

Gülşah Özdemir<sup>1</sup> , Elchin Mürseloğlu<sup>2\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>PhD, Associate Professor of the Balıkesir University Burhaniye Faculty of Applied Sciences, 10700 Burhaniye-Balıkesir, Türkiye

<sup>2</sup>PhD, Associate Professor of the Balıkesir University Burhaniye Faculty of Applied Sciences, 10700 Burhaniye-Balıkesir, Türkiye

\*e-mail: [elikiyar84@hotmail.com](mailto:elikiyar84@hotmail.com)

## NATO'S SECURITY STRATEGIES WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF NON-MILITARY TACTICS

### Abstract

NATO's non-military strategies encompass a range of approaches to address security challenges without direct military intervention. These strategies aim to enhance cooperation with neutral states and transform them from security consumers to providers, strengthening regional stability. Integrating military and non-military forces against hybrid threats is also crucial, underscoring the necessity for a comprehensive approach that encompasses political, economic, and social dimensions. In this context, the Strategic Concepts introduced by NATO in 2010 and 2022 outlined various non-military approaches to combat challenges such as terrorism, cyber threats, and energy security. This shift highlights the need for a more comprehensive strategy that extends beyond traditional military methodologies. It acknowledges the growing importance of non-military tactics within the alliance's framework in addressing contemporary security concerns. NATO's dynamic, evolving strategy integrates a range of non-military tactics that prioritise governance, political cohesion, and technological advances to address modern security threats effectively. Instead of relying solely on top-down directives, the emphasis is on bottom-up strategies that involve grassroots-level participation in legitimate decision-making processes. This inclusive methodology is evident in NATO's strategic approaches, which encompass non-military measures to reduce conflicts and establish sustainable governance frameworks. Beyond traditional military constraints, NATO actively supports key diplomatic, political, economic, and technological initiatives to holistically address regional stability, security, and energy security threats. The purpose of the article is to analyze the evolution of NATO's non-military strategies based on a comparative analysis of the 2010 and 2022 Strategic Concepts, and to identify the effectiveness of an integrated "bottom-up" approach in countering hybrid threats, terrorism, and energy security challenges.

**Keywords:** International Security, NATO, Strategic Concept, Regional Stability, security strategies.

### Introduction

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established in 1949 with the primary mission of protecting the freedom and security of its member states through political and military means. This mission was initially motivated by the need to protect Western Europe from the threat posed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) during the Cold War, as expressed by NATO's first Secretary General Lord Ismay, who defined the organization's mission as "keeping the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down." NATO's role has evolved significantly over the decades, adapting to new threats beyond its original focus on collective defense under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Over time, the alliance has evolved into a major political-military coalition that addresses a wide range of traditional and non-traditional threats and adapts to the changing dynamics of global security.

Initially established to deter the expansionist tendencies of the USSR, NATO has expanded its scope over time to include the implementation of United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolutions. Since their inception, the United Nations (UN) and NATO have had a complex and evolving relationship regarding cooperation and conflict. During the Cold War, the two organizations operated largely independently, with NATO focusing on defense against USSR aggression and the UN on broader international peacekeeping and security efforts. The end of the Cold War and subsequent global challenges have called for closer cooperation between members, as in the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia. For example, NATO's intervention in Kosovo in 1999, which took place without the explicit authorization of the UNSC, highlighted the tensions between NATO's strategic imperatives

and the legal frameworks of the UN. Despite these challenges, the relationship between the two organizations has been transformed by significant milestones such as the 2008 joint declaration that underlined the cooperation and commitment of NATO and UN leaders. This partnership is particularly evident in addressing modern security threats such as terrorism, where NATO's military capabilities complement the peacekeeping and political efforts of the UN.

Contemporary security challenges, including the threat of terrorism, the assertive behaviour of the Russian Federation (RF), hybrid warfare tactics, and the ongoing conflicts in Ukraine and Palestine, have necessitated a deeper level of cooperation between NATO and the European Union (EU). Drawing on common resources and synchronised defence strategies to support collective security measures, the EU and NATO must work together to address these challenges. The misuse of digital platforms to spread disinformation also poses risks of eroding public trust and stability, particularly in countries previously under communist rule and during election campaigns.

The security environment in the North Atlantic region, a critical area for NATO's operations, is challenged by technological advances and the effects of climate change. The lack of robust institutional frameworks in the alliance has heightened Chinese influence. However, amidst internal disagreements, the commitment of both NATO and the EU to fostering a strong transatlantic partnership and developing credible military capabilities is reassuring. The future trajectory of the alliance hinges on its ability to navigate the subtleties of both internal and external security dynamics.

### **Materials and methods of research**

The character of war has undergone significant transformation due to technological advances, from archery to gunpowder, armored vehicles, nuclear weapons, and modern cyberspace systems. However, it is essential to recognize that non-military strategies, encompassing political, economic, cultural, scientific, and industrial dimensions, can significantly alter nations' perspectives, preparations, and methodologies for waging war. These strategies, which aim to achieve strategic goals without military intervention, can be applied in diplomacy, economic sanctions, information warfare, public diplomacy, and cybersecurity. As a military organization, NATO also recognizes the value of these strategies as complementary components to the application of military power.

Strategies are long-term policies and goals formulated by existing institutions and organizations in the international system to provide security. However, the evolving security environment within the global system necessitates that these organizations, including NATO, develop new strategies to adapt and protect their assets effectively. As a military alliance established to address the need for a security framework, NATO's conceptualization of security and related strategies has undergone significant transformations over time. Alliances like NATO must review their security conceptualizations and create appropriate strategies to ensure survival in this contemporary security environment. In this context, NATO has developed strategies to meet various security demands that have emerged in different historical periods, demonstrating its proactive stance.

NATO, which aims to contribute to global security through a multifaceted approach that includes collective defense, crisis management, and cooperation, has undergone a significant transformation in its security approach with the NATO 2010 Strategic Concept, approved in Lisbon, and the new Strategic Concept adopted at the Madrid Summit in 2022. These documents emphasize collective defense, crisis management, collaborative security, and the challenges emerging in cyberspace, space, and emerging technologies. Recognizing the importance of cooperation with global partners to understand the interconnected nature of contemporary threats, increase the resilience of the Alliance, and prevent crises, NATO has embarked on developing an international approach to security within the framework of adapting to the changing global strategic environment.

NATO's approach encompasses not only military strategies but also political and economic tools to protect the security of its member states. For example, diplomatic initiatives, crisis management, and peacebuilding efforts are significant. Financial sanctions can be a powerful mechanism to change a nation's behavior. In addition, information warfare and media strategies that leverage technological tools in the virtual world are effective ways to shape public perception and undermine adversaries' morale. In our study examining non-military security tactics in NATO's interventions against hybrid

threats, evaluations were based on the Strategic Concepts for 2010 and 2022, with particular attention to evolving threats and the impact of globalization. Upon examining NATO's strategy documents, it becomes apparent that they reflect a multifaceted approach to addressing contemporary security problems, emphasizing collective defense, deterrence, and adaptation to new threats. Especially after the annexation of Crimea in 2014 and the 2022 Ukraine crisis, the tendency to focus on the Russian threat has brought NATO's basic mission of collective defense and deterrence to the forefront. Before this, the NATO Lisbon Summit, convened to address the evolving security environment and redefine the Alliance's basic tasks to ensure its relevance in the post-Cold War and post-September 11 world, presented the 2010 Strategic Concept. The 2010 Strategic Concept emphasizes a comprehensive approach to security by integrating political, military, and non-military measures to combat threats such as terrorism, cyberattacks, and energy security. This approach has become evident in NATO's crisis response operations, which now involve multiple organizations performing both military and non-military missions, emphasizing the importance of multinational cooperation in a globalized security environment. NATO's "Smart Defense" policy, adopted in 2010, aimed to enhance interoperability and technological capabilities, including a robust cyber defense strategy, to create a more agile and efficient defense posture. Launched as a comprehensive approach to addressing the evolving security environment, NATO's 2022 Strategic Concept adopts a global security framework that focuses on interconnected challenges, working with partners, and increasing resilience in a complex and contested world. This new strategic concept emphasizes an international approach to security, cooperation with partners, and resilience. In this sense, it encompasses various aspects, including collective defense against cybersecurity threats, addressing the security implications of climate change, and analyzing the factors contributing to efficiency increases among NATO countries.

