

*Global Challenges Conference:
New Security Challenges in the New Millennium,
Friends University in Wichita, Kansas / US
6-8 April 2006*

**THE MISSION POSSIBLE:
THE US FOREIGN POLICY, HOMELAND SECURITY AND SOFT POWER**

Dr. Fatih KARAOSMANOGLU
Fulbright Visiting Professor, Georgetown University
fkaraosmanoglu@yahoo.com
fk47@georgetown.edu

Police Academy
The Faculty of Security Sciences & the Institute for Security Sciences
Ankara-TURKEY
2006

Introduction

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.

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, 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.

In my presentation, the following conceptual hypothesis will be scrutinized: *the use of soft power is more significant and critical than that of hard power in a foreign policy with a homeland security issue*. The hypothesis, which will be put forward in my presentation, emphasizes however that the soft power must have a preference over the hard power in a foreign policy with a homeland security issue.

Here, although the US foreign policy will be dealt with, Turkey will be conceptualized as the misconceived country. Both countries suffered and are suffering from the acts of terrorism, Al Qaida and PKK respectively and conjunctionally, resulting in paying attention homeland security issues in their foreign policies. The hypothesis I put forward here seems to be compatible with the philosophy of Soft Power 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.

The Conceptual Linkages about Foreign Policy, Homeland Security and Power

Foreign Policy and Homeland Security

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 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.

Hard and Soft Power

Today the US is a top power. As Paul Kennedy rightly says in the *Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, the evidence of the political history shows us that nothing lasts forever in international/world politics: let us think Rome, Ottoman State, British Empire.

Concerning whether the USA can 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 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.¹ 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.

¹ Joseph S. Nye, Limits of American Power, *Political Science Quarterly- the Journal of Public and International Affairs*, winter 2002-03, p.545-560.

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. 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.²

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 why Turkish Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan's behaviour about not giving address with the Denmark Prime Minister Rasmussen due to the presence of the RojTV. Saying that Roj TV is linked with the terror organization, and asking Danish government to ban immediately Roj TV broadcasting from Copenhagen, the US letter, sent to Danish Justice Minister Espersen, put Rasmussen in a difficult situation.³ On recent terrorism-related events in some southeastern cities of Turkey, Abdullah Gul, Foreign Minister of Turkey, declared that Denmark would take steps to ban the Roj TV, which broadcasted from Copenhagen, announcing the local people not to open their own shopping buildings.

The Homeland Defense before the 9/11⁴

Homeland Defense until the 20th Century

After the 9/11, there is actually nothing new for the homeland defense because it has been constant in the American foreign policy since the creation of the US. 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

² 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.

³ *Zaman Newspaper*, November 21, 2005.

⁴ For a detailed information see: Daniel S. Papp, *American Foreign Policy: History, Politics and Policy*, 2005.

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 the post-independence period, the *geographical isolation* was the key factor in defending the homeland given that transportation and communication technologies were not improved much in 18th and 19th centuries. *European geopolitical competition* and *occasional international cooperation* comes after the geographical isolation. The US had become the beneficiary of the power struggles in Europe and secured its objectives with limited interference from the great states of the continent such as France and Britain playing as global actors in world affairs. The demilitarization of the American-Canadian border was the result of cooperation with the Great Britain. Such demilitarization in 19th century American foreign policy was a significant contribution to the homeland defense. Despite those factors, Americans at that time thought that the Great Britain was a threat to the US. 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.

The Homeland Defense before and after the Cold War

The crisis involving Mexico and the Zimmermann telegram, resulting in that the US saw Germany's action as a direct threat to the US security, precipitated America's 1917 entrance into the WW1. On the other hand, Japan's 1941 direct attack on military bases at Pearl Harbor also precipitated the United States' entry into the WW2. As far as the US homeland is concerned, it was never attacked meaningfully during the WW2 despite the fact that the Americans had experiences such as blacking the coastal cities out, windborne balloon bombs of Japan into the Northwest America, an occasional spy of Germany on the Atlantic coast.

