

İsa ERASLAN

M.A. Thesis in International Relations

JUNE - 2012

ASCENDING IMPORTANCE OF TURKEY WITHIN THE VEERING DIRECTION
OF NATO'S MISSION AFTER 9/11

Thesis submitted to the

Institute of Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

International Relations

by

İsa ERASLAN

Fatih University

June 2012

© İsa ERASLAN

All Rights Reserved, 2012

APPROVAL PAGE

Student : İsa ERASLAN
Institute : Institute of Social Sciences
Department : International Relations
Thesis Subject : Ascending Importance of Turkey within the Veering
Direction of NATO's Mission after 9/11
Thesis Date : June 2012

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet ARABACI
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Berdal ARAL
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Berdal ARAL

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Savaş GENÇ

Asist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali BALKANLIOĞLU

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet KARAKUYU
Director

AUTHOR DECLERATIONS

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is the final copy of the thesis including final revisions as accepted by my examiners. The data in this thesis were not used in any other scientific study. Other studies which were used in the thesis had been referred accordance with scientific norms.

İsa ERASLAN

June, 2012

ABSTRACT

İsa ERASLAN

June 2012

ASCENDING IMPORTANCE OF TURKEY WITHIN THE VEERING DIRECTION OF NATO'S MISSION AFTER 9/11

NATO has been the most effective and important alliance and defence organization since the end of the Cold War. In 1949, when NATO was founded, twelve states were members, but today NATO is a 28 membered colossal defense organization and NATO members make % 70 of the total military spending in the World. Right after the September 11 attacks in 2001, the Article 5 was implemented for the first time in the history of the organization and the Alliance took the commandments of the ISAF units in Afghanistan over. In recent years, the impact of NATO forces in Libya operation, and the debates over what NATO can do in a possible operation in Syria indicate that NATO has had vast transformation since its establishment. The aim of this thesis is to discuss the role of Turkey within the historical transformation process of NATO and to show that Turkey has an increasing position in NATO within the "New World Order" formed after the Soviet Union. The second aim is to discuss the effect of 9/11 and "war on terror" over NATO and Turkey. The thesis has a proposal that if the position of Turkey is given due importance and initiatives, NATO's achievements and credibility would increase.

Key words: NATO, ISAF, Afghanistan, 9/11

KISA ÖZET

İsa ERASLAN

Haziran 2012

11 EYLÜL SONRASI NATO'NUN DEĞİŞEN MİSYONU

ÇERÇEVESİNDE TÜRKİYE'NİN ARTAN ÖNEMİ

Soğuk Savaş'ın bitişinden bu yana NATO en önemli ve etkili savunma örgütü. 1949'da NATO ilk kurulduğunda 12 üyesi vardı ama bugün gelinen noktada ittifak, 28 üyeli devasa bir savunma örgütü ve tüm Dünya'da ki savunma harcamalarının yüzde yetmişi NATO üyesi ülkeler tarafından yapılıyor. 11 Eylül 2001 terör saldırılarının hemen ardından NATO tarihinde ilk defa beşinci maddeyi uyguladı ve terörizme savaş ilan etti. Afganistan savaşı bittikten bir süre sonra ISAF kuvvetlerinin komutasını devralan örgüt hala bu görevi devam ettiriyor. Son zamanlarda, Libya da NATO kuvvetlerinin etkisi, olası bir Suriye operasyonunda NATO'nun rolünün ne olacağı üzerine yapılan tartışmalar da gösteriyor ki, savunma örgütü olarak kurulan NATO büyük bir değişim geçirdi ve de değişmeye devam ediyor. Bu tezin amacı, ittifakın tarihi dönüşüm süreci içerisinde Türkiye'nin rolünü tartışmak ve ittifakın görev tanımları değiştikçe Türkiye'nin de öneminin arttığını göstermektir. Bununla birlikte, eğer Türkiye'ye gerekli imkanlar tanınır ve de hakettiği önem verilirse NATO'nun başarısı ve de saygınlığının artacağı savunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: NATO, ISAF, Afganistan, 11 Eylül