In the contemporary era, the range of threats in the security environment has expanded significantly, and security risks are multidimensional, asymmetric, and emerging. Such a security environment loses its predictability and draws an unstable profile. In light of the prevalence of hybrid security threats from this evolving perspective, a wide range of security issues, encompassing digital, cyber, climate, and spatial dimensions, has been included in NATO's security strategies. Within the scope of our study, the strategic roadmaps that NATO will adopt to address the wide threat scale effectively have been examined. In this sense, while addressing NATO's security transformations in our study, the first section primarily focuses on what military and non-military strategies are and why non-military tactics are needed. Within the framework of NATO's historical development, the second section examines NATO's expansion and the methods it employed during the Cold War and post-Cold War periods, which is our main research topic: non-military tactics. In the third section, where the effects of the transformation from a global security perspective to global defense are examined, changes in security strategies, especially in the 2010 and 2022 Strategic Concepts, focused on crisis prevention, management, and a collaborative approach, are detailed in terms of diplomatic initiatives, civil infrastructure creation, economic and technological developments, and defense perspectives. The emphasis on the cooperative approach in NATO's security strategies makes the audience feel included in the solution. As a result, it is emphasized that there is a shift towards global defense in NATO's strategic transformation - primarily driven by geopolitical tensions with the RF - while at the same time, the expanded roles and responsibilities in terms of potential allies and areas of influence are discussed within the framework of NATO's mission and influence. It is examined how non-military tactics that support traditional methods are evaluated for their ability to adapt to changing geopolitical dynamics and to respond to new threats.

### **Results and their discussion**

Military and non-military strategies are fundamental and indispensable elements of national security, and each type of strategy performs different but interrelated functions, crucial to effectively addressing various threats while maintaining sociopolitical stability. While military strategies have traditionally emphasized the deployment of armed forces to protect national sovereignty and deter potential foreign aggressors, non-military strategies encompass a broader, more multifaceted range of

activities designed to prevent the outbreak of conflict and promote enduring stability through the implementation of various diplomatic, economic, and social initiatives.

Military strategies fundamentally require deploying armed forces to deter and address potential threats. These strategies, which remain the cornerstone of national security, focus on utilizing armed forces to safeguard sovereignty and prevent aggression. They include directing military resources, personnel, and technology to gain strategic advantages over enemies [1]. This paradigm, which requires developing defensive capabilities and maintaining operational readiness through international cooperation, is seen as a necessity by states to formulate military strategies to address traditional threats, including military aggression and regional conflicts. The historical evolution of military strategy has predominantly centered on the use of organized armed forces to protect national sovereignty and deter external aggression that threatens peace. Military strategy, which can be traced back to ancient times with the fundamental works of strategists such as Machiavelli, Jomini, Sun Tzu and Carl von Clausewitz, who emphasized the integration of military strategy with political goals, have been shaped by focusing on the nature, tools and methods of warfare, which revolve around the use of force and power [2]. This strategic focus, which can be evaluated in the context of traditional military strategies, requires establishing and maintaining a formidable military presence, the continuous development of advanced weapon systems, and, when deemed necessary, active participation in combat operations to address threats. However, it is necessary to recognize that the nature of military victories tends to be temporary and by their nature do not guarantee sustainable results or peace for subsequent generations; therefore, the overall effectiveness of military activities in achieving long-term peace and stability is often limited, often leading to the paradox of temporary success overshadowed by permanent instability [3].

While traditional military tactics and strategies remain valid, it is essential to remember that integrating new technologies and adapting to geopolitical changes requires continuous adjustment. In the contemporary geopolitical environment, military strategies are increasingly expanding and evolving to confront and counter hybrid threats that interweave traditional military tactics with a range of non-military methodologies, such as cyberattacks and sophisticated disinformation campaigns designed to manipulate public perception. This evolving landscape requires formulating an integrated strategic approach that skillfully leverages the strengths of both military and non-military resources, providing a comprehensive and effective response to these multifaceted and complex threats that challenge traditional war paradigms. The emergence of the “New Cold War” has shifted military tactics to an information warfare, in which cyberspace has become the primary battle space. This approach includes psychological operations, economic coercion, and targeting social structures to weaken enemies without the costs of traditional warfare [4]. Integrating advanced technologies, including artificial intelligence and cybersecurity frameworks, into security issues significantly enhances military capabilities, facilitating advanced threat detection and decision-making mechanisms [5]. In military strategies, success in specific counter-operations often requires a sophisticated combination of direct military action supported by non-military tactics and efforts to win the “hearts and minds” of civilian populations that insurgent narratives may influence. This dual-pronged approach, strategically suited to undermine support for insurgent movements and minimize civilian casualties, should instill confidence in the military's tactics. It increases the legitimacy and effectiveness of military operations and fosters an environment conducive to peacebuilding and social cohesion in the affected regions. When considering the incorporation of advanced technological developments into NATO-led security operations, it is a complex and multifaceted initiative aimed at enhancing the organization's capabilities in threat detection, response mechanisms, and overall defensive functions against various potential hostile activities. In addition to its military capabilities, NATO strategically employs a wide range of non-military tools to support its operations and achieve its overarching objectives on the global stage. These tools encompass various approaches beyond diplomatic initiatives, information dissemination strategies, economic leverage, technological advances, cyber defense frameworks, and civilian infrastructure development, all critical in supporting NATO's mission. Their importance is growing,

particularly in the context of NATO's comprehensive Multi-Domain Operations<sup>1</sup> warfighting concept integration and achieving operational effectiveness in a rapidly changing global environment.

The evolving security environment within the international system necessitates a corresponding transformation in the security needs of its various actors. Like other global actors, alliances are compelled to devise appropriate strategies to enhance their security environments and effectively meet the demands of their allies. As scholars, students, and professionals interested in international relations and security studies, your role in understanding and analyzing NATO's strategies is crucial. NATO, a prime example of adaptability, has adjusted and refined its strategic frameworks to address the diverse security challenges that have emerged at various times. This adaptability is evident in the three basic transformation stages for NATO: the Cold War period, the post-Cold War period, and the period following the September 11, 2001, attacks. These transformations, from Cold War strategies centered on deterrence through nuclear capabilities to post-Cold War approaches focusing on the threat of international terrorism and then to the discussions surrounding War in the cyber domain, demonstrate the Alliance's resilience and effectiveness in restructuring itself in response to evolving security conditions and imperatives. In this context, we can generalize the non-military security strategies discussed within the framework of our study, encompassing both the Cold War period and the Post-Cold War period.

Before World War II, the USA and the USSR developed ideologies that would facilitate their unilateral actions, one of which was interventionist liberalism and the other was international communism. Thus, the USA intervened in Central American countries under the pretext of national security and sought to teach them how to govern their own countries. The USSR aimed to increase the number of countries governed by communist regimes and to support them. The Cold War period, a significant chapter in international relations, saw everyone carrying their regime as far as their army could reach [6]. The USA and the USSR did not engage in direct hot conflict during this period. However, they attempted to maintain a forced balance through ideological propaganda, regime exports, and armaments. In other words, the superpowers of the period struggled to impose their socio-political system and model on the environment [7]. The main characteristics of the Cold War period were the military, economic, political, geopolitical, and strategic attitudes and practices of these two great poles, their leaders, and the states on their side [8].