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. That is why, the US homeland defense consisted of a combination conventional and nuclear military preparedness deterring the foreign attack on the US and its allies; military alliances; early warning systems; air defense and ballistic missile defense systems; arms

control agreements, and intelligence and diplomacy. For much of the Cold War, the MAD⁵ policy was at the core of the deterrence policy of the United States. The philosophy behind the MAD was the conception of the *first and the second strikes*. In other words, a state would not strike first if it believed that it would suffer a massive retaliatory strike in response. It might be said that such defensive system worked well because of the unexistence of a ballistic missile attack

After the cold war, even if the Americans felt secure after the end of the cold war due to the soviet collapse, it was not long lived. In other words, when Americans lived the 90s, they had growing concerns about the defense of the American 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*, which is 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.

One of the reasons for growing concerns about the US homeland security is the growing reliance of the US and other developed states on the network systems. The philosophy of Gerstein's book, *Securing America's Future* puts forward⁶ that Americans has therefore fears that rogue states or the enemy might attack the information systems leading to the information warfare. Gerstein analyzes in his book a number of capstone documents such as the 2002 National Security Strategy, the 2002 Homeland Security Strategy, The Commission of National Security/ 21st Century, and the 9/11 Commission report. As the 1997 President's Commission report *Critical Foundations: Protecting America's*

⁵ The MAD stands for Mutual Assured Destruction.

⁶ Daniel M. Gerstein, *Securing America's Future: National Strategy in the Information Age*, (Westport, Connecticut, London: Prager Security International, 2005).

Infrastructures showed, some believe that the US might face *an electronic Pearl Harbor* which could devastate the American economy.

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. Thus, there were some responses to homeland vulnerability before the 9/11. Some members of Congress, who were concerned with the above mentioned fears, thus sought to establish a federal agency with the responsibility for homeland security. *The proposed 1996 Nun-Lugar Bill* suggested for example a homeland defense zcar who would be placed over the many agencies involved with protecting the US from outside threats. Although a homeland defense zcar was not created, the Clinton Administration established in 1998 *the US Commission on National Security in the 21st Century*⁷ to review American security policies because of the idea that there was a need to enhance the US security in general and homeland security in particular. The commission was going to reformulate national security in a more comprehensive fashion than that since 1947. One of the recommendations made by the final study of the commission was to ensure the homeland security.⁸

Interestingly, *the final report of the Commission on National Security* was very specific on the need for enhanced homeland security: “*A direct attack against American citizens on American soil is likely over the next quarter century. The risk is not only death and destruction but also a demoralization that could undermine US global leadership. In the face of this threat, our nation has no coherent or integrated governmental structures.*” We therefore recommend *the creation of a new independent National Homeland Security Agency* with responsibility for planning, coordinating, and integrating various US government activities involved in homeland security.”⁹ The need for homeland defense

⁷ Also called the Hart-Rudman Commission after its two chairs

⁸ Appendix B: Recommendations from The Commission on National Security / 21st Century, in: Daniel M. Gerstein, *Securing Ameica's Future: National Strategy in the Information Age*, (Westport, Connecticut, London: Prager Security International, 2005).

⁹ US Commission on National Security in the 21st Century, Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change, Phase 3 Report of the Commission, Washington DC, January 31, p. 4. See also: Appendix B: Recommendations from The Commission on National Security / 21st Century, in: *Daniel M. Gerstein, Securing Ameica's Future: National Strategy in the Information Age*, (Westport, Connecticut, London: Prager Security International, 2005).

received its first attention in the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR)¹⁰ in 1997. The *Joint Vision 2020* also stated that the future joint force must be proactive in improving communications, planning, interoperability, and liaison with potential interagency participants. These factors are important in all aspects of interagency operations, but particularly in the context of direct threats to citizens and facilities in the *US homeland*¹¹. Although homeland defense was included in the full spectrum, it did not receive widespread attention until the 9/11.

The Homeland Defense after the 9/11

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.

The following plans have been developed to struggle global terrorism in the short term:

First, the office of homeland security, which a year later became the Department of Homeland Security, was created.¹² 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*,

¹⁰ QDR is the Defense Department's once-every four-years exercise to sort out defense priorities.

¹¹ Joint Vision 2020, America's Military-Preparing for Tomorrow, *Joint Force Quarterly* (summer 2000), p.66.

¹² 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.

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.

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.

