.

In NATO's transformation efforts which intensified after the September 11 attacks has also fueled the debates within NATO between the U.S. and European Allies regarding the willingness to take part in the Alliances' operations conducted against the non-state threats. As Vahid Erdem who is head of delegation of NATO Parliament Assembly (NATO PA) stated in his speech during the visit of young diplomats to the Parliament (2009) that there is a kind of divergence in NATO between the two sides of transatlantic regarding the response given to the non-traditional terrorist threat since Europeans are on the way to cut their budget after the dissolution of the Soviet Union with the conviction that main threat to their security is no longer exist. Tomur Bayer who is Ambassador and the Director General of International Security Affairs in the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs also argues that since it was difficult for European countries to tell their publics, changing security conditions require more proactive involvement, because of their assumption of the relative relaxation after the end of the Cold War. Since the structure, operational doctrine, equipment and training of most European force structures is mainly based on heavy ground forces within the Cold War paradigm, out of area issue carried in the NRF concept has been a new area of operation for many European Allies. In contrast, due to its distant geography and historical reasons, the United States has already been involved in different continents and deployed its forces to distant places. However, this stance adopted by NATO was reverted to a certain extent because of terrorist attacks in Madrid, London and Istanbul that occurred between the years of 2003-2004 at the heart of Europe. In this framework,

NRF has become a tool that makes the Alliance more interoperable with its all parts comprising the U.S and the EU sides. Hence, the capabilities gap between the two sides of the transatlantic, which became more apparent after the September 11 operations, has been another motive in the creation of the NRF.

The large, aging, immobile force structure of the European defense structure inherited from the Cold War era considered as a critical question whether and to what extent the NRF will achieve its goal of enhancing European acquisition of capabilities necessary to respond the threats in the new security environment. The answer for that question is assessed in Biasol and Koehl's paper (2005: 17) stating, "there is no long-term "spiral road map". In other words, "the NRF certification process is likely to follow armaments capability development and innovation rather than catalyze it. It is also pointed out "there is a growing disjunction between the operational and technological aspects of the NRF, without any firm roadmap for technological insertion or any mechanism to incentivize technology investment and military transformation." (Biosel&Koehl, 2005: 18). Subsequently, it is meant that under these circumstances of lack of technology driven road map makes it difficult for the NRF concept to reach a certain success. Another challenge in this respect is the cost management of the NRF. It requires both a strong political commitment and strong national economies in order to implement appropriate arrangements on the NRF and decide what to do with outdated equipment and infrastructure (NRF website: Allied Command Operations). Nevertheless, the NRF has opened a way to shift the European mindset from fixed, stationary defense – traditional approach of against the threat of Soviet invasion- to 21st century approach to security in which threats may arise from anywhere and not only from states but also from non-state actors, like terrorist organizations.

5.2.2 Transformation at the Command Level

Namely “old NATO” referred to its heavy integrated military command structure had been built to deal with threat posed by the former Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. Having understood that fundamentally changed security landscape with multi-centric and transnational challenges, NATO felt the need to review its concepts as well as its tools at use. So, although NATO’s transformation efforts on the basis of military command structure can be traced back to the London Declaration of 1990 when the heads of states and governments called for an internal adaptation process in the Alliance and the 1991 Strategic Concept that was adopted reflecting NATO’s broad approach to security, It was in the aftermath of 9/11 attacks that NATO moved terrorism to the top among other perceived threats to the security of the Allies and revised its command structure. In this regard, 9/11 brought a reshaping, not only of the Alliance’s defense policies but also of its command structure. A unanimous decision was taken at the Prague Summit held in 2002, adopting a “multifaceted and comprehensive response to combat terrorism.” (The Prague Summit Declaration, 2002). Here, NATO focused on three broad areas of transformation: New Capabilities, new members and new relationships. According to the leaders, “NATO can not pass this test without a new military command structure.” (Brick T. Miller; 2003: 9). For that reason Miller (2003: 9) states that, NATO must transform its military command structure in order to:

- “Adapt to the changing nature of strategic requirements and threats
- Gain advantages from information technology growth

- Increase its effectiveness and efficiency in managing the deployment of and sustainment of its forces across the spectrum of conflict.

Interoperability, which is closely related to the operational readiness, again has been the bedrock of this military command transformation process of the Alliance. In this regard, firstly, NATO command and control structure has been revised when the Military Committee of the Alliance has proposed a new military command structure to the Defense ministers in 1997. According to the new structure, present 65 headquarters were reduced to 20. The goal was to improve effectiveness and flexibility of the Alliance in the changing security environment. The current command structure at that period is primarily composed of a Military Committee as the highest military authority in NATO, working under the North Atlantic Council (NAC), the Defense Planning Committee (DPC) and the Nuclear Planning Group (NPC). The MC mainly assists the development of strategic concepts and assessment papers. International Military Staff is another leg in that structure that is responsible for planning, assessing and recommending policy for the consideration of the MC and ensures that the decisions of the MC are implemented then. Two strategic commands, the Allied Command Europe (ACE) and the Allied Command Atlantic (ACLANT), serve in that military structure. The ACE located at Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) at Mons, Belgium. ACLANT with headquarters located in Norfolk, USA. In addition to these two strategic commands, there are other regional level commands and staffs which are Allied Forces North Europe (AFNORTH), Allied Forces South Europe (AFSOUTH), Regional headquarters Eastern Atlantic (RHQ EASTLAND); Regional headquarters Western Atlantic (RHQ WESTLAND), Regional Headquarters, Southern Atlantic (RHQ SOUTHLAND) (Klaus Naumann, 1999: 57-60). The new mission is designed as

mission oriented with militarily effective and multi-capable structure. Under this command structure with more integrated and lessened in size, NATO aimed at undertaking certain tasks and responsibilities such as peace support operations and counter proliferation. The next stage of transformation at NATO command structure has been after the September 11 attacks in 2001. Taking it into consideration, it could be seen how a non-traditional, non-state centric terrorist threat created the second stimulus for the transformation of a global security organization. Then, after the terrorist incidents on the U.S. soil, operations in Afghanistan, Iraq and the Eastern Mediterranean have strengthened this motivation further.

5.2.2.1 The New Command Structure

During the Prague Summit in 2002, the decision to create a new command structure was agreed. Again, interoperability, meaning of preparing and operating together, has become the primary objective of this military transformation (Prague Summit Declaration, 2002). In this framework, the new structure is split into two at strategic level: one strategic command is responsible for operations and the other is taking responsibility of transformation. These two commands are “Allied Command Operation” and “Allied Command Transformation”.

Allied Command for Operations (ACO) has been established replacing the Former Allied Command Europe. The Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) and its staff at Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) based in Belgium have been tasked to be responsible for the new command. This includes an approximately 40% reduction in numbers of headquarters, besides a 70% reduction in the previous command structure after the end of the Cold War era. Reducing the force level with the aim of maximizing the effectiveness and flexibility

of forces has become a necessity in order to fight against easy moving, unpredictable and irrational threats.