With the establishment of NATO on April 4, 1949, the USSR's expansion towards the European continent was slowed down. However, until 1949, the USSR controlled much of Europe by occupying it [9]. Furthermore, on May 14, 1955, on the sixth anniversary of NATO's establishment, the USSR signed the Warsaw Pact, NATO's alternative in the world.

The most significant international developments between 1990 and 2000 were the US's involvement in the Middle East, particularly in Iraq, through the US-Iraq War, its efforts to reestablish stability in Eastern Europe, and its determination to secure energy transfer routes. The Bush Doctrine, which was declared on September 20, 2002 after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, was the period when Western analysts agreed on the necessity of designing the New World Order (NWO) according to itself as a single pole, since the US now had the power to control the globe. This doctrine was published as a text of these ideas. Thus, the US, often in collaboration with NATO, referred to countries that were not subject to free market economies, democratic principles, and human rights standards as "rogue and problematic countries," and began to intervene in other countries with humanitarian concerns, disregarding the UN. The US carried out all of these occupations in the name of "democracy(!)" and for the sake of creating a NWO. Thus, the US aimed to maintain its superiority in the post-USSR world system, drawing on Francis Fukuyama's "Theory of the End of History" and "The End of History" as a reference [10]. According to the US political scientist and statesman Zbigniew Brzezinski, the West's primary duty should be to strongly oppose any alliance's attempt to expel the US from Eurasia or to restrict its role as an arbiter. In this sense, potential rivals should be crushed before they become real rivals. Preventing the formation of any coalition in the region is vital

for the survival of the US. According to Brzezinski, the most serious threat to the US is the potential coalition of the RF, the People's Republic of China (PRC), and Iran, which is angered by the US's perceived superiority (Brzezinski, 1998, pp. 23, 53, 178). In essence, the USA's control of the Middle East and Central Asia energy resources will not only preserve the USA's superpower position. Still, it will also make other countries dependent on it and prevent the formation of new superpowers or coalitions [11].

The discourse of "Just War," shaped by theological elements in both the East and West and drawing its essence from medieval philosophy, has also become a key slogan in US foreign policy following the Cold War. By placing its intervention in Iraq in 2003 within this framework, the US has jeopardized the perception of international law. The Iraq War took place with the understanding of "Just War(!)" and has shown the fact that it is a philosophy rather than a law. The concept of Just War was revisited in the 20th century, following Kant, as a result of efforts to limit wars within the modern interstate system. The 20th century is a century in which efforts to prevent disasters were put into practice, to the extent that it included disasters. The 1907 Hague Convention, the establishment of the MC (1920), the signing of the Kellogg-Briand Pact<sup>2</sup> (1928), and finally the establishment of the UN (1945) are the best examples of these efforts [12]. In the second half of the 20th century, the elimination of state sovereignty in many Third World Countries and especially in the Middle East led to the emergence of terrorism and proxy wars. NATO made considerable efforts to avoid conflict with the RF in the regions. After the RF's move on Ukraine (the unification of Crimea with the RF on March 18, 2014), NATO returned to the Forward Defense Principle and had to accept the RF's presence in Syria. The RF's deployment of S-400s in Syria has led to the US sending AWACS<sup>3</sup> to the Middle East and NATO sending a navy to the Mediterranean. However, we can now emphasize that NATO has not had a consistent Middle East strategy. It has not been able to remain indifferent to the issue due to the course of the crisis in the region. It has also become clear that there is no common Middle East policy among NATO member countries [13]. The issue of NATO membership, the NATO Partnership for Peace initiative, which began to build the NWA and serves as a tool of the Euro-Atlantic strategy, and the expansion of its members in the direction of the Black Sea have two purposes. The first is the construction of a whole and free Europe, and the second is to sever their ties with the RF by integrating the former Soviet member countries into the Euro-Atlantic ranks. However, in April 2009, NATO increased its membership to 28 by including Albania and Croatia at the Kehl Summit, and the importance of stability in the Black Sea region, especially economic and political reforms in Georgia and Ukraine, for Euro-Atlantic security was underlined [14]. Montenegro became a member of NATO in June 2017, North Macedonia in March 2020, Finland in April 2023, and Sweden in March 2024, and the security strategy of this institution took the form of expansion.

To summarize the section up to this point, during the Cold War, NATO's and the USSR's security strategies within the framework of non-military tactics were ideological expansion and regime-like governance. The USA and subsequently Western European countries, especially after the events of September 11, introduced countries that did not comply with the criteria of their worldview to the world public opinion as "rogue and problematic countries" and, with so-called "humanitarian concerns" and "for the sake of democracy", they embarked on the construction of a "New World Order" for the control of the globe. Within this framework, the power of Eurasia's energy will not only preserve the USA's superpower position. However, it will also ensure the continuity of the loyalty of third-world countries to the USA. This is also a non-military security strategy or tactic for the USA to control countries or organizations. The USA's "Just War" diplomacy and the "Forward Defense Principle", in other words, moves to eliminate the danger at a distance, can be examples of non-military tactics. In the 20th century, the establishment of several international organizations such as the MC and the UN to prevent disasters, proposals for a "Partnership for Peace" and attempts to separate former USSR countries from the RF and include them in the Euro-Atlantic ranks to bind their loyalty to treaties were also parts of non-military security strategies.

To date, the development of NATO doctrines and the evolution of NATO's security strategies have been based on the scale, geography, and warfare methods of possible future battlefields. In this context, NATO continues to expand quantitatively to reinforce its image or status as the leading organization providing security in Europe and globally, a measure against the outbreak of wars within the framework of non-military tactics or focused on regional control. However, as it was in the past, NATO is selective in terms of the countries it wants to include. To give an example from the past, it is contradictory that the USSR made attempts to join NATO in the 1950s, but this is accurate information [15]. However, in May 1954, the Western powers did not accept the USSR's offer of NATO membership. They rejected this offer because the USSR's accession to NATO would be incompatible with the alliance's democratic goals [16]. As stated above, this is an example of NATO's desire to establish a world order according to its understanding. Since 1968, NATO's strategic concept for countering external threats has been based on "soft intervention," blended with the "defense plus dialogue" philosophy of the Harmel Doctrine [17]. At the London Summit in July 1990, it was announced that a new strategic framework would be formulated for the alliance. At the NATO Council session in Rome in 1991, the new strategic concept for NATO's collective security was outlined in the format of "defense plus dialogue plus cooperation" [18]. From 1991 onwards, the strategic concept became an open document for the first time, and the term "threat" was replaced with the term "risk." In this document, "cooperation" refers to the development of various ties with Central and Eastern European countries, the Baltic States, and post-Soviet countries. Following the approval of the new strategic framework, initiatives aimed at rapidly implementing its provisions were launched without delay. Within this framework, the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (CACCP) was established in 1991 to facilitate cooperation with non-member countries in the Euro-Atlantic area; in 1994, under the auspices of the Partnership for Peace (PFP) initiative, cooperation with former Warsaw Pact countries and the Soviet Union began. Later, in 1996, an expansion initiative was implemented to include new members in the alliance, and on December 7, 1996, the NATO-Russia Permanent Partnership Council was established, along with the NATO-Ukraine Commission [19]. As a result of developments in the international conjuncture in the 1990s, NATO leaders agreed in 1997 to review and update the current concept. The new strategic concept was accepted at the NATO summit in Washington in 1999. At the Washington summit, a new strategic concept was approved for the common defense, peace, and stability of the Euro-Atlantic region. In the new strategic concept, it was confirmed that NATO could contribute to peacekeeping operations outside its territory upon the invitation of the UNSC and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) [20].