Prior to the formation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the report concerning the results of the RAND 2002 nationwide survey¹³ is significant. Conducted one year after the 9/11 attacks and just prior to the formation of the DHS, the RAND survey has the goal of assessing how prepared the Law Enforcement Agencies are for terrorism. According to the report¹⁴, there are two kinds of responsibilities: *first* is to coordinate first-responder terrorism preparedness efforts and to work with state and local first responders to improve terrorism preparedness such as training, exercises, and equipment support, *second* is to direct terrorism preparedness grant programs at the federal level for all emergency response providers and to measure programmatic performance and improvements in domestic preparedness.

After the 9/11 attack, the intelligence and security agencies of the USA made their assessment of the threat as well. They mainly said that “we do not know the extent of Al Qaida’s capabilities in the US but we have reason to believe that there are additional cells deployed in the US and no reason to doubt their capabilities.” After this assessment, the

¹³ This RAND survey was conducted, for the National Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism (MIPT), as part of a subcontract to a larger study undertaken by the University of Alabama at Birmingham and the University of Oklahoma to create a national database of American terrorism.

¹⁴ Lois M.Davies and the others, *When Terrorism Hits Home: How Prepared are State and Local Law Enforcement ?*, (USA: RAND Corporation, 2004), p.

Bush administration had a plan for a homeland security resulting in the DHS as the cabinet-level department. It integrates a wide range of agencies under one umbrella and creates some new ones within homeland security.¹⁵

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 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.¹⁶

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.¹⁷

The US Foreign Policy and Turkey

As far as the US National Security Strategy of 2002/2006 is concerned, it has both hard and soft power elements in the form of a complete set than before. 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. 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

¹⁵ George Friedman, *America's Secret War: Inside the Hidden Worldwide Struggle between America and Its Enemies*, (New York: Doubleday, 2004), p.109.

¹⁶ *New York Times*, 27 September 2005.

¹⁷ George Friedman, *America's Secret War*, opcit, p.126.

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.

To be able understand why the US foreign policy with a homeland security, it is important to reflect here the characters of the American foreign policy.

Homeland Conception

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 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 case, 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 despite the policy of making it freedom. Given that there exists a potential risk for civil war, especially after the Samara operation, 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 Middle East.

Unilateralism

The hard-line perspectives of the president George W. Bush and his senior foreign and defense policy officers has become controversial in not only the US and but also the international community. In fact, after the 9/11 attack Bush doctrine emerged articulating

primarily neoconservative logic and language. The doctrine itself supports not only the use of overwhelming force in the face of potential threat but also pre-emption as strategic policy. Concerning this, *Jim George* (2005) argues in his essay, titled *Leo Strauss, Neo conservatism and US Foreign Policy*, that the political legacy of Strauss has a more compelling factor. *Brendon O'Connor* argues also in his article, *Beyond the Cartoon*, that to understand the Bush Administration, biographical literature is so important: the son of a president, the Evangelical Christian, and the Texan. In early 40s that changed his life seriously, he was named as *Bombastic Bushkin* by his friends.¹⁸

The following incidents show that the US foreign policy has a unilateralist character: the decision to fight war against Iraq despite the lack of an explicit mandate from the United Nations Security Council, the rejection of a series of major international instruments such as the Kyoto Protocol on climate change, the Rome Statute of International Criminal Court, the International Landmine Ban Treaty, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, and a New Protocol to the Biological Weapons Convention. Literatually speaking, *Two Blasts against Unilateralism*¹⁹, *the Paradox of American Power*²⁰, *the High and the Mighty*²¹ have all been the reflective of the movement from multilateralism to unilateralism.

I agree with the view of Skidmore (2005), who underlines the growing *unilateralism* of the US foreign policy as the *structural effects* because with the removal of the Soviet threat, the American presidents have got greater scope to act independently of international opinion abroad. If we look at the definition of John Gerard Ruggie (1993), he maintains that there are two dimensions of *multilateralism* including first, *investing in the creation and maintenance of international institutions for coordination purposes* such as participation, provision of resources and rhetorical support, second, *complying with the*

¹⁸ Brendon O'Connor, *Beyond the Cartoon: George W. Bush and His Biographers*, *Political Studies Review*, volume: 3, number: 2, April 2005, p.163-174.

¹⁹ Charles William Maynes, *Two Blasts Against Unilateralism*, in: *Understanding Unilateralism in American Foreign Relations* (Ed.) Glyn Prins, (London: The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2000).

