

*NATO & TIPS Terrorism Project:  
Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multi Dimensional Approach,*

*September 8-9, 2006,  
Washington DC*

**THE PREVENTION OF TERRORISM:  
FOREIGN POLICY AND HOMELAND SECURITY**

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih KARAOSMANOGLU**

*Fulbright Visiting Professor 2005-2006, Georgetown University*

[fkaraosmanoglu@yahoo.com](mailto:fkaraosmanoglu@yahoo.com) / [fk47@georgetown.edu](mailto:fk47@georgetown.edu)

Police Academy

*The Faculty of Security Sciences & the Institute for Security Sciences*

Ankara-TURKEY

2006

**The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**  
*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'*  
*September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*  
**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

## **Introduction**

This study will examine the issue of *terrorism* from the perspective of *foreign policy and homeland security* relationship. As we know, the concept of homeland security has become agenda of international community especially after the 9/11 event. As a domestic policy, however it is and has already been used much by states. However, after the 9/11 it has become used as foreign policy behavior of states especially by the US with the preemptive war doctrine.

Before passing the issue I want to say some remarks here. First, concerning the title of this session, *Public Safety Policies*, the first question I had is in which way there exists a connection between *public safety* and, especially, *foreign policy / politics*. I think the title of *Public Safety Policies* implies that today in our world we cannot refer *public* only as the people or things that belong to the people in a country or community as a whole (see Collins Cobuild Dictionary). In other words, there is an assumption here that there is a *globalized public* today. May be it is true but I am not sure on that. Second, there has been a slightly change about the title of my presentation, actually I don't know why it has been so. It is originally the *Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security*, not '*Foreign policy and Terrorism*').

## **Terrorism: A New Threat Conception**

One of the most important problems facing the world is how states will address new security challenges today. During the cold war, there was almost a clear policy on how the Eastern and the Western states behave about security issues. In the aftermath of the Soviet collapse, states have found themselves in the changing environment of security policies as well. One reason is that the concept of *threat* changed. In the post-cold war era, there is however still a lack of an internationally defined policy or growing consensus on the nature of security threats and the response type. All states must therefore reconsider their security interests and policies. How states are adjusted to this difficult environment is really a key question to such issues.

**The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**  
*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'*  
*September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*  
**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

Especially after the 9/11 attacks, international terrorism as a threat and keeping the homeland safe has become the agenda of states to struggle with. That is the reason why, as we all know, in the days following the 9/11, having the preemptive strategy and war, the US acted to declare war to Afghanistan and displace the Taliban regime, and then to make military intervention to Iraq. All those actions are based on the 2002 US National Security Strategy (NSS) and the National Strategy for Homeland Security. Updated in 2006, the NSS provides the complete set of the elements of power than its predecessors. However, hard power including political, military, and intelligence remain the tools of choice rather than that of soft power including economic, social, cultural and informational.

**Is Homeland Security Issue New in Foreign Policy?**

Homeland security/defense issue is not new for countries such as the US and Turkey because it goes back to their establishments. In the US, for instance, however, there has been a dispute on what must be done for homeland defense and what made up the homeland.

In the past, especially during the American Revolution, it had a difficulty of differentiating between the defense and offence. The America thus invaded Canada in 1775 because of the conception and envisioning by revolutionary leaders of a homeland including Canada, but the Canadians defeated the invasion at Quebec. And then the Americans applied to the other colonists such as France for Loans to stop the war. In my opinion, today one of the problems facing the US and Turkey is therefore to draw the line between the defense and offence regarding the fight against al Qaida and PKK respectively.

In the post-independence period, the *geographical isolation* and *European geopolitical competition* were the key factors in defending the homeland. However, it was known that the continental US was only rarely attacked by the outside powers: namely, apart from the civil war, the 1812 War with Great Britain, the 1916 attack by Poncho Villa, Mexican revolutionary leader, to New Mexico leading to the death of 17 Americans. Just before

## **The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**

*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'  
September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*

**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

the cold war the US saw Germany's action in regard to the Zimmermann telegram and Japan's action in regard to Pearl Harbour as a direct threat to the US security.