By September 11, 2001, the international security environment had undergone considerable changes, and the 1999 strategic concept agenda and security approaches required revision. So much so that NATO needed to adapt to the current situation by taking into account new security threats, the terrorist attacks in the USA on September 11, 2001, by the alliance members, and a series of measures was initiated to transform the organization at the Prague Summit in 2002. The coordination of views emphasized at the Riga (2006), Bucharest (2008), and Strasbourg-Kehl (2009) Summits, as well as the formulation of new tasks, areas of responsibility, and objectives for the alliance forces, were negotiated and implemented one after another [21]. Afterwards, a new, long-term strategic vision needed to be developed. The main challenge was to integrate the traditional orientation towards collective defense with the new one and to develop a strategy for protecting members from emerging threats. The intention to create a new strategic concept, decided at the 2009 Strasbourg Summit, also known as NATO's 60th anniversary summit, was realized with the 2010 Strategic Concept. In addition to nuclear and conventional deterrence, the theme of security based on cooperation was a distinguishing feature of this concept. In this sense, it is possible to say that the security concept transformation of the post-9/11 period for NATO was from symmetric war to asymmetric war [22].

NATO's new strategic concept, adopted at the Lisbon Summit in 2010, was "Active Engagement, Modern Defense." Another name for this concept is "Smart Defense." The previous strategy was based on transatlantic solidarity and the principles of freedom, democracy, and the rule of law. However, NATO's primary functions in the 21st century have evolved to include collective defense, crisis

management, and security cooperation. Thus, NATO has become a "hybrid" alliance supported by an ideological component [23].

The Strategic Concept 2010 is of significant importance as it outlines the necessity of military and political reform and evolution, targeting goals such as combating terrorism, in addition to the traditional and established roles of the alliance member states. It exhibits several notable distinctions when compared to previous concepts. For example, the risk posed by cyberattacks is crucial in the new framework. While previous concepts classified terrorism alongside other security threats, such as sabotage and organized crime, the 2010 Strategic Concept views it as an independent and distinct threat in its own right, demonstrating NATO's strategic foresight and preparedness for future threats.

Indeed, the alliance's functionality has expanded significantly by focusing on preventing the spread of nuclear weapons or other types of mass destruction, combating terrorism that poses a direct threat to the security of NATO countries as well as international stability and the economy, preventing extremist groups and their use of nuclear, chemical, biological or radiological means of destruction, and combating cyber attacks. Later, in connection with the new events of the 2010s and the transformation of the world order, new strategic concepts were needed to define NATO's functions and its new goals and objectives. The changes in NATO's system and external conditions have not affected its fundamental principles. The dominant role of the USA in NATO, both in the formation of the military bloc and in its modern financing and management, is one of the fundamental principles that has not changed. Initially, Washington established a distinct hierarchy of relations within NATO, which ultimately led to the alliance becoming a de facto extension of US military power. Within this framework, NATO was established as a Cold War instrument in the fight against the USSR and the Warsaw Pact. Today, the Warsaw Pact and USSR no longer exist, but NATO continues its activities at full speed, as it is an instrument of US foreign policy [24]. As an instrument of US foreign policy, NATO has over 400 military bases worldwide, with 258,500 personnel stationed in these bases, including 75,000 in the European region [25]. We determine NATO's geopolitical agenda; therefore, the US also determines the nature of wars and conflicts. Apart from this, Great Britain and France are implementing an action plan on the islands they own in the north of South America and Central America, and these islands are not independent of NATO. The rest of Europe and Canada are prohibited from engaging in geopolitical activities, pursuing a logical foreign policy, and having an independent army. Even Western European countries are not fundamentally independent and are under the complete control of the US. These countries are to serve as outposts in implementing the US's strategic interests. It is clear that NATO's doctrines are based on the US's international strategy, whereby Washington follows the instructions of American advisers when choosing suppliers of military equipment to serve its interests, and does not leave NATO to make this decision [26]. Nevertheless, NATO maintains its position not as a military-political alliance, but as a system that attempts to adjust the international order. NATO's principles are also based on self-preservation [27]. The additions to NATO's strategic Concept were reviewed and approved by the organization's Military Committee in 2018. This Concept remained closed to the public, but the Alliance's new military exercises, new types of equipment and weapons emerged, and the US's failure to expand or withdraw from several fundamental agreements attracted attention. NATO countries increased their purchases of Patriot and next-generation missile defense systems, as well as fighter jets. Additionally, the Alliance has initiated a series of measures, including the implementation of military training programs and the intensification of intelligence operations. NATO's strengthening of its intelligence leg is also an example of this Alliance's security strategy within the framework of non-military tactics.

While Russia's conflicts in Ukraine, ongoing conflicts in Africa and the Middle East, the problem of terrorism, and global and regional instability continue to pose threats to countries today, NATO has been faced with the most complex security environment since the end of the Cold War. In addition, China's growing political and economic moves continue to create challenging agendas for the Alliance's interests, security, and values. Increasing global unpredictability, complex and destructive cyber and hybrid threats, and technological developments necessitate strategies that enhance the operational effectiveness of the Alliance [28]. In this context, ensuring that national and military forces

operating under NATO command receive adequate support from civilian resources and infrastructure is crucial to NATO's resilience initiatives. During the Warsaw Summit in 2016, Alliance leaders agreed on agendas to enhance NATO's resilience in key areas, including energy, health, transportation, finance, water resources, and space exploration, to address seven critical needs through non-military means. Modern societies exhibit a high degree of complexity due to their interconnected sectors and core systems, making them more vulnerable to terrorist and hybrid attacks targeting critical infrastructure [29]. At this point, another important document emerges: NATO's 2022 Strategic Concept, which summarizes the Alliance's vision and operational framework. The document, officially approved at the Madrid Summit on June 29, 2022, defines NATO's key priorities and outlines the strategic approaches the organization plans to implement over the next decade. This suggests that the Alliance is developing a roadmap for its future endeavors.

In line with the NATO 2030 Agenda and the Reinforced Resilience Commitment established in 2021, the 2022 Strategic Concept emphasizes the need to adopt a more coherent and coordinated resilience strategy within the Alliance, especially to address threats posed by Russia and to assist NATO partners facing hostile interventions and attacks. Collaboration with non-NATO states and various organizations is crucial for enhancing the national and collective resilience of Alliance members and strengthening the Alliance's strategic planning efforts and preparedness through the exchange of expertise and best practices.

The Strategic Concept provides a comprehensive understanding of the complex, multifaceted security environment NATO is currently navigating. It reaffirms the Alliance's unwavering commitment to its core values and principles. The Concept also underscores that NATO's primary purpose is to ensure the collective defense and security of its member states and allies against potential threats, thereby reassuring the Alliance's mission. In addition, as stated in the Concept, "Our new Strategic Concept reaffirms once again that NATO's fundamental purpose is to ensure our collective defense based on a 360-degree approach. The Alliance's three fundamental tasks are deterrence and defense, crisis prevention and management, and cooperative security. ... As the backbone of our Article 5 commitment, we must significantly strengthen our deterrence and defense..." In this way, the document promotes cooperative security measures with various partners. It defines the three fundamental tasks that NATO has committed to undertake in the new world order. These include deterrence and defense against aggression, as well as proactive crisis prevention and effective management [30]. The emphasis on proactive crisis prevention should make our audience feel secure and prepared for potential threats. Moreover, this Strategic Concept emphasizes the need to focus more on the increasingly essential risks in contemporary geopolitics, particularly in the wake of the RF's ongoing intervention in Ukraine, which has significantly altered the security environment in Europe. In this context, the Alliance has incorporated various non-military methods, including information warfare, cybersecurity, and economic sanctions, into its Strategic Concept to adapt to the evolving world order. Although the Concept has been under Washington's influence since its inception, it clearly conveys the meaning of acceptance through the Western wing of the Biden administration's statement: "Democracies around the world must stand united against autocratic powers."