²⁰ Joseph Nye, *the Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go it Alone*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

²¹ Stanley Hoffman, *the High and the Mighty*, *the American Prospect*, 13 (24): 28-31.

*norms and decision making processes of these institutions*²², the US did not take the second dimension. The American policymakers demanded that the other countries must respect the norms of such institutions, the US believed the right to freedom to act outside of these norms.²³

Neo-conservatism

The term ‘neo-conservatism’ refers maximalists/internationalists group in analyzing the US conservative foreign policy thinking especially in the 1990s. This group advocates the use of the overwhelming power to create a unipolar world order. It also advocates that the American values should be the central to the foreign policy due to the universal values rather than a choice of particular culture, and that the US should do all in its power to assist the others to share in their benefits. That means that in foreign policy, realism is principle because of the validity of *democratic peace theory*²⁴ or worldwide democracy leading to guarantee the peace and American security.²⁵

Conservatives and neo-conservatives therefore disagree on the importance of promoting human rights to the US foreign policy. The result of the survey carried out by Noonan (1999) indicated 59 percent of neo-conservatives favoring promoting human rights abroad compared to just 38 percent of conservatives. There are also disagreement between the two factions over the intervened issues of peace keeping and nation building. According to the survey, 79 percent of conservatives said that peace keeping and nation building should not be a key mission for the US foreign policy, whereas 44 percent of neoconservatives agreed. Similarly regarding the Bosnia case, the figures are parallel to this.²⁶

²² John Gerard Ruggie, *Multilateralism: The Autonomy of An Institution*, in: John Gerard Ruggie (ed.) *Multilateralism Matters: the Theory and Practice of an Institutional Form*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), p.3-50.

²³ David Skidmore, *Understanding the Unilateralist Turn in US Foreign Policy*, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, (2005), 207-228.

²⁴ M. Doyle, *Liberalism and World Politics*, *American Political Science Review*, (1986) 80, p.1151-1169.

²⁵ E. Abrams, *Security and Sacrifice: Isolation, Intervention, and American Foreign Policy*, (Indianapolis: Hudson Institute, 1995).

²⁶ M. P. Noonan, *Conservative Opinions on US Foreign Policy*, *Orbis*, 43, p. 621-639.

It is believed that neo-conservatism is the driving force behind the Bush foreign policy despite the existence of an opposite view²⁷ to this. Saying that ‘we will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent’²⁸, George W. Bush really sticks the neo-conservative goal of democracy promotion. The 2002 *National Security Strategy* includes not only the conservative ideas but also neo-conservatives ones. While it reiterated the ‘non-negotiable demands’ of human dignity, the rule of law, limited government, justice, religious tolerance, free speech, it also included the intention to extend the peace by working to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets and free trade to every corner of the world’²⁹

The first Bush administration seemed to reflect, namely, realism, neo-conservatism, and internationalism.³⁰ For *realists*, the followings are important: the prioritization of national defense and politics among great powers, and the return to a war and fighting capability. For *neo-cons*, it is significant to make an emphasis on regime change in rogue states such as Iraq, Iran, North Korea. For *internationalists*, developmental assistance initiatives were vital issue.

The second Bush administration has a more realist approach. That means that states are not only the primary agents in international politics but also selfishly pursuer of national interests. In the pursuit of national interests, material capabilities including military one are also the most important resources. Being anarchic character international politics is distinct from domestic politics. Practically speaking, non-state actors are discounted, unilateralism is more preferable than multilateralism, military force has a privilege,

²⁷ See: Steven Hurst, Myths of Neo-conservatism: George W. Bush’s ‘Neo-conservative’ Foreign Policy Revisited, *International Politics*, 2005, volume: 42, issue: 1, p.75-96. According to his view, those who argue that neo-conservatism has been the key element for the Bush administration are in faulty in two ways: first, exaggerating the influence of a one particular ideology, second underestimating the importance of other key elements determining American policy since 2001 because ideology is only a small part of any total explanation of George W. Bush’s foreign policy.