LIST OF CONTENTS

Approval Page	ii
Author Declarations	iii
Abstract	iv
Kısa Özet	v
List of Contents	vi
List of Abbreviations	x
Acknowledgements	xi
CHAPTER I: SECURITY IN A BI-POLAR WORLD	
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. NATO's Search for Rival after the Soviet Union: Is the Islam New Threat?	3
1.3. NATO during the Cold War	5
1.4. Turkey and NATO during the Cold War	8
CHAPTER II: NATO AFTER THE COLD WAR: FROM COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TO "EUROPE WHOLE AND FREE"	
2.1 The Collapse of the Soviet Union	12
2.2. The New Strategic Concept	13
2.3. The Transformation of the Alliance: Out of Area or Out of Business?	14
2.4. Disintegration of Yugoslavia and the Conflict in Bosnia	16
2.4.1. The Rise of Nationalism and Fall of an Empire	16

2.4.2. The Approach of EU and UN to the Conflict in Bosnia	18
2.4.3. Seeking for Security outside the Borders: Bosnia and Herzegovina	20
2.4.4. Turkey's Activism during the Bosnian War	21
2.5. Kosovo Conflict	26
2.5.1. Out of Area or Out of Business	26
2.5.2. Kosovo and Turkey	32
2.6. A General Evaluation	34
CHAPTER III: SEPTEMBER 11 TERROR ATTACKS AND THE NEW MISSION OF NATO	
3.1. NATO and the War on Terror	37
3.2. The Road to September 11: Rise of the Taliban	39
3.3. The Story of Al Qaeda	40
3.4. The Perception of 9/11 in the World	45
3.5. The Perception of 9/11 by NATO	49
3.6. The War in Afghanistan	51
3.7. ISAF mission and NATO	53
3.8. Resurgence of the Taliban	56
3.9. Turkish Role in ISAF	57
3.9.1. Turkey's Cultural Ties with Afghanistan	58
3.9.2. Turkey's Military Support	60
3.9.3. Turkey's Contribution to Education and Economic Development in Afghanistan	62

3.9.4. Turkey's Role as a Negotiator in Afghanistan	64
3.10. A General Evaluation	65
CHAPTER IV: NATO, LIBYA AND TURKEY	67
4.1. How did the Unrest Start in Libya?	67
4.2. The French Eagerness for Action	68
4.3. UN's Response	69
4.4. NATO Intervention	70
4.5. Turkey's Position	71
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION	
5.1. Conclusion	75
Bibliography	82

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NATO	:North Atlantic Treaty Organization
WEU	:Western European Union
UN	:United Nations
ISAF	:International Security Assistance Force
CSCE	:Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
NACC	:North Atlantic Cooperation Council)
NAC	:North Atlantic Council
UNSC	:United Nations Security Council
CFSP	:Common Foreign and Security Policy
UNPROFOR	:United Nations Protection Force
EAPC	:Euro–Atlantic Partnership Council
PfP	:Partnership for Peace

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge all those who helped me during my studies. I owe my special thanks to Prof. Dr. Berdal ARAL, who guided me through the whole process with his valuable wisdom and advice.

I am also grateful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Savaş Genç for believing in me. He has always supported and encouraged me.

I am thankful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Arabacı, who has always been kind and helpful to me and without his understanding it might have been really hard for me to finish my studies.

I would like to thank Asist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali Balkanlıođlu, who convinced me to start my academic career and helped me through the whole process.

I should also mention my wife, Yasemin, without whose emotional support maybe I would not be able to finish my thesis on time.