Secondly, the most viable manifestation of NATO's transformation efforts at institutional level is the creation of the Allied Command Transformation. The Allied Command Transformation (ACT), in Norfolk, USA, replaced the Allied Command Atlantic (ACLANT), but has an entirely different purpose, structure and rationale. Its aim is to promote Alliance's transformation and operational ability. Its long term objective is defined as "to foster change, evolution and development, providing continual improvement and advancement." (International Military Staff, 2003). Its vision statement declares that "ACT will be NATO's leading agent of change; enabling, facilitating and advocating continuous improvement of military capabilities to enhance the military interoperability, relevance and effectiveness of the Alliance." (NATO Web site: ACT Vision Statement). Its strategic objectives are: "to provide support to NATO missions and operations, to lead NATO military transformation, to improve relationship, interaction and practical cooperation with partners, nations and international organizations." (NATO Topics: NATO Command Structure). ACT mainly focuses on education and training, concept development, comprehensive approach, experimentation, research and technology; and through working with NATO Response Force, it aims to increase Alliance effectiveness in response to new security challenges, primarily the threat of terrorism that has primacy on NATO's security agenda. In other words, "ACT will shape the future of combined and joint operations. It will identify new concepts, and bring them to maturity. It will then turn these transformational concepts into reality; a reality shared by the entire NATO Alliance," said former NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson at the ceremony of ACT (NATO Update: New NATO transformation Command Established, 18 June

2003). Similarly, Robertson said, “ACT is, in a very real sense, both the symbol of the new NATO, and the architect that will shape its future. It will play an invaluable role in ensuring that the Atlantic Alliance can continue to defend the security and interests of its members against threats and challenges, which we cannot even imagine today. ACT is a symbol of this Alliance’s confident embrace of the future and its challenges.” (NATO Speech: by the Secretary General of NATO, Lord Robertson at the ceremony to the Commission of the New Allied Command Transformation, Norfolk, 18 June 2003).

On the other hand, this transformation process at institutional level carries certain critical points. First, it is claimed that the process is focusing on expeditionary capabilities. Although NATO created high readiness deployable headquarters and Response Force as the examples of improvement in institutional area, still an overwhelming majority of European forces remain non-deployable approximately two million soldiers. Secondly, in order to continue to receive their publics’ support, NATO’s end state is crucial in that transformation process. Thirdly, stated in the previous parts, capabilities gap still exists between the European and the United States. Therefore, closing the gap may be expensive and can have institutional difficulties to implement at a short notice. Planning budgetary terms in order to allocate resources to transformation efforts is another issue. Overall, NATO needs to accept the risks in any case in management of the transformation efforts within the Alliance (Brendon L. Wilson, 2003: 4-5).

As summarized in the NATO issues: the NATO’s Command Structure: the Old and the New (June 2003):

The new NATO Command Structure will in fact be undergoing a metamorphosis, which involves major structural changes of headquarters, overall reduction in the number of HQs, addition of transformation tasks,

fundamental redistribution of functions and substantial increases in robustness, all of which should be finished within three years from now.

5.2.3 Transformation at the Structural Level

NATO's transformation efforts with regard to fight against terrorism mission are not limited to force and command levels. There are concrete steps taken at structural side in order to strengthen the capability of the Alliance in the face of a non-state terrorist challenge. Intelligence draws considerable attention since capable intelligence systems logistically support actions. So, establishment of a Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit (TTIU), which is specifically devoted to terrorism, is an important development in the transformation process of the Alliance. In addition to the TTIU, NATO-Russia Council has gained a new dimension after the September 11 attacks by adopting terrorism and intelligence sharing as an item on their agenda. Thus, terrorism with its transnationalized and immune from state support form has altered the NATO's approach to terrorism from a domestic issue to global threat at an important meeting forum.

5.2.3.1 Establishment of Center of Excellence Defense against Terrorism (COE DaT)

At 2002 Prague Summit, transformation of the NATO command structure was the main concern, and it was stated that the "new NATO command arrangements will be supported by a network of Centers of Excellence." (The Prague Summit Declaration, 2002). By definition, a Center of Excellence is "nationally or multinationally sponsored entity which offers recognized expertise and experience to the benefit of the Alliance, especially in support of transformation." (COE DaT

vision, July 2009). This Center provides opportunities to enhance training, improve interoperability and capabilities, assist in doctrine development, test and validate concepts.

With regard to the threat of terrorism, Turkey, as one of the nations that has exposed to terrorism for years, declared her intention to be the host nation of the Center of Excellence Defense against Terrorism. Then, COE DaT was inaugurated on 28 June 2005. According to its mission statement (COE DaT website, July 2009), the Center assumes:

- To provide subject matter expertise on the full spectrum of terrorism,
- To provide DAT training and education at the strategic and operational level,
- To assist ACT in testing and validating terrorism-related NATO concepts through experimentation,
- To assist in doctrine development,
- To contribute to NATO standardization and improve capabilities and interoperability.

In terms of organizational structure, COE DaT is headed by a military Director with the advisory bodies of the Deputy Director, Legal Advisor and Political Advisor. The Academic Board and Council of Science of the Center meet when required, and the Director chairs them. The Chief of Education and Training directs the academic staff. In a briefing given in Romania on 25-26 October 2007 by Colonel Mete Tahmisoglu who is working at the COE DAT, it is stated that this center acts as an advisory body to the NATO's Headquarter Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (HQ SACT) on terrorism related topics and it coordinates all its activities with this HQ (Bucharest, 2007). Tahmisoglu (2007) also mentioned that COE DAT has relations with other international organizations extending from China to the US, from Israel to Germany. Furthermore, instructors give lectures at the Center and instructors from other countries are invited to give conferences, seminars and lectures. So, the Center is considered to "become NATO's

transformation expert for Defense against Terrorism”, and issues monthly terrorism reports covering a range of countries and regions from Afghanistan, Iraq to Middle East, Africa, Europe, Asia and Americas. In the briefing, information about the main departments and branches of the center is provided under two headings, transformation department and the Education and Training Department. The main missions of Transformation Department are to assist in concept and doctrine development, test and validate concept and support the analysis. It mainly operates as a tool in the transformation period of NATO through its missions as listed above. The activities of the education and training department include courses, workshops, conferences and symposia. Some of the activities of the Center are courses on “Defense against Suicide Bombing”, “Definition, Dimension and Categories of Terrorism”, “Legal Aspects of Countering Terrorism”, “Terrorism and Media”, and “Efficient Crisis Management to Mitigate the Effects of Terrorist Activities”. As a result of my research at the COE DAT where I could have opportunity to visit and interview with some of its personnel, I learned that the Center is not directly a result of NATO’s transformation in the face of a terrorist threat, rather it is a institutionalized tool that helps NATO to transform itself in the area of terrorism through expertise.