During the Cold War, the Americas thought that the real threat to the homeland came from the Soviets having nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles. After the cold war, Americans had growing concerns about the defense of the homeland. These are *weapons of mass destruction (WMD), the clash of civilizations, nuclear proliferation, information warfare*. I want to say something here about the Huntington's clash of civilizations. He argues that it is likely that the western and Islamic civilizations will be in conflict in near future. He imagined that religion and culture would be the major defect lines dividing the world. It seems to me that if we establish the political idealism rather than political realism in international relations leading to *dialogue of civilizations* based on human's free will, we can prevent the potential risk of the clashes. Actually different religions such as islam, christianity and judaism have all prohibitions about the killing unlawfully. That is the reason why, those who defend dialogue of religions should be supported in the world.

After the attacks such as the 1993 WTC and the 1995 Oklahoma City, the Americans considered that the US was not totally safe, the extent of the threat was more comprehensive than before. The Clinton Administration established in 1998 *the US Commission on National Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*<sup>1</sup> to review American security policies. Interestingly, its *final report* was very specific on the need for enhanced homeland security. However, it did not receive widespread attention until the 9/11.

### **What is changed in Foreign Policy with a Homeland Security after the 9/11**

Generally speaking, there exist many aspects of a foreign policy such as history, politics and policy, and the issues are ranging from homeland security, democracy and human rights to the use of force in foreign policies. Those who study on a foreign policy should not devote their attention to only the homeland security issue area in foreign policies. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Also called the Hart-Rudman Commission after its two chairs

**The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**  
*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'*  
*September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*  
**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

reason is clear: there are of course other issue areas to be given attention such as environment, immigration, international law and institutions.

However, homeland issue area is among the most critical in the conduct of foreign policies of countries including Turkey and the US especially after the 9/11.

I therefore concentrated on homeland security issue area causing sometimes to break the relations between the US and Turkey, for instance, concerning the Iraq case. The September 11, which is the terrible event like Pearl Harbor in American history, focused the attention of the American people and government on the most fundamental responsibility for defending homeland. Turkey has suffered the PKK terrorism for decades.

In the US, most of the security and defense initiatives have historically been directed toward using hard power externally to achieve national goals and objectives. These efforts have been led primarily by the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the Intelligence agencies. Since the 9/11 attacks, the US has however begun a concerted effort to focus domestically using all elements of power as well as to coordinate, synchronize, and integrate the efforts of numerous federal, state and local government agencies and organizations. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has been charged with such efforts. There are strict limits on the use of hard power within the borders of the continental United States or on citizens, either here or abroad.

**Prevention of Terrorism: Using Soft and/or Hard Power?**

The evidence of the political history shows us that nothing lasts forever in international/world politics: let us think Rome, Ottoman State, British Empire.<sup>2</sup> If so, it is significant to ask a question here: Can the USA lead toward a better world over the future? *Joseph S. Nye* makes analysis with studying the sources of US power. In his analysis, there are three kinds of powers; namely, military, economic and soft powers. Besides, there exist three types of countries; the *first* is weak pre industrial states coming out of collapsed empires, the *second* is modernizing industrial states such India and

---

<sup>2</sup> See: Paul Kennedy, the *Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*.

**The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**  
*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'*  
*September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*  
**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

China, the *third* is post industrial states such as Europe, North America and Japan. The use of force is still common in the first, still accepted in the second, but less tolerated in the third.

Despite that, military force play role in international politics today. Economic power has become more important than in the past. However, According to *Nye*, Americans need also to pay attention to soft power implying indirect way to exercise power. Values, institutions and qualitative foreign policy etc.<sup>3</sup> In my opinion, values, of course, include human rights democracy, accountability etc. That is the reason why, as the source of soft power, all NGOs which develop soft power in the world should be supported.