CHAPTER I: SECURITY IN A BI-POLAR WORLD

1.1. Introduction

In 1949, when NATO was founded, twelve states were members: the United States, the United Kingdom, Norway, Portugal, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands. In 1952, Greece and Turkey became members. West Germany became a member in 1955 and Spain in 1982. After the end of the Cold War the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland became members in 1999. In 2004 Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia joined the organization.¹ Lastly, in 2009 Croatia and Albania became members. Macedonia and Cyprus failed to become members because Macedonia was vetoed by Greece and Cyprus was vetoed by Turkey. Today NATO is a 28 membered colossal defense organization and NATO members make nearly % 70 of the total military spending² in the world.

Despite the fact that it has been such an effective and powerful defense organization, there have been periods when NATO's existence was occasionally questioned. We can divide 63 years of the history of the Alliance into three periods: Cold War period, Post-Cold War period, and the period after September 11. All these three periods paved the way for various crises, which were followed by transformations.

With the collapse of the Soviets, the Alliance, which was first founded in 1949 to ensure the security of Europe by balancing colossal military power of the Soviets, had become an institution whose existence could be questioned. While the discussions were going on, NATO came to prominence once again

¹ Jennifer Medcalf, NATO: A Beginner Guide (London, Oneworld Publications, 2005), 13.

² CIA-The World Factbook <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/> Accessed in 03.05.2012

when WEU and UN became ineffective in the conflicts in the Balkans. It contributed considerably to the conflict resolution by taking initiatives. The conflicts in the Balkans paved the way for the transformation of the Alliance.

Another crisis deeply affected NATO after the September 11 attacks in 2001. Right after the attacks, the Article 5 was implemented for the first time in the history of the organization and the Alliance took the commandments of the ISAF units in Afghanistan over. In recent years, the impact of NATO forces in Libya operation, and the debates over what NATO can do in a possible operation in Syria indicate that NATO has had vast transformation since its establishment.

NATO, which was first a collective defense organization, showed that it can interfere into crises that threaten its borders through Bosnian and Kosovan tragedies. By going to Afghanistan, NATO demonstrated that wherever there is threat for its allies, it could interfere, which has been a new definition of task for the Alliance. Up to now, NATO has overcome serious crisis – France’s withdrawal from NATO integrated forces, coup d’état in Portugal, Turkey and Greece, Turkey’s “invasion” of Cyprus and, besides overcoming all these serious problems, it also became the winner party of the Cold War.³ During the Cold War there had never been a war in which NATO involved as a fighting force, but today it is actively involved in six different operations. Fighting against Taliban and securing stability in Afghanistan; peacekeeping in Kosovo; assisting force for the defense of reforms in Bosnia and Herzegovina; patrolling the Mediterranean Sea, training Iraq forces, and promoting peace and stability in Libya.⁴ For the past 18 years NATO forces have been engaged in various military operations outside the borders of NATO member states. Since the end of the Cold War, NATO has had many “out of area” operations. However, as terrorism has

³ Todd Sandler and Keith Hartley, *Past, Present, and into the 21st Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

evolved to be the most dangerous security threat for Western countries, NATO has been transformed into a security organization from being a defence organization.

1.2. NATO's Search for Rival after the Soviet Union: Is the Islam New Threat?

After September 11 terror attacks, operation against Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan caused many civilian losses. Many people started thinking that "the fight against terrorism" had a potential to spread other Muslim states, and after the invasion of Iraq, it was seen that a new American strategy was being applied to form a "Greater Middle East".

All these developments were dangerous for the future of Turkish foreign policy. After many years of isolation from the Muslim world, Turkey aimed to develop her ties with the Middle East, but American side wanted Turkey to be active in its so-called "fight against terrorism". While Islam was being seen as a threat by many, as a state with Muslim majority, Turkey started feeling a dilemma.