In general terms, the NATO 2022 Strategic Concept differs significantly from its predecessor and indicates an evolution in the Alliance's approach to security and defense. In fact, it is thought that NATO has entered a new era of great power competition, especially in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian war, with the New Concept at the point of 'Strategic Focus Change'. This shift in focus implies that while NATO strengthens its collective defense and deterrence capabilities, Russia is likely to focus on non-military strategies, such as cyber warfare, information operations, and economic influence, to counter NATO's military advances.

While outlining the alliance vision, the New Concept openly identifies the RF as a threat for the first time since the end of the Cold War and highlights China's growing threat potential [31]. This recognition of Russia and China as threats should validate our audience's concerns and reassure them that their worries are being taken seriously. On NATO's 70th anniversary, NATO Secretary General J. Stoltenberg openly stated that the Alliance was established to "take control of the USSR" [32].

However, the USSR no longer exists, and most of the Alliance's activities are now focused on controlling the RF. German Defense Minister A. Kramp-Karrenbauer also joined the anti-Russian rhetoric and actions, saying that "we should only talk to the RF from a position of strength, that is, with the authority granted by an organization or state such as NATO" [33].

The approach of NATO's military infrastructure to the RF territory shows that the concept of a global attack at lightning speed without the use of nuclear weapons is being implemented. However, since NATO does not currently have all the technical capabilities necessary for such an attack, this is a very remote possibility. The primary role Washington assigns to NATO is to preserve it as a military-political alliance and to demonstrate its necessity, especially in Western Europe and globally. In such a scenario, Russia should be presented to the world as a serious threat not only in Europe but also on a global scale, before terrorism. From the moment NATO Secretary General J. Stoltenberg stated that Russia was interfering in the affairs of Ukraine and Georgia, and also strengthened its military presence in Crimea, NATO began to expand its presence in the Black Sea [34]. An online conference of foreign ministers from the alliance countries endorsed these statements and NATO's military preparations. The main enemy of NATO for the next 10 years was Russia. The NATO 2030 report was also discussed at this conference. The report emphasized that NATO's strategy has not worked for a long time and that threats from the RF to the entire Euro-Atlantic area are increasing. The report stated that dialogue with the RF is necessary, but that flexible, adaptable responses to Russia's hybrid wars should be provided. The most crucial point emphasized in the report is that NATO member countries have decided to reconsider their strategic concepts that have been in effect since 2010. In this report, it was particularly demanded that its members end their partnership with the RF, stand against it, and tighten economic sanctions [35]. This NATO tactic, which involves diplomatic, financial, and political measures, should also be evaluated within the framework of a comprehensive non-military strategy.

### **Conclusion**

When we evaluate the 2010 and 2022 Strategic Concepts mentioned in the study, the revival of NATO's strategic emphasis on the fundamental goals of collective defense and deterrence has been observed as a direct response to the geopolitical landscape that emerged mainly after the controversial annexation of Crimea by the RF in 2014 and the escalation of tensions that characterized international relations in the region. This strategic evolution is not just a response but a necessary and timely maneuver to effectively address and reduce the increasing threats posed by leading actors, including the RF and the PRC, thereby underlining the critical importance of maintaining a solid and harmonious political-military alliance among member states. The 2010 NATO Strategic Concept, in particular, played a transformative role in redefining the Alliance's fundamental tasks and defending the necessity of collective security. In NATO's strategic framework, which represents a significant transformation in response to the evolving global security environment, the motto 'Transition from Collective Security to Collective Defense' is understood to signify a return to NATO's fundamental principles of collective defense. This transition, which marks a departure from the emphasis on collective security prevalent in 2010, can be attributed mainly to the decline of the international order and the resurgence of great-power competition, especially following the RF's attack on Ukraine. The focus on collective defense, supported by the growing importance of nuclear capabilities in NATO's latest strategic framework, highlights a shift away from previous atomic disarmament goals. According to the 2022 Concept, strategies developed to 'counter global and emerging threats' such as terrorism, climate change, and cyber risks advocate a holistic approach to security by acknowledging the global nature of these threats. This situation requires understanding the connections between various challenges and regions, as well as cooperating with international partners to enhance resilience. At this point, the question arises whether a holistic approach to combating global threats is feasible within the NATO framework. This problem, which can be interpreted as a complex effort that requires a multifaceted approach combining military, political, economic, and civilian tools, cannot be overcome with traditional military methods alone. NATO, which now encompasses a broad range of emerging areas, including cyber, space, and technology, in its strategic concept, reflects a complex evolution in response to shifting geopolitical dynamics and evolving threats. This change emphasizes collective defense while maintaining a global

security perspective. Various factors, including geopolitical tensions, emerging security challenges, and the need for strategic alignment, drive the transformation.

At this point, in terms of strategic challenges, the intensifying strategic alliance between the RF and the PRC, along with the policies they have put forward, has been perceived as contrary to NATO's values and interests. Consequently, a strengthened commitment and coordination among the allies has been emphasized. Given members' differing priorities and security dilemmas regarding the effects of this situation on international security, an adequate response may be hindered. Therefore, a harmonized strategic framework focused on collective defense and deterrence is deemed necessary among NATO members.

As NATO's strategic concept evolves to confront modern security challenges, it also raises questions about balancing traditional defense responsibilities and emerging global threats. This is not merely a matter of concern, but a crucial aspect that requires attention. While focusing on Russia and the PRC is necessary, it risks overshadowing other vital problems, such as human security and transnational threats. At this point, it appears that implementing both military and non-military methods for collective security, with applications to its members and potential allies, will be a topic

of intense discussion. In today's international arena, NATO should insist on adaptation while ensuring its strategies are comprehensive and practical, addressing both immediate and long-term security imperatives. Today, NATO members do not share a common mission. NATO is not a voluntary union that 'works freely' for its members in the military sector. NATO is a tightly controlled system, complicated by horizontal relations and vertical dependencies among the Alliance's member states at the political and financial levels. Despite its non-military strategic approach, NATO is undoubtedly the world's largest military alliance. Therefore, given the large-scale changes in the global order and the emergence of numerous local conflicts and crises, it is natural for NATO to reassess its military and non-military strategic concepts and update them for the modern era. The changes that will occur after the change of US President Joseph Robinette Biden and the formation of the new White House administration will profoundly impact the formation of a new strategic concept for NATO, potentially leading to a more confrontational approach. This shift is likely to increase NATO's military and political pressure on the RF. The US factor will continue to be a key determinant of NATO's European presence, leading to an escalation of NATO's military power near Russia's borders and potentially drawing the EU and former Soviet countries into military-political tensions.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Chitadze N. Geopolitics, National, and Military Strategy. N. Chitadze (Ed.), *The Russia-Ukraine War and Its Consequences on the Geopolitics of the World*, IGI Global, 2023. P. 20–45. Available at: - URL: <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8521-7.ch002> (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 2 Devlen B. *Grand Strategy in Theory and Practice: The Need for an Effective American Foreign Policy*, By William C. Martel, *International Affairs*, 2015. 91(4), P. 924–925. Available at: - URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12384> (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 3 Jamison J.F., et Marines U.S. Marines (2002). *Writing The Last Chapter First: Operational Commanders And The 'Steady State'*, Joint Military Operations Department, Available at: - URL: <https://doi.org/10.21236/ADA409156> (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 4 Zagdsuren B. The Changes in Ensuring The Military Security Actions, *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*, - 2024. 2 (42), Available at: - URL: [https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal\\_ijitss/](https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/) (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 5 Sarjito A. Enhancing National Security: Strategic Policy Development in Defense Management. *Jurnal Pelita Nusantara: Kajian Ilmu Sosial Multidisiplin*, - 2024. 2(1), 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.59996/jurnalpelitanusantara.v2i1.524> (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 6 Waltz K. *Uluslararası Politikanın Değişen Yapısı, Uluslararası İlişkiler*, -2008. 5(17), P.3-44.
- 7 Girgin K. *21.Yüzyıl Perspektifinde Dünya Siyaseti*, Okumuş Adam Yayıncılık. -2002. P.30-54.
- 8 Kantarcı Ş., *Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Uluslararası Sistem: Yeni Sürecin Adı Koalisyonlar Dönemi Mi, Güvenlik Stratejileri*, -2012. 8 (16), 46-85.
- 9 Armaoğlu F., *20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi 1914-1980, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları*. -1987. P.31-65.