5.2.3.2 Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit (TTIU)

During 2004 Istanbul Summit, NATO leaders also agreed to boost the Alliance's anti-terrorism efforts through improving intelligence sharing and to develop new, high technology defenses against terrorist attacks. In this regard, a Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit at NATO Headquarters in Brussels was set up which analyzes general terrorist threats, as well as those that are more specifically

targeted at NATO. TTIU, which evolved into a permanent unit replacing a temporary cell, established just immediately after the September 11 attacks, has become NATO HQ's center of expertise on terrorism. TTIU provides regular terrorism related intelligence reports to NATO (NATO News: Heads of State and Government strengthen NATO's anti-terrorism efforts, 2004).

Intelligence was deemed as one of the priority areas of Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism (PAP-T) which has been another important step in NATO's more active involvement in the fight against terrorism (Political Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace, 2009).

5.2.3.3 Struggle Against Terrorism As a Task For the NATO-Russia Council (NRC)

In 1997 NATO and Russia signed the NATO-Russia Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security, which provided the formal basis for NATO-Russia relations and led to the development of a bilateral program of consultation and cooperation in specific areas under the Permanent Joint Council¹⁴. In 2002, with the effects of the September 11 attacks, the relationship was given a new impetus and substance with the signature of the Rome Declaration on "NATO-Russia" relations: A New Quality" which established the NATO-Russia Council. At that time as a result of the lessons learned from the September 11 assaults, the NRC leaders agreed to enhance their cooperation in areas of common interest and to take actions against common threats and risks to their countries' security with particular emphasis to terrorism. In this period, the NRC has developed a number of practical cooperation projects including struggle against terrorism. (NRC Practical Cooperation Fact Sheet,

¹⁴ NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC) was created as a forum for regular consultation on security issues of common concern.

2 April 2008, 1) Then, in December 2004, the NRC Foreign Ministers approved a “NRC Action Plan on Terrorism”, demonstrating the effect of terrorism threat on the NRC security agenda. This Plan not only condemns terrorism but also suggests concrete cooperation areas between NATO and Russia. NATO-Russia Action Plan on Terrorism (9 December 2004) says:

We are encouraged by the progress that has been made in developing NRC Co operation in the fight against terrorism, and are determined that the Council can and should make an even more direct and substantial contribution to this global struggle, in co operation, as appropriate, with partners. NRC co-operation against the terrorist threat should be pragmatic and goal-oriented, complementing and enhancing efforts underway in other for a.

Following, a joint pre-deployment has been underway to support Operation Active Endeavour, NATO’s maritime counter terrorist operation in the Mediterranean. Russian ships were deployed in the following year. This has been another development in institutional transformation efforts by establishing a partnership with the successor of the former Soviet Union, namely the Russian Federation in the face against a non-state terrorist threat. Terrorism has been a crucial area of concern in the NRC work program in the areas of cooperation in Afghanistan, land transit in support of ISAF, initiatives were launched in defense aspects of combating terrorism and finally working programs are taking place on confronting new security challenges, mainly terrorism through scientific cooperation within the framework of the Committee on Science for Peace and Security (SPS). The SPS Committee, established in 2006, supports NATO in civil science and innovation. It includes programs directly funded by NATO. The primary motive has been the rapidly changing security environment. Studying terrorism scientifically is another field for SPS, as Jean François BUREAU, assistant Secretary General in Public Diplomacy Division and Chairman of the SPS Committee said in a statement in

NATO Head Quarter “the scientific study of terrorism must be one of NATO’s priorities.” (Speech by J. F. Bureau, Brussels, 24 April 2009).

Although the NRC meetings were suspended after the crisis in Georgia in August 2008¹⁵, a meeting of the NRC at the level of foreign ministers was held in Corfu/Greece on 27 June 2009. In a move that prevail over the final break with “no business as usual” policy after the Georgian war, the foreign ministers from NATO and Russian sides agreed in Corfu to resume formal cooperation again on a range of security threats including greater cooperation on Afghanistan, counter-terrorism and nuclear proliferation (NATO and Russia to Resume Military Ties, Financial Times, 29 June 2009). It is proved that terrorism has been among one of the priority areas for NRC, which is an institution that brings together NATO and Russia beyond the Cold war mindset. Therefore, terrorism has been a drive behind NATO’s transformation efforts with regard to the Alliance’s efforts to develop its relations further in Euro-Atlantic zone besides Central and Eastern European countries.

¹⁵ During the night of 7 to 8 August 2008, Georgia launched a large-scale military attack against the self-proclaimed Republic of South Ossetia. The following day, Russia reacted by deploying combat troops in South Ossetia and launching bombing raids into Georgia proper. Russian and Ossetian troops clashed with Georgians. On 26 August 2008 Russia recognized the independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In the changing international environment, state centric approaches to security are not sufficient to express increasing role of non-state actors with special reference to terrorist organizations. Transnationalization of insecurity originating from global terrorist networks has influenced the security understanding of states and international institutions to a certain extent. Transnational terrorist organizations that can be evaluated under “new terrorism” concept with more lethal, indiscriminate, irrational and fundamentalist character have found concrete expression with the September 11 terrorist attacks. The attacks demonstrated that even superpowers are vulnerable to terrorism assaults. Terrorism as a violent non-state actor with its transnational feature has been a drive motive for states and main international organizations to revise their policies regarding terrorism since the September 11. So, the prospects of change in international security with the influence of transnational terrorism are become prominent since the September 11 attacks.

In the thesis, it is argued that September 11 has been a milestone for NATO which is an organization originally established against the Soviet Union and its

expansionism. Its basic principles are collective security and indivisibility of security by providing a security umbrella to its members under the Article 5 obligation of its founding treaty. Article 5 clause extends a comprehensive security by agreeing on that “an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all”. Throughout the research, it is found out that since 2001, NATO is convinced that terrorism is the major threat to the security of the Alliance and almost every step taken within NATO has been in the way of fighting against terrorism. So, in this thesis, transnational terrorism is the focus point. Subsequently, NATO as the most viable security organization is my test case in order to illustrate the effect of a transnational non-state actor on a state centric organization’s transformation. To this end, it is searched through NATO’s transformation in the fight against a non-state terrorist challenge at three levels, which are rhetorical, operational and institutional level.

At rhetorical level, as a result of the search on NATO’s press releases, statements, Summit declarations and news related to terrorism issues, it is concluded that NATO articulates terrorism differently after the September 11 attacks. In this context, in NATO documents, there are not even references to terrorism between the years of 1949 and 1990 except 1982 Bonn Conference Document. Between the years of 1990 and 1999, two Strategic Concepts were adopted that identify NATO’s role and missions with regard contemporary security threats to the Allies. Then, after the September 11, 2001, NATO’s approach to terrorism has changed dramatically, almost every act taken in this direction and in the name of fight against terrorism. Terrorism has moved top on NATO’s agenda. New concepts particularly devoted to terrorism threat were adopted including Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism (PAP-T) and Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism. These are indicators of

NATO's transformation in the face of non-state terrorist challenge at the rhetorical level.

At the practical and operational levels, the focus has been on NATO's operational contributions to the fight by revising again its capabilities and strategies in accordance with its new mission. In this regard, NATO commenced operations in the Mediterranean, Afghanistan and Iraq. Also, the Alliance involved in anti-terrorist operations in its continuing operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. These operations launched after 2001 against the contemporary security threats with main focus on terrorism has also been crucial since the capabilities gap between two sides of the transatlantic has been more prominent. This situation led within the Alliance to the launch of new initiatives in order to close the gap as possible.