²⁸ www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html

²⁹ www.usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/secstrat.html

³⁰ During the first Bush administration, it had a mixed team of advisers: Condoleezza Rice, National Security adviser and Donald Rumsfeld, Defense Secretary were hard-line realists. Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and Undersecretary of Defense Douglas Feith were neo-conservatives named shortly as *neocons*. Secretary of the Treasury Paul O’Neill and Secretary of State Colin Powell were internationalists.

international law and human rights are expendable because morality is never universal. It has therefore the two-pronged national security strategy: *first* is the preservation of the US primacy with an emphasis on increasing and exploiting America's military advantages multilaterally, if not, unilaterally. *Second* is 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.³¹

The second Bush administration's strategy involves thus a strong state-centric approach with an emphasis on security, a stress on hard power, and unilateral approaches to international problems. Developmental, humanitarian, environmental and cultural goals are the secondary issues. Even poverty is made agenda in terms of security interests, it does not make poor people into terrorists but it can make weak states vulnerable to terrorists-networks within their borders. Besides, it does not emphasize international law and institutions such as the United Nations. Global legal frameworks have therefore not been followed in the cases of Iraq, Kyoto Protocol on environment, Rome Treaty establishing the ICC. The 2006 National Security Strategy keeps and reflects such strategy as well.

Regarding such strategy, despite being attacked by Al Qaida terrorist organization, which is a non-state actor, the US response was largely state centric. Likewise, although there are other benefits of going to war, the interest of national security has been kept its key importance. The president Bush said in reference to his decision for invasion of Iraq: '*I made the decision I made, in order to protect our country first and foremost*'. Implying America's *hard power*, military has been used in a preemptive fashion to defend the interest of national security. Interestingly, according to a report by Georgetown University Group, chaired by former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, '*Bush has less global flexibility post-Iraq, broad resistance to US leadership initiatives...diminished US influence in Europe, Asia and the Middle East*'.³² This result means that in Iraq in the

³¹ 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.

³² 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.

Middle East, Bush's foreign policy could not be successful in the protection of homeland security as a foreign behavior because the Bush administration could not do the balanced use of hard and soft powers, which is expected to necessitate global flexibility, and to diminish resistance to the political initiatives.

A Misconceived Country: Turkey

Since the end of the cold war Turkey has the opportunities and constraints in the new world. Turkey 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 survey³³ 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)..

What I argue is that the increase in the role of Turkey to play in the region will depend on its balanced use of the hard and soft power in both domestic and foreign policy. However, not only Turkey but also the US are not still able to read exactly the changes regarding *threat and security* issues especially terrorism truly. Let us take an example, the reflex of both the US and Turkey regarding terrorism is characteristically the same and based on the use of force and hard power. The Iraqi situation getting complicated in the Middle East, the philosophy of the recent preparation of the Turkish draft counter-terrorism act (CTA) supports my argument.

That's why, the Bush administration's foreign policy is criticized from this perspective as well. For instance, one of the critics is Joseph S. Nye, Professor at Harvard University. He

³³ <http://www.tesev.org.tr/temmuz2002/e1.html>. 3 April 2006.

has a book of *Soft Power*³⁴. Nye, who visited the Georgetown University two and half month ago and gave his speech, argues 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.

Apart from Nye, 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.³⁵

Regarding the Turkish draft CTA, which is now on the agenda of Turkey after the recent terrorism related events in the southeastern part of the country, unless modified, it has the following the unacceptable elements: *First*, it provides that every law enforcement officials and all judges all over the country can use the powers concerning the measurements provided by such Act. *Second*, power users are only limited to the Secretary of Home Affairs, exceptionally, to a supreme-court judge in the British CTA. The decisions are also taken on the basis of intelligence information provided by the MI5 intelligence service. In other words, whereas, in the UK, the users of powers are very limited and centralized because of the heavy responsibility, in Turkey, they are unlimited and decentralized, which is likely to lead to the violation of human rights, and thus the risk for its democratization process in the country.

Third, the draft Turkish CTA accepts the concept of *heavy and close risk* rather than *suspicion* on the application of the measurements for a commitment of *a crime in future*

³⁴ Joseph S. Nye (2006), *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, Public Affairs, New York.