- 10 Oran B. Dönemin Bilançosu, Baskın Oran (Der.), Türk Dış Politikası, Cilt II, 3. Baskı, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul. -2002. P.65-84.
- 11 Hacısalihoğlu İ. Y., Avrasya Zemininde Şangay İş Birliği Örgütü Ve Türkiye, Jeopolitik, -2004, 3 (9), P.74-76.
- 12 Özlük E. Adil Savaş ve Irak Savaşı: Anakronik Bir Öğreti 21. Yüzyılda Yeniden Okumak, Selçuk Ün. İİBF Sos. Ek. Ar. Dergisi, -2015. 15 (30), P.15-58.
- 13 Yalçın H. B ve Duran, B. Suriye’de İç Savaş, Vekalet Ve Yıpratma, Hasan Basri Yalçın-Burhanettin Duran, (Ed.), Küresel Ve Bölgesel Aktörlerin Suriye Stratejileri, Seta Kitapları. -2016. P.13-44.
- 14 Canar B. Soğuk Savaş Sonrasında Amerika Birleşik Devletleri’nin Karadeniz Politikası, Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, -2012. 67(1), P. 49-80.
- 15 Белов В. А. Как России и НАТО выйти из их нынешнего тупика?, РЕГНУМ. 2020. Erişim adresi: [Электронный ресурс] - URL: <https://regnum.ru/article/3135496>. (дата обращения: 13.01.2025)
- 16 Замостьянов А., Великолепная восьмерка: как был создан противовес НАТО Варшавский договор противостоял Североатлантическому блоку, Известия İz, 2020. [Электронный ресурс] - URL: <https://iz.ru/1010265/arsenii-zamostianov/velikolepnaia-vosmerka-kak-byi-sozdan-protivoves-nato>. (дата обращения: 13.01.2025)
- 17 NATO Active Engagement, Modern Defence, Strategic Concept 2010, Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/nato\\_static\\_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf\\_publications/20120214\\_strategic-concept-2010-eng.pdf](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_publications/20120214_strategic-concept-2010-eng.pdf). (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 18 NATO Member Countrie, Erişim adresi: Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/cps/ru/natohq/topics\\_52044.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/ru/natohq/topics_52044.htm?selectedLocale=en) (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 19 Aksu F.E. NATO’nun Güvenlik Anlayışı ve Stratejik Konseptleri, Güvenlik Yazıları Serisi, 2019. No.23. Available at: - URL: <https://trguvenlikportali.com/wp-content/uploads> (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 20 NATO Member Countrie, 2024, 10 Mart. Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/cps/ru/natohq/topics\\_52044.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/ru/natohq/topics_52044.htm?selectedLocale=en) (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 21 Cyberpedia Стратегическая концепция Североатлантического союза, 2017. Available at: - URL: <https://cyberpedia.su/11xb556.html> (дата обращения: 03.01.2025)
- 22 Özer Y. Stratejik Konseptler Bağlamında NATO’nun Stratejik Kültür Dönüşümü, Güvenlik Yazıları Serisi, 2021. No. 58. [https://trguvenlikportali.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/NATOSTratejikKonsept\\_YusufOzer\\_v.1.pdf](https://trguvenlikportali.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/NATOSTratejikKonsept_YusufOzer_v.1.pdf) DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.24400.43522 (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 23 NATO Strategic Concepts 1968, 2022, 18 Temmuz. Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en) (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 24 Интерфакс Путин назвал НАТО инструментом внешней политики США”. 2017. [Электронный ресурс] - URL: <https://www.interfax.ru/forumspb/565091> (дата обращения: 23.01.2025)
- 25 Сибнет.ру Минобороны насчитало вокруг России 400 военных баз Запада. 2015. [Электронный ресурс]- URL: <https://info.sibnet.ru/article/421365/> (дата обращения: 23.01.2025)
- 26 Армейский В., Военные базы США и НАТО: их размеры и где они находятся. 2015. [Электронный ресурс] - URL: <https://army-news.ru/2015/06/voennye-bazy-ssha-i-nato-ix-razmery-i-gde-ony-naxodyatsya/> (дата обращения: 23.01.2025)
- 27 Абаринов В., Союз нерушимый. НАТО исполнилось 70 лет. 2019. [Электронный ресурс] - URL: <https://www.svoboda.org/a/29859524.html> (дата обращение: 23.01.2025)
- 28 Caner E. NATO Yeni Startejik Konsepti, Sun Savunma Net, 2023. Erişim adresi: Available at: - URL: <https://www.sunsavunma.net/nato-yeni-stratejik-konsepti/> (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 29 İldem T. NATO Yeni Stratejik Konsepti Nedir Ne Değildir?, Ekonomi ve dış Politikalar araştırma Merkezi, EDAM, -2022. 7(22), P.1-18.
- 30 NATO Strategic Concepts 1991, 2022, 18 Temmuz. Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en) (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 31 NATO Strategic Concepts 1999, 2022, 19 Temmuz. Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en) (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 32 Советская историческая энциклопедия. Советская энциклопедия, 1962, Том 2 — М., С.779-780.
- 33 ЕРЕШКО А. Шойгу назвал заявления министра обороны Германии ‘нападками ученицы младших классов’, ТАСС. 2020. [Электронный ресурс] - URL: <https://tass.ru/politika/10124131?nw=1606712039000>. (дата обращения: 23.01.2025)
- 34 NATO Strategic Concept 2022, Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/nato\\_static\\_fl2014/](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/) (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 35 Саможнев А. Доклад о реформе НАТО: До 2030 года РФ и КНР остаются главными соперниками, Российской газеты. 2020. [Электронный ресурс]- URL: <https://rg.ru/2020/12/02/doklad-o-reforme-nato-do-2030-goda-rf-i-knr-ostaiutsia-glavnymi-sopernikami.html> (дата обращения: 23.01.2025)