Finally in the institutional spectrum, NATO's transformation efforts in the face of terrorist threat were into two sections. For the transformation at force level, the search was on the change in the Alliance after the Prague Summit and agreement on the Prague Capabilities Commitment, then the creation of the NATO Response Force which reflects the need for a more mobile, flexible and deployable force different from its static conventional forces. Secondly, at the command level, NATO's new command structure revised firstly in 1997 and then after 2001 was focused. In the latter, the Alliance aimed at having a further effective command structure. For that purpose, two strategic commands were replaced with the Allied Command Operations which is responsible for all operations assumed by the Alliance and the Allied Command Transformation which is responsible for education and training, concept development activities of the Alliance. Through the new arrangements, NATO has had a reduced level of commands compare to the previous one. In addition to the command structure, NATO transformation efforts could be

seen in other institutional areas such as establishment of Center of Excellences in order to provide guidance to the Alliance in its fight against terrorism mission. One of them, namely COE-DAT located in Ankara

In general, the research has fundamentally aimed to provide a detailed analysis of NATO's new mission after 2001 and its transformation efforts in this regard. It is known that NATO started its transformation process after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. However, in this thesis, it is focused on this transformation process directly related to the anti-terrorism campaign. Therefore, the thesis aims at contributing to the role of a non-state terrorist challenge having of more lethal, indiscriminate, fundamentalist and independent character on the transformation of a state centric organization. NATO established against a state centric threat namely the Soviet Union and its expansionism; hence its institutional and force characters were shaped in traditional sense consisting of huge conventional forces and nuclear stockpiles; however, 9/11 has shaken the strategic landscape of the Alliance by showing the static force and command structure of NATO is unable to respond the terrorism threat effectively. Then, the Alliance fastened its transformation process, which indeed started after the end of the Cold War and directed it to the fight against terrorism mission. Nevertheless, it was manifested in the thesis; this is not a linear and easygoing process for the Alliance. the Leaders did not come together and took the decisions at one night. There have been serious considerations raised by some states particularly by the EU member of the Alliance in terms of force contributions as mentioned under the ISAF content. So, NATO faced certain limitations especially arising from capability gap between the two sides of the Atlantic and the countries' ongoing difference in the approach towards the response given to the terrorism threat. On the other hand, this thesis study tries to demonstrate how a non-state

terrorist challenge could have a crucial impact on the transformation of a state centric security organization at three levels of rhetorical, operational and institutional.

Throughout the research process, it could be seen that NATO is really transforming in the face of transnational terrorism, which has a non-state character different from traditional terrorism. At the same time, it is a fact that NATO is a highly institutionalized body and has a consensus based decision-making procedure, which makes transformation efforts slowdown. Discussing the success of NATO can be analyzed well in long term since the Alliance intensified its transformation initiatives since 2001. NATO is now undertaking counter-terrorism missions in various parts of the world from Afghanistan to the Mediterranean from Iraq to the Balkans. However, just sticking the success of the Alliance in this transformation process to the success of the operation assumed in Afghanistan would be misjudgment. Although it can not be neglected that NATO is facing difficulties in Afghanistan both in itself related to the Allies' participation and in the mentioned country where Taleban groups are empowering in Afghanistan-Pakistan border, NATO is gaining certain success in its mission in the fight against terrorism such as a more strengthened consensus on the seriousness of the terrorism threat and develop new institutional and practical capabilities including the establishment of the NATO Response Force, creation of new units dedicated to intelligence collection on terrorism. The question of whether NATO will defeat terrorism has an open-ended answer because terrorists cannot be detected easily and can emerge anywhere in the world at any time in any place.

The second issue that may be raised as a result of this research is why NATO did not take a stance and paced up its transformation efforts before the September 11 attacks occurred. In other words, is it really necessary to be cracked down in order to

take concrete actions? Before the September 11 attacks, terrorism was on the agenda of NATO since 1991, but did not constitute a top priority and the Alliance did not take such a serious, concrete and decisive stance against terrorism threat. After the terrorist scourge, there is not even a consensus on the definition of terrorism, the Alliance agreed on invoking the Article 5 of the Washington Treaty by accepting an attack against one as an attack against all. NATO's new attitude to terrorism after the September 11 attacks on the U.S soil proved a crucial fact that even a super power is not immune from terrorism and can expose to terrorism threat despite of its very powerful military forces, huge conventional weaponry, nuclear stockpiles and sophisticated military technology. So, those attacks on the U.S. territory have become a turning point in the history of Alliance by manifesting that terrorists can organize assaults even in distance places and against super powers. At the same time, from a critical point of view, it could be claimed that the U.S. approach to the threat has very much influenced the Alliance's stance and NATO did not give such a reaction to the other terrorist incidents on its members' soil, like the case of Turkey. Therefore, at that point, the U.S. position in the Alliance reinforced other member states adapting the fight against terrorism mission.

On the other hand, NATO began its transformation process after the end of Cold War era when the Alliance faced new risks and threats including ethnic clashes, proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, terrorism and environmental degradation. However, the September 11 attacks have been the guidance of transformation route leading the Alliance specifically developed concepts, policies and tools on terrorism. It could be claimed that before hit by a transnational terrorist network, NATO was not aware of how a non-state terrorist challenge could be. The

Alliance was still under the influence of the Cold War mindset. From NATO case, the conclusion that these institutions are learning through living could be drawn.

NATO was created after the Second World War against Soviet Union and its expansionist policies. NATO countries experienced Soviet threat and suffered from its invasions in the European theatre. Then, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the Alliance lost its main enemy and new debates on the necessity of NATO raised. Following 2001, the Allies again understood that terrorism is becoming increasingly threatening on their security and they have to take urgent action. In this regard, NATO identified its new enemy as terrorism. As a result of the research, it might be resulted in that before the September 11 attacks, NATO did not take into consideration terrorism seriously; the Alliance reacted to terrorism threat after it seriously damaged one of its members, particularly the leading power of the organization. Therefore, NATO seems to learn to react when the threat concretely damaged its members' security, which led to reach a consensus among the Allies to response the threat as soon as possible.