*Joseph S. Nye* also described Turkey as having strong soft power in the Middle East. *Nye* continued to say that that's the reason why the Parliament in Turkey refused the Draft Act giving powers to the Turkish government for passing of American Troops to the Northern Iraq in 2003. In my opinion, *Nye's* idea is partly true because Turkey is a country, not really having a soft power but becoming a soft power especially after the cold war. After the 9/11 one of the main reasons for the diversity of foreign policy approaches concerning the security issues is the conception of hard and soft power.<sup>4</sup> I shared this idea with my Danish Colleague in the Middle East Studies Association (MESA) annual meeting held in Washington DC on 19-22 November 2005 to explain Turkish Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan's behaviour about not giving address with the Denmark Prime Minister Rasmussen due to the presence of the RojTV. In my opinion the act to send soldier to Lebanon also shows us that Turkey becomes soft power in the Middle East.

### **Reconceptualisation of Power in Foreign Policy with a homeland Security**

From the standpoint of terrorism prevention, actually how can we reconceptualise power in a foreign policy? I want to say something: it is essential to use *soft power rather than*

---

<sup>3</sup> Joseph S. Nye, Limits of American Power, *Political Science Quarterly- the Journal of Public and International Affairs*, winter 2002-03, p.545-560.

<sup>4</sup> Joseph S. Nye, on Soft Power, the speech made on 15 November 2005 at Georgetown University. He was named as the Secretary of Soft Power during the Question-Answer section.

**The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**

*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'  
September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*

**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

*hard one in a foreign policy with a homeland security issue.* Hence such hypothesis emphasizes that the soft power must have a preference over the hard power in a foreign policy with a homeland security issue.

Both the US and Turkey suffered and are suffering from the acts of terrorism, Al Qaida and PKK respectively and conjunctionally, resulting in paying attention to homeland security issues in their foreign policies. The hypothesis seems to be compatible with the philosophy of Soft Power understanding of Harvard Professor Joseph S. Nye, who was called as the Secretary of Soft Power at the time when he made a speech on November 15, 2005 at Georgetown University.

The hypothesis seems also to be supported by Gerstein's suggestion that *the ability to use hard and soft powers in an integrated and synchronized manner is critical to the successful defense of the US, the people and ideals and values.* As Gerstein (2005) pointed out in his book, *Securing America's Future*, the US National Security Strategy, the National Strategy for Homeland Security will not be sufficient for ensuring America's security in the twenty first century. Having the view that today the efforts are more heavily weighted to the use of hard power, Gerstein suggest a new National Security Act: It must take a comprehensive view of the Information Age environment, national goals and objectives, and the ways and means available to satisfy these goals and objectives. He thus focuses on the development of a new US national security strategy in the information age.

As I said before, the homeland defense became the significant issue on the agenda of the American government after the 9/11. Here it should be borne in mind that in the US, most of the security and defense initiatives have historically been directed toward using hard power externally to achieve national goals and objectives. These efforts have been led primarily by the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the Intelligence agencies. Since the 9/11 attacks, the US has however begun a concerted effort to focus domestically using all elements of power as well as to coordinate, synchronize, and integrate the efforts of numerous federal, state and local government agencies and organizations.

## **What Has Been Done to Fight Against Terrorism**

In the US the following has been done: *First*, the Department of Homeland Security was created.<sup>5</sup> The concept behind the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security was to unify federal forces and protect the US from a new host of terrorist threats. The patriot act was signed on October 26, 2001. The patriot act expanded the capabilities of the intelligence and law enforcement communities to investigate terrorist groups by easing restrictions on wiretaps, email monitoring, and sneak and peak searches (without service of warrant). The patriot act made information on financial transactions available to intelligence and law enforcement agencies.

*Second*, a coalition of states to combat terrorism was sought. In this respect, the UN resolutions, intelligence sharing, and obtaining promises of military support were all part of the effort to build an international coalition. The UN adopted the resolution 1373 on September 28, 2001, which required all member states to suppress terrorist finances, and the resolution 1390 on January 16, 2002, which modified and expanded the international sanctions against the Taliban and al Qaeda.

*Third*, the American military force was used against the Taliban and al Qaeda in Afghanistan. The US also made it clear that the war against terrorism would be carried out to other countries if necessary, and then the military force was used against the Saddam regime in Iraq. *Fourth*, Congress created Emergency Response Fund.