## **НАТО-НЫҢ ӘСКЕРИ ЕМЕС ТАКТИКА ШЕҢБЕРІНДЕГІ ҚАУІПСІЗДІК СТРАТЕГИЯЛАРЫ**

### **Аңдатпа**

НАТО-ның әскери емес стратегиялары тікелей әскери араласусыз қауіпсіздік мәселелерін шешудің әртүрлі тәсілдерін қамтиды. Бұл стратегиялар бейтарап мемлекеттермен ынтымақтастықты нығайтуға және оларды қауіпсіздікті тұтынушылардан жеткізушілерге айналдыруға, аймақтық тұрақтылықты нығайтуға бағытталған. Әскери және әскери емес күштерді гибриді қауіптерге қарсы біріктіру де өте маңызды, бұл саяси, экономикалық және әлеуметтік аспектілерді қамтитын кешенді тәсілдің қажеттілігін көрсетеді. Осы тұрғыда 2010 және 2022 жылдары НАТО енгізген Стратегиялық Тұжырымдамаларда терроризм, киберқауіптер және энергетикалық қауіпсіздік сияқты сын-қатерлермен күресудің әртүрлі әскери емес тәсілдері көрсетілген. Бұл ауысым дәстүрлі әскери әдістемелерден асып түсетін неғұрлым жан-жақты стратегияның қажеттілігін көрсетеді. Ол қазіргі заманғы қауіпсіздік мәселелерін шешуде альянс шеңберіндегі әскери емес тактиканың өсіп келе жатқан маңыздылығын мойындайды. НАТО-ның серпінді және дамып келе жатқан стратегиясы заманауи қауіпсіздік қатерлерін тиімді шешу үшін басқаруға, саяси келісімге және технологиялық жетістіктерге басымдық беретін әртүрлі әскери емес тактикаларды біріктіреді. Тек "жоғарыдан төменге" директиваларына сүйенудің орнына, "төменнен жоғарыға" стратегиялары арқылы заңды шешім қабылдау процестеріне төменгі деңгейді қамтитын тәсілдерге баса назар аударылады. Бұл инклюзивті әдістеме НАТО-ның қатығыстарды азайтуға және тұрақты басқару шеңберін құруға бағытталған әскери емес шараларды қамтитын стратегиялық тәсілдерінен айқын көрінеді. Дәстүрлі әскери шектеулерден басқа, НАТО аймақтық тұрақтылыққа, қауіпсіздікке және энергетикалық қауіпсіздікке төнетін қатерлерді кешенді түрде шешуге бағытталған негізгі дипломатиялық, саяси, экономикалық және технологиялық бастамаларды белсенді түрде қолдайды. Мақаланың мақсаты - 2010 және 2022 жылдардағы стратегиялық тұжырымдамаларды салыстырмалы талдау негізінде НАТО-ның әскери емес стратегияларының эволюциясын зерттеу, сондай-ақ гибриді қауіптерге, терроризмге және энергетикалық қауіпсіздік сын-қатерлеріне қарсы іс-қимылда кешенді тәсілдің («төменнен жоғары») тиімділігін анықтау болып табылады.

**Негізгі сөздер:** Халықаралық қауіпсіздік, қауіпсіздік стратегиялары, НАТО, стратегиялық тұжырымдама, аймақтық тұрақтылық,

## **СТРАТЕГИИ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ НАТО В РАМКАХ НЕВОЕННОЙ ТАКТИКИ**

### **Аннотация**

Невоенные стратегии Организация Североатлантического договора (The North Atlantic Treaty Organization - НАТО) включают в себя различные подходы к решению проблем безопасности без прямого военного вмешательства. Эти стратегии направлены на укрепление сотрудничества с нейтральными государствами и превращение их из потребителей в поставщиков безопасности, укрепление региональной стабильности. Объединение военных и невоенных сил против гибридных угроз также имеет решающее значение, что подчеркивает необходимость комплексного подхода, включающего политические, экономические и социальные аспекты. В этом контексте стратегические концепции, введенные НАТО в 2010 и 2022 годах, демонстрируют различные невоенные подходы к борьбе с такими вызовами, как терроризм, киберугрозы и энергетическая безопасность. Этот сдвиг подчеркивает необходимость более всеобъемлющей стратегии, выходящей за рамки традиционных военных методологий. Он признает растущую важность невоенной тактики в рамках альянса для решения современных проблем безопасности. Динамичная и развивающаяся стратегия НАТО сочетает в себе различные невоенные тактики, которые отдают приоритет управлению, политическому консенсусу и технологическому прогрессу для эффективного решения современных угроз безопасности. Вместо того, чтобы полагаться исключительно на директивы "сверху вниз", акцент делается на подходах, которые охватывают более низкий уровень юридических процессов принятия решений с помощью стратегий "снизу вверх". Эта инклюзивная методология очевидна в стратегических подходах НАТО, которые включают невоенные меры, направленные на сокращение конфликтов и создание устойчивой структуры управления. Помимо традиционных военных ограничений, НАТО активно поддерживает основные дипломатические, политические, экономические и технологические инициативы, направленные на комплексное решение угроз региональной стабильности, безопасности и энергетической безопасности. Цель статьи - проанализировать эволюцию невоенных стратегий НАТО на основе сравнительного анализа стратегических концепций 2010 и 2022 годов, а также выявить эффективность комплексного подхода («снизу вверх») в противодействии гибридным угрозам, терроризму и вызовам энергетической безопасности.

**Ключевые слова:** международная безопасность, стратегии безопасности, НАТО, стратегическая концепция, региональная стабильность.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Chitadze N. Geopolitics, National, and Military Strategy. N. Chitadze (Ed.), The Russia-Ukraine War and Its Consequences on the Geopolitics of the World, IGI Global, 2023. P. 20–45. Available at: - URL: <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8521-7.ch002> [in English] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 2 Devlen B. Grand Strategy in Theory and Practice: The Need for an Effective American Foreign Policy, By William C. Martel, International Affairs, 91(4), 2015. P. 924–925. Available at: - URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12384> [in English] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 3 Jamison J.F., et Marines, U.S. Marines Writing The Last Chapter First: Operational Commanders And The 'Steady State', Joint Military Operations Department, 2002. Available at: - URL: <https://doi.org/10.21236/ADA409156> [in English] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 4 Zagdsuren B. The Changes in Ensuring The Military Security Actions, International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science, 2024. 2 (42), Available at: - URL: [https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal\\_ijitss/](https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/) [in English] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 5 Sarjito A. Enhancing National Security: Strategic Policy Development in Defense Management. Jurnal Pelita Nusantara: Kajian Ilmu Sosial Multidisiplin, 2024. 2(1), 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.59996/jurnalpelitanusantara.v2i1.524> [in English] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 6 Waltz K. Uluslararası Politikanın Değişen Yapısı, Uluslararası İlişkiler, 2008. 5(17), P.3-44. [in Turkish]
- 7 Girgin K. Yüzyıl Perspektifinde Dünya Siyaseti, Okumuş Adam Yayıncılık. 2002. 21.P.30-54. [in Turkish]
- 8 Kantarcı Ş., Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Uluslararası Sistem: Yeni Sürecin Adı Koalisyonlar Dönemi Mi, Güvenlik Stratejileri, - 2012. 8 (16), 46-85. [in Turkish]
- 9 Armaoğlu F., Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi 1914-1980, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları. -1987. 20. P.31-65. [in Turkish]
- 10 Oran B. Dönemin Bilançosu, Baskın Oran (Der.), Türk Dış Politikası, Cilt II, 3. Baskı, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul. 2002. P.65-84. [in Turkish]
- 11 Hacısalihoğlu İ. Y., Avrasya Zemininde Şangay İş Birliği Örgütü Ve Türkiye, Jeopolitik, -2004, 3 (9), P.74-76. [in Turkish]
- 12 Özlük E. Adil Savaş ve Irak Savaşı: Anakronik Bir Öğretiyi 21. Yüzyılda Yeniden Okumak, Selçuk Ün. İİBF Sos. Ek. Ar. Dergisi, -2015. 15 (30), P.15-58. [in Turkish]
- 13 Yalçın H. B ve Duran, B. Suriye'de İç Savaş, Vekalet Ve Yıpratma, Hasan Basri Yalçın-Burhanettin Duran, (Ed.), Küresel Ve Bölgesel Aktörlerin Suriye Stratejileri, Seta Kitapları. -2016. P.13-44. [in Turkish]
- 14 Canar B. Soğuk Savaş Sonrasında Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nin Karadeniz Politikası, Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, -2012. 67(1), P. 49-80. [in Turkish]
- 15 Belov V. A. Kak Rossii i NATO vyjti iz ih nyneshnego tupika? [How can Russia and NATO break out of their current impasse?]. 2020. Erişim adresi: Available at: - URL: <https://regnum.ru/article/3135496> [in Russian] (accessed: [13.01.2025](#))
- 16 Zamost'yanov A., Velikolepnaya vos'merka: kak byl sozdan protivoves NATO Varshavskij dogovor protivostoyal Severoatlanticheskomu bloku, [The Magnificent Eight: How a Counterweight to NATO Was Created The Warsaw Pact opposed the North Atlantic bloc]. Izvestiya. 2020. Available at: - URL: <https://iz.ru/1010265/arsenii-zamostianov/velikolepnaiia-vosmerka-kak-byi-sozdan-protivoves-nato>. [in Russian] (accessed: [13.01.2025](#))
- 17 NATO Active Engagement, Modern Defence, Strategic Concept 2010, Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/nato\\_static\\_f2014/assets/pdf/pdf\\_publications/20120214\\_strategic-concept-2010-eng.pdf](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_f2014/assets/pdf/pdf_publications/20120214_strategic-concept-2010-eng.pdf). [in English] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 18 NATO Member Country, NATO 2024, 11 Mart. Erişim adresi: Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/cps/ru/natohq/topics\\_52044.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/ru/natohq/topics_52044.htm?selectedLocale=en) [in English] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 19 Aksu F.E. NATO'nun Güvenlik Anlayışı ve Stratejik Konseptleri, Güvenlik Yazıları Serisi, 2019. No.23. Available at: - URL: <https://trguvenlikportali.com/wp-content/uploads> [in Turkish] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 20 NATO Member Country, NATO, 2024, 11 Mart. Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/cps/ru/natohq/topics\\_52044.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/ru/natohq/topics_52044.htm?selectedLocale=en) [in English] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 21 Cyberpedia. Strategicheskaya koncepciya Severoatlanticheskogo soyuza. [Strategic Concept of the North Atlantic Alliance]. 2017. Available at: - URL: <https://cyberpedia.su/11xb556.html> [in Russian] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 22 Özer Y. Stratejik Konseptler Bağlamında NATO'nun Stratejik Kültür Dönüşümü, Güvenlik Yazıları Serisi, 2021. No. 58. [https://trguvenlikportali.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/NATOSTratejikKonsept\\_YusufOzer\\_v.1.pdf](https://trguvenlikportali.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/NATOSTratejikKonsept_YusufOzer_v.1.pdf) DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.24400.43522 [in Turkish] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 23 NATO Strategic Concepts 1968, - 2022, 18 Temmuz. Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en) [in English] (accessed: [03.01.2025](#))
- 24 Interfaks Putin nazval NATO instrumentom vneshnej politiki SSHA, [Putin called NATO an instrument of US foreign policy]. 2017. Available at: - URL: <https://www.interfax.ru/forumspb/565091> [in Russian] (accessed: [23.01.2025](#))
- 25 Sibnet.ru. Minoborony naschitalo vokrug Rossii 400 voennyh baz Zapada. 2015. [The Ministry of Defense counted 400 Western military bases around Russia]. Available at: - URL: <https://info.sibnet.ru/article/421365/> [in Russian] (accessed: [23.01.2025](#))