For a third point, what could be NATO's motivation behind this transformation? As a result of the thesis study, it could be evaluated that firstly, fear of increasing lethality and indiscriminateness of terrorism combined with the possible use of weapons of mass destruction led NATO to adopt a more active stance against the threat. It can also be argued that terrorism has not created such kind of a fear before the September 11; rather it was considered in domestic realms of nations. The September 11 attacks and following London, Madrid and Istanbul bombings between 2004 and 2006 demonstrated that non-state actors could hit NATO members; even they are equipped with advanced armaments and technology. Besides, those attacks which were perpetrated in public areas such as in the

underground railway, bank and religious places, deeply affected public by causing incredible fear, suspicion and anxiety. Secondly, the attacks occurred on the territory of the super power, which is also leading country of NATO. Therefore, the U.S. decision to start “war on terrorism” has altered other countries’ stance. It is remembered that U.S. draw a line between the countries that will be either on their side or the enemy’s side. On the other hand, as stated in the thesis, the U.S. took the decision of interference in Afghanistan without a decision or resolution adopted by NATO or the UN. The U.S. forces intervened Afghanistan by a U.S. led coalition namely “coalition of the willing” not through consensus based NATO operation. At this stage, it seemed that NATO faced the risk of being excluded in the action taken against transnational terrorism. This would further embitter the debates on NATO’s necessity and its future role after the Cold War. So, it could be assessed that NATO did not want to remain on the periphery in the fight against terrorism mission, which has been brought on the top of U.S. national security agenda. Furthermore, the U.S. is considered as the leading country of the organization in terms of financial and burden sharing concerns within the Alliance, it makes extensive contributions to the Alliance operations including money and forces, even its personnel can take place in remote and challenging areas. Since 1949, the United States has committed itself to defending its European allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), regarding any attack on those countries as an attack on itself. As quoted from the Congressional Budget Office of the U.S (Congressional Budget Office, August 2001):

Over the past 50 years, the United States has maintained as many as 300,000 military personnel in Europe and has consistently devoted more of its gross domestic product (GDP) to defense than have most of its allies. With the end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet threat, the United States cut its force presence in Europe to about 100,000 and sharply reduced its defense

budget. But the European allies have also cut their defense spending over the past decade, leaving the United States still bearing the largest financial burden among the NATO allies.

Therefore, it could be commented that the U.S. has a powerful voice in the Alliance and may have opportunities to channel certain decisions.

For the final word, recent years have witnessed important changes in the domain and nature of conflict around the world, notably as a result of the end of the Cold War polarization between the two blocs. Research data as also stated in the thesis indicate that with the conclusion of the Cold War there has been marked a decline in particularly conflict between states. At the same time, while interstate conflict has decreased, the character of conflict has undergone a significant shift. Non-state actors become increasingly involved in conflicts. So, this move away from state focused conflicts towards a more complex type of conflict involving states and non-state actors lead to research one dimension of this change in international system by studying the effect of transnational terrorism on transformation of a state centric international institution. Therefore this thesis tried to find out how an international security and defense organization can transform in the face of a non-state terrorist challenge. Since my research focused on institutional transformation, further research area could be on state transformation in the face of transnational terrorism. This point of view can provide new ideas and findings on how a non-state transnational terrorist challenge infiltrated into international security politics and altered states' and defense institutions' threat perception.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allied Joint Force Command Naples. 2005. "NATO's Training Mission-Iraq." Available at http://www.afsouth.nato.int/JFCN_Missions/NTM-I/Factsheets/NTM-I.htm>.
- Aly, Abdel Monem Said and Mohamed Kadr Said. September 30, 2002. "NATO & South Mediterranean in search of a concert for moderation, Cooperation and Peace," *International Seminar: From Dialogue to Partnership, Security in the Mediterranean and NATO: Future Prospects*, 1-22.
- Arquilla, John, David Ronfeldt, Michele Zanini. 1999. "Networks, Netwars, and Information Age Terrorism" In Ian O. Lesser, Bruce Hoffman, John Arquilla, David Ronfeldt, Michele Zanini, Brian Michael Jenkins, eds, *Countering the New Terrorism*, 39-84. Available at http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR989/MR989.chap3.pdf>.
- Art, Robert J. Autumn 1998. "Creating a Disaster: NATO's Open Door policy," *Political Science Quarterly* 113(3): 383-403.
- Aybet, Gülnur. March/May 1999. "NATO's New Missions," *Perceptions*, 4(1): 1-7.
- BBC News. August 3, 2009. "Profile: NATO." Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/country_profiles/1549072.stm>.
- Bebler, Anton. March/May 2004. "NATO and Transnational Terrorism," *Perceptions* 9:159-175.

- Bialos, Jeffry P. and Koehl, Stuart. September 2005. "NATO Response Force: Facilitating Coalition Warfare through Technology Transfer and Information Sharing," *Report of a study conducted by the Center for Transatlantic Relations, Center for Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University*, 1-114.
- Bilgin, Pinar. 2005. *Regional Security in the Middle East: A Critical Perspective*. Great Britain: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Boczek, Boleslaw A. 1995. "NATO and the former Warsaw Pact countries." In S Victor Papacosma and Mary Ann Heiss, eds, *NATO in the Post Cold War Era: Does it have a Future*. London: Macmillan Press, 204-243.
- Brown, Cody. Fall/Winter 2007. "The New Terrorism Debate," *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations* 6 (3&4): 28-43.
- Brussels's Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. May 29-30, 1989. Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c890530a.htm>>.
- Bucharest Summit Declaration. April 2-4, 2008. "Progress in Afghanistan Document." 1-24. Available online at http://www.nato.int/ISAF/docu/epub/pdf/progress_afghanistan.pdf>.
- Buzan, Barry. 1997. Rethinking Security After the Cold War," *Cooperation and Conflict* 32 (1): 5-28.
- Center of Excellence Defense against Terrorism. August 13, 2009. "TMMM vision." Available at <http://www.coedat.nato.int/index.htm>>:
- Cerny, G. Philip. 2005. "Terrorism and the New Security Dilemma," *Naval War College Review* 58 (1): 10-33.
- Cesaretti, Robert. Autumn 2005. "Combating Terrorism in the Mediterranean," *NATO Review*.
- Cha, Victor D. May 2000. "Globalization and the Study of International Security," *Journal of Peace Research* 37(3): 391-403.

- Cilluffo, Frank. Winter 2004-2005. "Fighting Terrorism," *NATO Review*, 1-12.
- Ciuta, Felix. April 2002. "The End(s) of NATO: Security, Strategic Action and Narrative Transformation," *Contemporary Security Policy* 23(1): 35-62.
- Cottey, Andrew. 2002. "September 11th 2001 One Year On: A New Era in World Politics?," *Alternatives Journal*. Available at <http://www.alternativesjournal.net>>.
- Cragg, Antony. 1996. "The Combined Joint Task Force Concepts: a key component of the Alliance adaptation," *NATO Review* 44(4): 7-10.
- Devetak, Richard. 2005. "Violence, Order and Terror." In Alex J. Bellamy, eds., *International Society and its Critics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 229-246.
- Duffield, John S. Winter 1994-1995. "NATO's Functions After the Cold War," *Political Science Quarterly* 109(5): 763-787.
- Edited by. Mustafa Aydın and Kostas Infantis. 2006. *International Security Today: Understanding Change and Debating Strategy*. Ankara: SAM papers.
- Edited by Paul Williams. 2008. *Security Studies: an Introduction*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Ek, Carl. January 24, 2007. "NATO's Prague Capabilities Commitment," *CRS Report for Congress*, 1-6.
- "ESDP and NATO: Competitors or Companions." Available at http://rand.org/natsec_area/products/MR1463.html>.
- "EU-NATO: The Framework of Permanent Relations and Berlin Plus document." Available at <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/03-11-11%20Berlin%20Plus%20press%20note%20BL.pdf>>.
- European Parliament. June 2008. "Stabilization of Afghanistan: Challenges for the EU and International Community," Report (2007/2208(INI) of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Available at

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/DownloadSP.do?id=15295&num_rep=7477&language=en>.