Being the lead federal agency responsible for disaster relief, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is the division of the DHS as well. However, after the Hurricane Katrina and Rita, which caused disasters in cities which are at the coasts of the Gulf of Mexico in the southern US, the president Bush offered the department of defense (DoD) as the more appropriate agency to stabilize the situation, and then hand back over

---

<sup>5</sup> Note: When Thomas Ridge, Pennsylvania Governor, was appointed as the head of the Office of Homeland Security, the authority of Ridge was not as extensive as that proposed in the 1996 Nunn-Lugar bill, but homeland defense had advocate with Cabinet rank and reasonable access to the president. In late 2002, the office of homeland security was reorganized as the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The DHS combined 22 agencies into one and employed 170.000 people. The office must deal with complex measures needed to identify, prevent and if necessary respond to an attack on the US. The challenges are daunting, but failure to meet the challenges might be catastrophic.

**The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**  
*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'*  
*September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*  
**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

the homeland security. However, it is said that this scenario needs to change and revise the *Posse Comitatus Act of 1878*. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) is against the Bush's scenario for such Act having two characteristics: first, it guarantees the civil liberties of American citizens, second, it separates military and civil powers. If *Posse Comitatus Act* is changed today, the US becomes a latin Americanised country.<sup>6</sup>

The military was also reorganized. Prior to September 11, there was no unified military command being responsible for the US. Although there are commands for every other region in the world, there was not a command for the homeland. That is why, a command, named Northern Command, not the US Command because of claiming that the military had no authority over the soil and should not in any way be given command authority, was set up to protect the USA.<sup>7</sup>

**“Homeland” Conception in foreign policy**

Although the US National Security Strategy has hard and soft power elements, hard power including political, military, and intelligence remain the tools of choice rather than that of soft power including economic, social, cultural and informational. In other words, keeping security and the global war on terrorism is strictly considered to be based on the conception of hard power rather than soft power. The important thing is however to use hard and soft power in justice and a balanced way. The US makes the unbalanced use of hard and soft power in the foreign policy with a homeland security, especially after the 9/11. The reasons why this is so can be found in the characteristics of the US foreign policy, such as realism, neo-conservatism, unilaterality, and “homeland” conception.

In my opinion, both realism and homeland conception are worth examining here.

Given that historically there has been a dispute on what must be done for homeland defense and what made up the homeland, and that in the past, especially during the American Revolution, it had a difficulty of differentiating between the defense and offence, it seems to me that today the Americans, the leaders and the intellectuals should

---

<sup>6</sup> *New York Times*, 27 September 2005.

<sup>7</sup> George Friedman, *America's Secret War*, opcit, p.126.

**The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**

*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'  
September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*

**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

reconsider whether or not there is the same rationale for the homeland defense especially in the aftermath of the 9/11. In other words, let us take for example Iraqi and Lebanon cases, there should be a more discussion about the following question: *do the US leaders and decision makers have a wider homeland conception and envisioning which is fictional rather than territorial?*

Answers to this question are concerned with the methodology of which the following questions include: *what must be done for homeland defense? What makes up the homeland?* A wider homeland conception, I think, would bring the difficulty of differentiating between the defense and offense. It would therefore lead to the unbalanced use of hard and soft powers in foreign policy. Practically speaking, as long as the above questions are not answered satisfactorily, it cannot be understood why there exist counter attacks/insurgency/terrorism in Iraq and Lebanon, despite the policy of making it freedom or the Greater Middle East Policy. Given that there exists a potential risk for civil war between Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds in Iraq, obviously it would be very bad not only for Iraqi people but also the US seeking stability and security in Iraq and the Middle East.

Wider homeland conception also requires the maintenance of *homeland security* - especially against rogue states and terrorists set on using weapons of mass destruction- with an emphasis on defense through missile shields, and on offense through smaller, quicker and more technologically advanced military forces. Such conception thus leads to a largely state centric response despite being attacked by terrorist organizations like Al Qaida, which is a non-state actor.

An Administration having such a wider, fictional homeland conception cannot be successful in the protection of homeland security as a foreign behavior. May be because of that, a report by Georgetown University Group, chaired by former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger included that *'Bush has less global flexibility post-Iraq, broad resistance to US leadership initiatives...diminished US influence in Europe, Asia and the*

## **The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**

*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'  
September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*

**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

*Middle East*'.<sup>8</sup> The main reason is that the Bush administration could not do the balanced use of hard and soft powers.