- 26 Armejskij V. Voennye bazy SSHA i NATO: ih razmery i gde oni nahodyatsya [US and NATO military bases: their sizes and locations] . 2015. Available at: - URL: <https://army-news.ru/2015/06/voennye-bazy-ssha-i-nato-ix-razmery-i-gde-oni-naxodyatsya/> [in Russian] (accessed: 23.01.2025)
- 27 Abarinov V. Soyuz nerushimyj. NATO ispolnilos' 70 let., (2019). [An unbreakable union. NATO turns 70] Available at: - URL: <https://www.svoboda.org/a/29859524.html> [in Russian] (accessed: 23.01.2025)
- 28 Caner E. NATO Yeni Startejik Konsepti, Sun Savunma Net, 2023. Erişim adresi: Available at: - URL: <https://www.sunsavunma.net/nato-yeni-stratejik-konsepti/> [in Turkish] (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 29 İldem T. NATO Yeni Stratejik Konsepti Nedir Ne Değildir?, Ekonomi ve dış Politikalar araştırma Merkezi, EDAM, 2022. 7(22), P.1-18. [in Turkish]
- 30 NATO Strategic Concepts 1991, - 2022, 18 Temmuz. Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en) [in English] (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 31 NATO Strategic Concepts 1999, - 2022, Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_56626.htm?selectedLocale=en) [in English] (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 32 Sovetskaya istoricheskaya enciklopediya. [Soviet Historical Encyclopedia]. Tom 2 — M., Sovetskaya enciklopediya, 1962, P.779-780. [in Russian]
- 33 ERESHKO A. SHojgu nazval zayavleniya ministra oborony Germanii ‘napadkami uchenicy mladshih klassov’ [Shoigu called the German Defense Minister's statements "attacks by a primary school student"]. TASS. 2020. Available at: - URL: <https://tass.ru/politika/10124131?nw=1606712039000>. [in Russian] (accessed: 23.01.2025)
- 34 Strategic Concept 2022, NATO. 2022. Available at: - URL: [https://www.nato.int/nato\\_static\\_fl2014/](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/) [in English] (accessed: 03.01.2025)
- 35 ERESHKO A. SHojgu nazval zayavleniya ministra oborony Germanii ‘napadkami uchenicy mladshih klassov’. [NATO Reform Report: Russia and China Remain Main Rivals Until 2030]. TASS. 2020. Available at: - URL: <https://rg.ru/2020/12/02/doklad-o-reforme-nato-do-2030-goda-rf-i-knr-ostaiutsia-glavnymi-sopernikami.html> [in Russian] (accessed: 23.01.2025)

#### Information about the authors:

Gülşah Özdemir - PhD, Associate Professor of the Balıkesir University Burhaniye Faculty of Applied Sciences, 10700 Burhaniye-Balıkesir, Türkiye.

E-mail: [gulsah.ozdemir@balikesir.edu.tr](mailto:gulsah.ozdemir@balikesir.edu.tr)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8900-2560>

Elchin Mürseloğlu - **corresponding author**, PhD, Associate Professor of the Balıkesir University Burhaniye Faculty of Applied Sciences, 10700 Burhaniye-Balıkesir, Türkiye.

E-mail: [elikiyar84@hotmail.com](mailto:elikiyar84@hotmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4340-3566>

#### Информация об авторах:

Гульшах Оздемир - PhD, доцент факультета прикладных наук Бурхание Университета Балыкесир, 10700 г.Бурхание-Балыкесир, Турция.

E-mail: [gulsah.ozdemir@balikesir.edu.tr](mailto:gulsah.ozdemir@balikesir.edu.tr)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8900-2560>

Эльчин Мурселоглу – **основной автор**, PhD, доцент факультета прикладных наук Бурхание Университета Балыкесир, 10700 г.Бурхание-Балыкесир, Турция.

E-mail: [elikiyar84@hotmail.com](mailto:elikiyar84@hotmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4340-3566>

#### Авторлар туралы ақпарат:

Гүлшах Оздемир – PhD, Балыкесир университетінің Бурхания қолданбалы ғылымдар факультетінің доценті, 10700 Бурхание-Балыкесир к., Түркия.

E-mail: [gulsah.ozdemir@balikesir.edu.tr](mailto:gulsah.ozdemir@balikesir.edu.tr)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8900-2560>

Эльчин Мурселоглу – **негізгі автор**, PhD, Балыкесир университетінің Бурхания қолданбалы ғылымдар факультетінің доценті, 10700 Бурхание-Балыкесир к., Түркия.

E-mail: [elikiyar84@hotmail.com](mailto:elikiyar84@hotmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4340-3566>