³⁵ Daniel M. Gerstein (2005), *Securing America's Future: National Strategy in the Information Age*, Praeger Security International, Westport, Connecticut/London.

provided there. Who can explain the heavy and close of the risk with *a crime in future*. The measurements provided by the draft act are as follows: *among the others*, the restriction on doing a job (judicial), the restriction on entrance to or exit from an area (administrative), and restriction on travel (administrative), confiscation of IDs, passport, driving licence etc (administrative), taking an example of DNA and Fingerprint, photo to be able to use in criminal investigations (judicial). The heavy measurements might be applied for those who are *not involved* in a crime or those who *are not suspect* of a crime. That would be unjust and violates human rights. In other words, the decisions taken by law enforcement officials and courts will be based on *intelligence information* rather than legally *evidence*. That means that there are actually *no courts but secret commissions*. There would not be any actual defense in that case. I think these are not acceptable because the draft Act takes Turkey into a police state rather than the rule of law. *Lastly*, it is valid permanently.

The logic of a struggling with terrorism in Turkey, in my opinion, is that it is therefore left only to the use of force and thus to the shoulders of law enforcement officials. That means that the draft CTA, if adopted, would be a Hurricane Katrina- like effect, may be more than this in Turkey. 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 as I said before have some earns from the European Union accession process.³⁶

We must bear in mind that 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 legacy³⁷ has

³⁶ 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,

³⁷ 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.'*³⁷ 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.

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 Secretary General of the National Security Council³⁸, 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 and business in home and abroad especially in the Central Asia.

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 in 2005 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

³⁸*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.³⁸ 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.

years. Turkey is today on the way of becoming one of the largest economies of Europe despite the structural problems in economy like big current account and trade deficits, social security problems, and big external and domestic debt.³⁹

Conclusion

Even if a foreign policy behavior with homeland security is concerned with both hard and soft powers, there is a democratic understanding that a domestic policy behavior with homeland security is primarily based on soft power rather than hard one. Given that there are two choices in international politics, the US foreign policy should be formed under the paradigm of political idealism rather than the political realism leading to the use of hard power.

Despite its legitimacy problem, the 19-day war with a hard power resulted in the down of tyrannous Saddam regime. However, the US has used the hard power or military power in asymmetry after the 19-days war in the Iraqi occupation. The third anniversary of the occupation started also with a risk for potential civil war after the Samara operation that is likely to cause the clashes between the Shiites and Sunnis. I think the US goes around the line of *loosing* because the US did not think that the post -19 days war situation in Iraq is strictly concerned with the Iraqi homeland security necessitating the soft power as well.

The twin towers attack is the turning-point for both the US and the rest of the world. Unfortunately, in the post-9/11 period, the Muslim world, having the problems such as poverty, uneducated persons, etc., did not question itself sufficiently in the light of Islam. Especially it did not look at the issues of suicide bombings and nuclear energy/weapons from the perspective of its prohibitions. Likewise, the US did not question itself sufficiently as well: It keeps the unbalanced use of the hard and soft power which is significant especially in the foreign policy with a homeland security issue. As Paul Kennedy rightly says in the *Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, it would be inevitable for the US to loose its strength. The unbalanced use of hard and soft power signs also that

³⁹ Fatih Macit (2006), *the Turkish Economy Today*, an Unpublished Article, PhD Candidate in Economics Department at Georgetown University.

there is an uncertainty in the post cold war era. However, there would be an uncertainty before the balanced situation.

With a book titled *Bound to Lead*, Joseph S. Nye does not essentially agree with Paul Kennedy's book implying that the US was going to go the way of Britain and others. In *the Paradox of American Power*, refusing the thought of realism based on action and reaction, he puts forward, nonetheless, the two trends: the *information revolution* and *globalization*. Regarding the first trend, for example, terrorists currently are able to organize trans-nationally and to use technology for greater destruction than in the past. According to the globalization trend, the US is too great to be challenged by any nation-state, but it is still not strong enough to solve new transnational problems by itself.⁴⁰

Turkey is now not on the line of 'loosing' due to the EU process resulting in the policy changes about the democratization and human rights which are significant instruments of soft power. It is likely that Turkey will however step back if the draft CTA is passed without modification because the Copenhagen criteria is still under consideration. It is likely that the draft CTA will cause bad human rights practice, and that many cases will be brought before the European Court of Human Rights.

⁴⁰ Joseph S. Nye, American foreign Policy: The next 25 years, *Foreign Policy Forum*, Foreign policy Association, 2003.