Afghanistan was the first test of Turkey in these new circumstances. Because, especially this dramatic event has evolved NATO into somewhere else and also the role of Turkey within the organization has changed. To understand the new role of Turkey within the organization there are questions to be answered: What are the achievements of NATO-Turkey relationship before 9/11 and what may be the benefits of it after 9/11? Has NATO enhanced and/or changed its role in the Balkans, Middle East and Afghanistan to cope with post-9/11 repercussions and how does this situation effect Turkish role within the organization? How has NATO's security policy evolved within its continuing transformation process that has laid down the foundations of its new global role? If Turkey has a role to play

in the new mission definition of NATO, what must it be? A military force or a soft power?

If we look at the situation from Turkey's side: The questioning of the reliability of the alliance by Turkey after Cyprus crisis and the arms embargo, the discussion over the necessity of Turkey for European security and defense after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the reluctance of the European states to defend Turkey against possible Iraq missile attack during the invasion of Iraq by United States in 2003; despite all these crisis, does it still worth for Turkey to remain as a member of NATO?

In this thesis, the answer for the above mentioned questions will be discussed. In the first chapter, brief information over the history of the NATO during the Cold War will be given to have a better understanding of the transformation process. After that, the role of Turkey within the organization will be evaluated briefly without giving detailed information. The collapse of the Soviet Union and its effects in the European security will be analyzed. The disintegration of Yugoslavia and ethnic conflicts in the Balkans are also included in the second chapter. How all these changes affected Euro-Atlantic area and Turkey, how it affected NATO will be discussed and the new place of Turkey as a soft power within the organization will be examined. To achieve this, the cases of Bosnia and Kosovo are given importance as a transformer for the role of NATO and Turkey correspondingly.

In the third chapter, at the beginning, the discussions over Islam and terrorism will be given and then a brief information will be given about the modern history of Afghanistan. After that, the formation of Taliban and Al Qaeda will be examined to have a better understanding for the 9/11 terror attacks. The perception of 9/11 in the world and Turkey will be examined. Right after that, ISAF mission of NATO will be examined and evaluated. The importance of Turkey for the success of this operation will be analyzed. The role of this operation over the new role of NATO and the new role of Turkey

as a soft power within NATO out of area operations will be discussed in detail. In the fourth chapter, Libya operation of NATO will be evaluated and the role of Turkey within the operation will be discussed. In the fifth chapter all the discussion will be summarized briefly and the answer for the above mentioned questions will be given. The discussions over the role of NATO and Turkey in a possible Syria operation will be analyzed.

The aim of this thesis is to discuss the role of Turkey within the historical transformation process of NATO and to show that Turkey has an increasing position in NATO within the "New World Order" formed after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. This thesis also asserts the view that, if the position of Turkey is given due importance and initiatives, NATO's achievements and credibility would increase. The main focus of my thesis will be on the 9/11 Terror Attacks, the war in Afghanistan and ISAF mission of NATO, and the Libya Operation.

1.3. NATO during the Cold War

The World War II resulted in the allied forces favor with the defeat of German forces and entrance of Soviet forces to Berlin in 1945. During the six years of war, all the super powers of the world mobilized their forces and colossal armies attacked each other desperately to take a decisive result. The great American economy, huge productive societies of Europe and Russian economy with its endless resources focused all their energy to weapons industry.

During all these years, the weapons industry that was functioning in full capacity, people that were held under gun for six years and certainly the politicians had been exhausted. European states were on the edge of economic collapse after the Second World War. After fighting with each other for six years, they saw that more problems were waiting for them at the end of the war than they aimed to solve through it. In the conjuncture formed

after the war, the most serious problems waiting to be solved were the problems of economy and security. Naturally both of them were connected to each other. For a Western Europe which collapsed economically and lost most of its population, it was nearly impossible to provide its security on the national level; and while a new zone of conflict was rising up between the East and the West, balancing the Soviet power was of high priority. Former allies of the World War II were turning their guns to each other. The war between the Fascist regimes and the Rest was being replaced by the power struggle between communism and capitalism.