Falk, Richard. 2005. "(Re)imagining the Governance of Globalization." In Alex J. Bellamy eds., *International Society and its Critics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 195-208.

"First Annual Report to the President and the Congress of the Advisory Panel to assess domestic response capabilities for terrorism involving Weapons of Mass Destruction." Available at <http://www.rand.org/nsrd/terrpanel/terror.pdf>>.

Gallis, Paul. May 5, 2003. "NATO's Decision Making Procedure," *CRS Report for the Congress*, 1-6.

Golino, Louis R. 1999. "NATO Internal Adaptation: the New Command Structure and the Future of the European Pillar." In A. M. Babkina, eds., *NATO's Role, Missions and Future*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 83-88.

Gordon, Philip. Summer 2002. "NATO and war on terrorism: A changing Alliance," *The Brookings Review* 20(3): 36-38.

Gyarmati, Istvan and Christopher Walker. July 2002. "Reconceptualizing NATO," *EastWest Institute Policy Brief* 1(3): 1-7.

Harmel Report. 13-14 December 1967. Brussels: North Atlantic Council.

Hoffman, Bruce. 1999. "Terrorism Trends and Prospects". In Ian O. Lesser, Bruce Hoffman, John Arquilla, David Ronfeldt, Michele Zanini, Brian Michael Jenkins, eds., *Countering the New Terrorism*, 7-38. Available at http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR989/MR989.chap2.pdf>.

Hunter, Robert E. 1990. "NATO's Enduring Importance." In Ted Galen Carpenter, eds., *NATO at 40: Confronting a Changing World*. Washington D.C: Cato Institute, 25-40.

Hunter, Robert. 2002. "The European Security and Defense Policy: NATO's Companion or Competitor," *RAND Report*, 1-206.

- Hoffman, Bruce. 1998. *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia: University Press.
- Hunter, Robert. November 16, 2006. "A race Against Time," *Guardian*. Available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2006/nov/16/theeusturninafghanistan>.
- Jenkins, Brian M. 2001. "Anatomy of a Terrorist Attack," In James F. Hoge, and Gideon Rose, eds., *How Did This Happen?*. New York: Public Affairs, 1-15.
- Jenkins, Brian. 2006. *McGraw Hill Homeland Security Handbook*. U.S.A: Rand Corporation, 117-130.
- Jordan, Rober S. 1995. "NATO's Structural Changes for the 1990s." In S Victor Papacosma and Mary Ann Heiss, eds., *NATO in the Post Cold War Era: Does it have a Future*. London: Macmillan Press, 41-70.
- June 29, 2009. "NATO and Russia to Resume Military Ties." Financial Times.
- Kaplan, Lawrence S. 1995. "NATO after forty-five years: A Counterfactual History." In S Victor Papacosma and Mary Ann Heiss, eds., *NATO in the Post Cold War Era: Does it have a Future*. London: Macmillan Press, 3-23.
- Karagöz, Murat. September/November 2003. "September 11: A new Type of Terrorism," *Perceptions* 7 (3):140–167.
- Kay, Sean. April 2005. "What Went Wrong with NATO?," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 18(1): 69-83.
- Kohlmann, Evan. Sep/Oct 2006. "The Real Online Terrorist Threat," *Foreign Affairs* 85 (5)
- Kostas, Infantis. March/May 2002. "Understanding International Politics after the 11 September Terrorist Attacks: A Note on the New Security Paradigm," *Perceptions* 7(1):101–115.
- Krahmann, Elke. 2005. *New Threats and New Actors in International Society*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Kydd, Andrew. Autumn 2001. "Trust Building, Trust Breaking: the Dilemma of NATO enlargement," *International Organization* 55(4): 801-828.
- Laqueur, Walter. Fall 1998. "Terror's New Face," *Harvard International Review* 20 (4).
- Laqueur, Walter. 2001. "The Changing Face of Terror." In James F. Hoge, and Gideon Rose eds., *How Did This Happen?*. New York: Public Affairs, 71-83.
- Larrabee, Stephen, Lesser, Ian O., Green, Jerrold D., Zanini, Michele. 1998."Chapter III: NATO's Mediterranean Initiative," *RAND Monograph on NATO's Mediterranean Initiative: Policy Issues and Dilemmas*, 132.
- Larrabee, Stephen, Ian O. Lesser, Jerrold D. Green and Michele Zanini. 2000. "Chapter III: NATO's Mediterranean Initiative," *RAND Monograph on NATO's Mediterranean Initiative: Evolution and Next Steps*, 1.50.
- Lieven, Anatol. 2001. "The Cold War is Finally Over." In James F. Hoge, and Gideon Rose, eds., *How Did This Happen?*. New York: Public Affairs, 295-306.
- Long, David E. 1990. *The Anatomy of Terrorism*. New York: The Free Press.
- Lübkemier, Eckhard. June 2008. "The Political Upheaval in Europe and the Reform of NATO Strategy," *NATO Review* 39(3): 16-21.
- Lynch, Rick and Janzen, Phillip D. 2006. "NATO Training Mission in Iraq: Looking to the Future," *JFG Forum* 40:29-34.
- Martin, Gus. 2006. *Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives and Issues*. California: Sage Publications.
- McCalla, Robert B. 1996. "NATO's Persistence After the Cold War," *International Organization* 50(3): 445-475.
- Media Operations Center. June 16, 2009. "NATO in Afghanistan, Master Narrative."

Moens, Alexander. April 2002. "NATO's Latest Challenges," Policy Options 23(3): 38-46.

Morgan, J. Matthew. Spring 2004. "The Origins of the New Terrorism," Parameters, 29-43.

NATO Basic Texts. July 6, 1990. "London Declaration." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/b900706a.htm>>.

NATO Basic Texts. November 29, 2006. "Comprehensive Political Guidance." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/b061129e.htm> >.

NATO Briefing. October 2006. "Operational Capabilities" Available at <http://www.nato.int/issues/capabilities/>>.

NATO Briefing. 2008. "Afghanistan." Available at <http://www.nato.int/ebookshop/briefing/afghanistan/afghanistan2008-e.pdf> >.

NATO Fact Sheets. April 2000. "NATO's Defense Capabilities Initiative." Available at www.nato.int/docu/facts/2000/nato-dci.htm>.

NTM-I Factsheets. February 10, 2005. "NATO Expands Training Mission in Iraq." Available at http://www.afsouth.nato.int/JFCN_Missions/NTM-I/Factsheets/NATO_ExpandsTM.htm >.

NATO Final Communiqué. May 17-18, 1982. "North Atlantic Council Meeting." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c820517a.htm>>.

"NATO Handbook". 2001. Retrieved from <http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/pdf/handbook.pdf>>.