As far as the Turkish foreign policy is concerned, since the end of the cold war it has the opportunities and constraints in the new world. It reflects also the three patterns towards: *first*, to help the transformation of the Eurasia, *second*, to struggle to keep the stability in the borders, and *third*, to realize the goals of the Europeanization. At the early years of the post cold war era, Huntington with the *Clash of Civilisations* thesis described Turkey and its foreign policy as a *torn* country being in dilemma in choosing either 'Brussels, Tashkent, Mecca'. However, concerning the *Turkish Public Opinion on Membership to the European Union*, TESEV's survey<sup>9</sup> published in 2002 showed that the majority of Turkish people (% 64) are in favour of Turkey's EU membership (Brussels). Ironically, they (% 76) do not know the Copenhagen criteria which Turkey has to fulfill like all other candidate countries in order to become a member of the EU. However, the survey indicates that the two most important benefits of joining the EU for Turkey are the economic development (% 52) and the improvement of democracy (% 28).

Although Turkey has a foreign policy with a homeland security on the basis of the second pattern, it has not a wider, fictional homeland conception. However, in my opinion, not only the US but also Turkey are not still able to read exactly the changes regarding the threat and security, and terrorism issues truly. The reflex of both the US and Turkey regarding terrorism is characteristically the same, and thus based on the use of force and hard power. The Iraqi situation getting complicated in the Middle East as well as the philosophy of the preparation of the Turkish draft counter-terrorism act (CTA) last year supports my argument. The logic of the draft CTA in Turkey, in my opinion, was that it the fight against the terrorism was going to left only to the use of force and thus to the shoulders of law enforcement officials.

---

<sup>8</sup> The report is cited in: Louis Klarevas, W version 2.0: Foreign Policy in the Second Bush Term, *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, summer 2005, volume: 29, number: 2, p.165-173.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.tesev.org.tr/temmuz2002/e1.html>. 3 April 2006.

## **The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**

*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'  
September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*

**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

What I argue is that the increase in the role of Turkey to play in the region will depend on the balanced use of its own hard and soft power in both domestic and foreign policy. That's why, criticizing the Bush administration's foreign policy, Joseph S. Nye, having a book of *Soft Power*<sup>10</sup> argues that it is easy to use hard power and to come down the dictators but what about after that? The situation becomes a problem unless soft power is under consideration. He continues to say, let us take an example, the Iraqi situation: the war took only 19 days in 2003 but since then the situation is not clear, and understood that there are many things to be done.

But what I or we know is that individuals and societies don't want to live without the values they earned, and that they don't want to turn back from the stage they reached on the universal values such as democracy, secularism, human rights etc. Turkish people have some earns from the European Union accession process.<sup>11</sup>

What I am saying is that I am not pessimistic about my country. We have a changing environment in Turkey as well as in the Globe since the end of the cold war. Having the military coups and their negative effects until 1980, Turkey drew its new route in 2000s because of the following developments: *first*, as the founder of the Republic of Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's legacy<sup>12</sup> has become more understandable in the community, *second*, the consciousness of soft power such as republicanism, secularism, democracy, human rights and tolerans has therefore raised in the community, *third*, much has done towards the access to the European Union such as the adoption of the new penal code and the criminal trial act, the appointment of a civilian instead of military person as the

---

<sup>10</sup> Joseph S. Nye (2006), *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics, Public Affairs*, New York.

<sup>11</sup> See Fatih Karaosmanoglu, The Draft Counter-Terrorism Act: Is Turkey Going Back or Ahead? The Michigan State University, Criminal Justice Department, Colloquium: 30 January 2006, 555 Baker Hall,

<sup>12</sup> Despite the fact that Atatürk and his close friends were military officers, he inspired civilianization of the regime and keeping the army far away from the partisan politics. The army was closely identified with the values of the new republican regime, which is a western orientated, secular, nationalist. Its responsibility is as follows: *'The duty of the armed forces is defend and protect the Turkish homeland and the Turkish Republic which is defined with the Constitution.'*<sup>12</sup> This rule saying only *'defense and protection'* brings also a constraint upon the armed forces. That is why, the military regimes in Turkey were not permanent regimes because they gave path to the general elections, which is a significant element of democracy in Turkey. The Turkish military has remained a highly professional institution. It gives an overriding importance on the duty of its external defense.