An expectation of the world full of peace and serenity formed after the war was soon replaced with tensions of the Soviets and Europe, the USA. Germany was no more a threat after the war; however, Soviet Union became the new threat. Although Europe and the USA discharged most of their troops, Russia sustained its military capacity as it was. The United States, the United Kingdom and Canada had decreased the number and capacity of their military forces from 3.7 million in 1945 to 900 thousand in 1946, while the Soviet Union was maintaining its military capacity at the same level which was 6 million soldiers and war industries running in full capacity in 1946.⁵ The reason why the Soviet Union sustained its military capacity was to enlarge area of effect and establish communist regimes in the East and the Central Europe. This was a prelude to the Cold War" which was regarded as an inevitable clash between opposing ideologies as both the Soviet Union and the United States in 1945—47 attempted to impose a new world order based upon Marxism or Capitalism."⁶

The confrontation of the US and Western European States with Soviet Union could mean a new war, and at the time no European country was ready to go to war with Soviets. After the Second World War, the European

⁵ Sandler, *op. cit.*, 25.

⁶ Bradley Lightbody, *Cold War* (London and New York, Routledge, 1999), 6.

states were not capable of maintaining their own security without outside help. The establishment of new communist governments in Eastern Europe with the effect of Soviet Union through military interventions and coup d'états pushed Western European states to form a defense community. That's why the UK, France and Benelux countries signed Brussels Treaty on 17 March 1948 to establish a front against communism; thus the Western Union was established. According to the treaty if "anyone of the parties should be the object of an armed attack in Europe, the other states will, in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, "afford the party so attacked all the military and other aid and assistance in their power"⁷ However all the analysis for the comparison of the forces of both parties obviously showed that Western Union had not enough power to repel a Soviet attack.⁸ For this reason, on 4 April 1949, ten Western European states, US and Canada established NATO by signing the North Atlantic Treaty.

By the foundation of NATO, American power was also placed on the scale and hence a balance was maintained. According to Lord Ismay, NATO's first Secretary General, the aim of the NATO was to keep "the Russians out, the Americans in and the Germans down".⁹ In addition to these three duties, NATO was also evaluated as "a community of likeminded nations that shared common values as well as facing a common threat".¹⁰ NATO righteously fulfilled its function to prevent war in Europe during the period of the Cold War by balancing the Soviet threat. Apart from the indirect conflicts and crisis between the years 1949 to 1990, the feared scenarios did not take place and the tension between the East and the West did not turn into war.

⁷ Text of the Brussels Treaty, <http://www.weu.int/Treaty.htm>

⁸ Henry Kissinger, *Diplomasi*(İstanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2009), 225.

⁹ Medcalf, *op. cit.*, 4.

¹⁰ *Id.*

1.4. Turkey and NATO during the Cold War

Starting from 1750s until 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, Russia was always the first threat for the Ottoman Empire. From the beginning of the XVIII century, Ottoman Empire started weakening and a power gap formed in the area. Hence, The Russian Empire wanted to fill this power gap by expanding its zone of influence to the extent of Ottoman Empire. As a result of the wars that stemmed from this power struggle, Ottomans lost so much land in the Balkans, Eastern Europe and Caucasus and even the capital of the Empire, İstanbul, stayed in danger of a Russian invasion for a while.¹¹ Except for the 1853-56 Crimean War, Ottomans were the losing side in all the battles that happened through the XVIII and XIX Century. However, the reforms to turn the traditional Ottoman Army into a modern army became unsuccessful.

Especially, with the Egyptian crisis, when Mehmet Ali Pasha defeated Ottoman army, a transformation period began in Ottoman foreign and security policy. After this event, it became evident that despite all the reforms, the army was not capable of competing with any modern army. The defeats against Russia and Egypt were particularly revealing. Therefore, the Ottomans' military failure against the armies of Egypt and Russia triggered a change of foreign and security policy.¹² The weakness against Russia forced the Ottomans to enter an alliance with the European powers against Russia. Abandoning unilateral foreign policy, from that time, Ottomans started entering into periodical alliances with powerful European states such as France and Britain.