NATO Handbook. 2006. Retrieved from <http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2006/hb-en-2006.pdf> >.

NATO Issues. October 2003. "NATO's Military Concept for Defense Against Terrorism." Available at <http://www.nato.int/ims/docu/terrorism.htm> >.

Paul Gallis and Vincent Morelli. July 18, 2008. "Afghanistan: A test of the Transatlantic Alliance," CRS Report for the Congress, 1-34.

NATO issues. November 22, 2007. "Strategic Lift: How did it evolve" Available at <http://www.nato.int/issues/strategic-lift/evolution.html>>.

NATO Issues. January 22, 2008. "NATO Response Force: How did it evolve" Available at <http://www.nato.int/issues/nrf/evolution.html>>.

NATO Issues: International Military Staff. August 17, 2009. "Allied Command Transformation" Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_52092.htm>.

NATO News. June 29, 2004. "Heads of State and Government strengthen NATO's anti-terrorism efforts." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_20808.htm?selectedLocale=en>.

NATO News. June 4-5, 2009. "Security Conference focuses on NATO's role for the 21st century." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_55375.htm?mode=news>.

NATO News. June 2009. "NATO to launch a public debate on the Strategic Concept." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-C267C71B07A98717/natolive/news_56119.htm>.

NATO Official texts. April 4, 1949. "The North Atlantic Treaty." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/txt/treaty.htm>>.

NATO Official Texts. November 7-8, 1991. "the Alliance New Strategic Concept." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_23847.htm>.

NATO Official Texts. December 10, 1996. "Final Communiqué Issued at the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_25056.htm>.

NATO Official Texts. April 25, 1999. "Towards a Partnership for the 21st Century." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27434.htm?selectedLocale=en>.

NATO Official Texts. December 18, 2001. "Statement on Combating Terrorism: Adapting the Alliance's Defense Capabilities." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_18843.htm>:

NATO Official Text. December 9, 2004. "NATO-Russia Action Plan on Terrorism." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_21003.htm?selectedLocale=en>.

NATO Opinions. June 11, 1998. "Shaping NATO to meet the challenges of 21st Century." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_26109.htm?selectedLocale=en>.

NATO Opinions. April 2, 2008. "Bucharest Summit Opening remarks." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_7601.htm>.

NATO Press Communiqué. December 14, 2000. "Report on Options for Confidence and Security Building Measures, Verification, Non Proliferation, Arms Control and Disarmament." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2000/p00-121e/rep-csbm.pdf>>.

NATO Preparatory Committee. 2008. "NRC Practical Cooperation Fact Sheet." Retrieved from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey.

NATO Press Releases. April 24, 1999. "The Alliance's Strategic Concept." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27433.htm>.

NATO Press Release (2001)122. September 11, 2001. "Statement by the North Atlantic Council." <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-122e.htm>>.

NATO Press Release (2001)138. October 8, 2001. "Statement by NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-138e.htm>>.

NATO Press Release M-NAC 2 (2001)159. December 6, 2001. "NATO's Response to Terrorism." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-159e.htm>>.

NATO Press Release (2001)173. December 18, 2001. "Statement on Combating Terrorism: Adapting the Alliance's Defense Capabilities." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-173e.htm>>.

NATO Press Release (2002)133. November 21, 2002. "Prague Summit Statement on Iraq." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-133e.htm>>.

NATO Press Release (2003)059. June 3, 2003. "Final Communiqué: Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held in Madrid." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2003/p03-059e.htm>>.

NATO Press Release (2003)065. June 12, 2003. "Final Communiqué: Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Defense Ministers session held in Brussels." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2003/p03-065e.htm>>.

NATO Press Release (2004)057. April 2, 2004. "Declaration on Terrorism." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-057e.htm>>.

NATO Press Release (2004)096. June 28, 2004. "Istanbul Summit Communiqué." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-096e.htm>>.

NATO Press Release (2007)065. June 8, 2007. "Statement by the Secretary General on terrorism in Turkey." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2007/p07-065e.html>>.

NATO Press Release (2008)124. January 1, 2008. "Strategic Airlift Capabilities moves to implementation" Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2008/p08-124e.html>>.

NATO Press Release (2008)049. April 3, 2008. "Bucharest Summit Declaration." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2008/p08-049e.html>>.

NATO Press Release (2009)043. April 4, 2009. "Declaration on Alliance Security." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_52838.htm?mode=pressrelease>.

NATO Press Statement. September 13, 2001. "NATO and Russia united in resolve against scourge of terrorism." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2001/0910/e0913a.htm>>.

NATO Response Force. September 25, 2003. "Allied Command Operations" Available at http://www.nato.int/shape/issues/shape_nrf/030820.htm>.

NATO-Russia unclassified document NRC(PREP)N(2008)OO14-REV1. April 2, 2008. "NRC Practical Cooperation Fact Sheet." Retrieved from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

NATO Review. Autumn 2005. "Combating WMD Proliferation." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2005/issue3/english/art3.html>>.

NATO School Oberammergau. Available at <http://www.natoschool.nato.int/>>.

NATO Speech. October 4, 1995. "Statement by NATO Secretary General Willy Claes at the National Press Club." Available at www.nato.int/docu/speech/1995/s951004a.htm>.

NATO Speech. March 22, 2000. "Statement by Lord Robertson, NATO Secretary General." Available at www.nato.int/docu/speech/2000/s000322b.htm>.

NATO Speech. January 31, 2002. "NATO After September: Speech by NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson to the pilgrims of the United States." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020131a.htm>>.

NATO Speech. June 14, 2002. "Speech by Lord Robertson, NATO General Secretary at the conference on International Security and Fight Against Terrorism." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020614a.htm>>.

NATO Speech. June 20, 2002. "Speech by the NATO General Secretary Lord Robertson: Tackling Terror: NATO's New Mission" Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020620a.htm>>.

NATO Speech. June 19, 2003. "Statement by Lord Robertson, NATO Secretary General at the ceremony to the Commission of the new Allied Command Transformation, Norfolk." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2003/s030619a.htm>>.

NATO Topics. 2003. "NATO's Command Structure: the Old and the New."

NATO Topics. May 9, 2007. "NATO's Cooperation with partners: How did it evolve?" Available at http://www.nato.int/issues/partnership_evolution/index.html>.

NATO Topics. February 18, 2009. "The Threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction." Available at <http://www.nato.int/issues/wmd/index.html>>.

NATO Topics. March 10, 2009. "NATO's relations with the European Union." Available at <http://www.nato.int/issues/nato-eu/index.html>>.

NATO Topics. April 3, 2009. "NATO Command Structure." Available at http://www.nato.int/issues/military_structure/command/index-e.html>.

NATO Topics. July 6, 2009. "The Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre." Available at <http://www.nato.int/eadrcc/index.html>>.

NATO Topics. August 17, 2009. "Crisis Management." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49192.htm>.

NATO Topics. August 24, 2009. "Membership Action Plan (MAP)." Available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_37356.htm>.