## **The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**

*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'*

*September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*

**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

Secretary General of the National Security Council<sup>13</sup>, the insistence on the system of the European Court of Human Rights by both making payment of *Loizidu* case and approving the additional protocols to the European Convention on Human Rights etc. Turkey is also a changing modern state beyond a classic modern state consisting of only its military, police and tax collectors. Being a significant element of modern state, the civil society is not satisfactorily developed. However, in Turkey, the young generations with self confidence, which is basic in a civil society, are more dynamic and more tolerant each other. That's why, in the post cold war era, the Turkish people are doing well especially in the area of education, of course, security education, and business in home and abroad especially in the Central Asia. This conference done as the NATO & TIPS Project (Turkish Institute for Police Studies, established by chief police officers who are doing graduate studies in the US) also shows attitude of Turkish people changing.

In addition, economically Turkey is getting growth. For the last three years after the 2001 economic crises, there has been considerable improvement in Turkish economy. Since 2002 the economy is attaining a %7 GNP growth average, which is well above growth rate of developed and many developing countries. Turkey as a notoriously high inflation country is now defeating the inflation. For the last 30 years it is the first time that inflation came down to single digits as low as %8. The exports of the country have more than doubled in the last three years reaching to \$70b. In addition to all these Turkey has been an attractive place for foreign direct investment for the last two years due to the political and macroeconomic stabilities lacking in the past. The amount of foreign direct investment received in 2005 is equivalent to one that has been received for the last ten years. Turkey is today on the way of becoming one of the largest economies of Europe despite the structural

---

<sup>13</sup>*Note:* The most important instrument or agency the military has been influential at the highest level of administration is the National Security Council (NSC), created first by the 1961 Constitution which was the production of the 1960 coup. The NSC later on was redefined by the law made after the 1980 Coup. The NSC is composed of the Prime Minister, the Minister of National Defense, the Chief of General Staff, the Minister of Interior, the Minister of Interior, The Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Commander of the Army, the Commander of the Navy, the Commander of the Air Force, and the Head of the Gendarmerie, under the Chairmanship of the President.<sup>13</sup> The Minister of Justice and Deputy Prime Ministers are also included in the NSC by the 2001 Amendment. All members of the NSC had an equal voice and decisions reached by consensus. Its agenda is prepared by the president in the light of suggestions made by the Prime Minister and the Chief of the General Staff.

## **The Prevention of Terrorism: Foreign Policy and Homeland Security,**

*Paper presented at the Conference 'Understanding and Responding to Terrorism: A Multidimensional Approach'  
September 8-9, 2006, Washington DC,*

**By Fatih Karaosmanoglu**

problems in economy like big current account and trade deficits, social security problems, and big external and domestic debt.<sup>14</sup>

### **Conclusion**

What should be done is to make a balanced use of hard and soft powers in foreign policy with a homeland security. Given that there is a democratic understanding that a domestic policy behavior with a homeland security is primarily based on soft power rather than hard one, in the country having foreign policy with a homeland security, decision-makers should think of the situation in the invaded country having also its own homeland security as a domestic behavior basically necessitating the soft power.

For instance, the US, in my opinion, did not think of much the post 19 days-war situation in Iraq. That's why the situation in Iraq becomes complicated in Iraq, generally in the Middle East. What can be done? Given that there are two choices in international politics, foreign policy should be formed under the paradigm of political idealism rather than political realism leading to the use of hard power. Otherwise, as Paul Kennedy rightly says in the *Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, it would be inevitable for losing the power. The unbalanced use of hard and soft power signs also that there is an uncertainty in the post cold war era. However, there would be an uncertainty before the balanced situation.

---

<sup>14</sup> Fatih Macit (2006), *the Turkish Economy Today*, an Unpublished Article, PhD Candidate in Economics Department at Georgetown University.