NATO Topics. August 27, 2009. "The Partnership for Peace." Available at <http://www.nato.int/issues/pfp/index.html>>.

NATO Update. September 20, 2001. "U.S. High Official at NATO HQ." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2001/0917/e0920a.htm>>.

NATO Update. June 18, 2003. "New NATO Transformation Command Established." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2003/06-june/e0618a.htm>>.

Nelson, C. Richard. Autumn 2004. "Expanding NATO's counter terrorism role," NATO Review Interpreting Istanbul.

Nevers, Renée de. Spring 2007. "NATO's International Security Role in Terrorist Era," *International Security* 31(4): 34-66.

- Nimetz, Matthew. 1999. "Mediterranean Security after the Cold War." In Nikolaos A. Stavrou, eds. and with a foreword by George P. Schultz, *Mediterranean Security at the Crossroads: A Reader*. USA: The Duke University Press.
- North Atlantic Final Communiqué. May 31, 1984. Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c840531a.htm>>.
- Naumann, Klaus. 1998. "NATO's new military command structure," *NATO Review* 46(1).
- North Atlantic Council. June 5-6, 1985. "Final Communiqué." Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c850607a.htm>>.
- Nye, Joseph. December 14, 2006. "NATO after Riga." Available at <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/nye40>>.
- Orkunt, Sezai. 1985. "The Effect of International Terrorism on NATO." In Joseph Godson, eds., *35 Years of NATO: A Transatlantic Symposium on the Changing Political, Economic and Military Setting*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 153-177.
- Patman, Robert G. 2006. *Globalization and Conflict: National Security in a New Strategic Era*. USA: Routledge.
- Paul, T.V. 2005. "The National Security and Global Terrorism: Why the State is not prepared for the New Kind of War," In Ersel Aydinli and James N. Rosenau, eds., *Globalization, Security and the Nation State: Paradigms in Transition*. U.S.A, Albany: State University of New York Press, 49-64.
- Perry, William J. 2001. "Prevention, Deterrence, Defense." In James F. Hoge, and Gideon Rose, eds., *How Did This Happen?*. New York: Public Affairs, 225-241.
- Phoenix Global Intelligence Systems. December 4, 2006. "Methods Utilized by Terrorists in the New Age of Technology." Available at <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=1418929&site=ehost-live>>.

- Political Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace. "Intelligence Sharing in the Fight against Terrorism." Retrieved from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey.
- Ricmond, Oliver. 2003. "Realizing Hegemony?: Symbolic Terrorism and the Roots of Conflict," *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 26:289-309.
- Ripsman, M. Norrin and T. V. Paul. 2005. "Globalization and the National Security State: A Framework for Analysis," *International Studies Review* 7: 199–227.
- Robb, John. 2007. *Brave New War: the Next Stage of Terrorism and the End of Globalization*. New Jersey: John Wiley&Sons. Inc.
- Roy, Oliver. "Neo-Fundamentalism," paper prepared for Center National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Sageman, Marc. 2008. *Leaderless Jihad: Terror Networks in the Twenty-First Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Said, Mohamed Kadr. Spring 2004. "Assessing NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue," *NATO Review: Taking NATO's Partnerships Forward*. Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2004/issue1/english/art4.html>>.
- Schmidt, John R. Winter 2006-2007. "Last Alliance Standing? NATO after 9/11," *the Washington Quarterly* 30(1): 93-106.
- Simon, Steven and Daniel Benjamin. Spring 2000. "America and the New Terrorism," *Survival*, 42 (1): 59–75.
- Simon, Steven. 2003. "The New Terrorism and the Peace Process." Available at <http://www.biu.ac.il/SOC/besa/publications/simon/new-terror.pdf>>.
- Smith, Steve and Amitav Acharya. May 2002. "The Concept of Security Before and After September 11," *Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies* 23.
- Stepanova, Ekaterina. 2008. "Terrorism in Asymmetrical Conflict: Ideological and Structural Aspects," *SIPRI Research Report No: 23*.

Papacosma, Victor S. 1995. "NATO and the Balkans." In S Victor Papacosma and Mary Ann Heiss, eds., NATO in the Post Cold War Era: Does it have a Future. London: Macmillan Pres, 245-277.

Prague Summit Declaration November 21, 2002. Available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-127e.htm>>.

Rearden, Steven L. 1995. "NATO's Strategy: Past, Present and Future." In S Victor Papacosma and Mary Ann Heiss, eds., NATO in the Post Cold War Era: Does it have a Future. London: Macmillan Press, 71-92.

Regional Headquarters Allied Forces Southern Europe Fact Sheets. December 16, 2002. "Operation Deliberate Force." Available at <http://www.afsouth.nato.int/factsheets/DeliberateForceFactSheet.htm>>.

Schulte, Gregory. March 1997. "Bringing Peace to the Bosnia and change to the Alliance," NATO Review 45(2): 22-25.

Speech by J. F. Bureau. 24 April 2009. Brussels.

Shape News. May 4, 2007. "NATO Response Force Leaders Consider NRF Missions." Available at <http://www.nato.int/shape/news/2007/05/070504a.htm> >.

Stavelko, Tomas. June 28, 2008. "Challenges of the ISAF Mission in Afghanistan," Euro-Atlantic Quarterly.

Stuart, Croft. January 2002. "Guaranteeing Europe's security? Enlarging NATO again," International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-) 78(1): 97-114..

Tahmisoğlu, Mete. October 25-26, 2007. Briefing of Center of Excellence Defense against terrorism (COE DAT) for the workshop on "Building Cooperative and Regional Approaches to BIO-Preparedness and combating the threat of terrorism" Bucharest, Romania.

"The EU-NATO: The Framework for Permanent Relations and Berlin Plus." Available at <http://consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/03-11-11%20Berlin%20Plus%20press%20note%20BL.pdf> >.

The Key to the Prague Summit: an agenda for change. 21-22 November 2002. Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 21-35.

Tucker, David. Autumn 2001. "What is new about new terrorism?," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 13(3): 1-14.

Voice of America. March 16, 2004. "NATO Expands anti-terrorism patrols in the Mediterranean."

Wallender, Celeste. Autumn 2000. "Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War," *International Organization* 54(4): 705-735.

Wijk, Rob De. 1997. *NATO on the Brink of the New Millennium*. United Kingdom: Brassey's.

Wilson, Brendon L. December 2, 2003. "Military Strategy for Transformation: NATO's Rubicon" *Strategic Insight*, 1-5.

Yost, David. 1998. *NATO Transformed: the Alliance New Roles in International Security*. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Zakaria, Fareed. 2001. "What September 11 Hath Wrought?," In James F. Hoge, and Gideon Rose, eds., *How Did This Happen?*. New York: Public Affairs, 307-319.

Interviews

Bayer, Tomur, the General Director of the International Security Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey. August 2009. Interview with the author.

Gun, Muhtar Ahmet, the Vice General Director of the OSCE, Arms Control and Disarmament Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey. August 2009. Interview with the Author.

Tahmisoglu, Mete, Colonel at the COE DaT. August 2009. Interview with the Author.