Even though, the strategy to try to balance the power of Russia via pursuing a multi-faceted foreign policy had extended the life of the Empire, it

¹¹ Nurşin Ateşoğlu Güney, Ed., *Contentious Issues of Security and the Future of Turkey*(Hampshire, Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 6.

¹² *Ibid.*, 7.

couldn't prevent the collapse of it. After that, Turkey, founded in the former lands of Ottoman Empire, acted with the motto "Peace at home, peace abroad" and tried to have good relations with its' neighboring states and pursued a policy of not being a side of any conflicts. Even during the World War II, Turkey achieved to stay out of the war. After the war ended, while the world was being divided into two sides, Turkey was also forced to choose a side. After Stalin's claims for the collective defense of the Straits between Turkey and the Soviet Union, and his land demands from the Eastern Anatolia, Turkey started getting closer to the Western block.

The Russian threat that had vanished after the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, started to endanger the security of Anatolia again. With the resurrection of the historical hostility, Ankara was returning to its historical alliance. Despite the two hundred years of reform period, Turkish army still was not capable of confronting a modern army. In 1952, after becoming a member of NATO, Turkey officially picked a side in the conflict. In İzmir, NATO's Allied Land Forces Southeastern Europe Headquarters were deployed and İncirlik Base in Adana was opened to the use of NATO.¹³ Turkey's mission was to defend NATO's southern flank and prevent Warsaw Pact and Soviet Union forces from reaching oil rich areas of the Middle East. Turkish army was also responsible for the defense of the Straits.¹⁴ From that time, we see that Turkey's freedom of action was restricted to a great extent. As a result of the unilateral binding to one side, the agendas of the super powers USA, France, Britain and Germany could easily dominate the agenda of Turkey. The states which had the second largest army of NATO absolutely didn't have the second place within the organization in deciding the agenda of the alliance.

During the Cold War, Turkey-NATO relations have had ups and downs. Some unfortunate events caused Turkey to distrust the reliability of the

¹³ *Ibid.*, 12.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 13.

organization. In 1962, after the Cuba Missile Crisis, Jupiter Missiles were withdrawn from Turkey and left Turkey open to Soviet military threat. The state having the burden of being the second provider of military personnel after USA, Turkey saw that the Alliance was not there when needed which turned the membership of NATO into a questionable issue. After that, between the years 1963-1964, Turkey wanted to intervene into the conflict in Cyprus as a guarantor state, but couldn't get any support. Particularly, the crisis that started with the Johnson Letter, made the NATO's sincerity interrogable. After Turkey announced that she was ready to use her right to defend Muslim population against Greek Cypriots' attacks by using her guarantor rights, American president sent a letter to Turkish prime minister. He said that NATO cannot protect Turkey in case of any Soviet Aggression if Turkish army went to Cyprus. This situation paved the way for Ankara to start questioning its unilateral foreign policy. A Turkey giving the impression of a country bandwagoning the West was not capable of taking the support of the Middle Eastern countries and the Soviet Union in regard to the Cyprus issue. The unilateral foreign policy narrowed down the movement area of Turkish policy makers. In the past, the same approach to foreign policy had helped Ottoman Empire to live longer but it hadn't been able to stop the collapse of the Empire.

The USA embargo which started after Turkey's military intervention to Cyprus made the crisis worse. It was seen after the military embargo that unilateral military dependence to one state was tying Turkey's hands in times of crisis. This situation went on like that until 1979 but Turkey was still a member NATO. With the 1979 Iranian Revolution, USA and NATO lost one of their most reliable allies in the Middle East, and the same year the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. These dramatic events formed a security gap in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East. Hence, USA-Turkey relations started

recovering after that time.¹⁵ From 1979 to 1990 Turkey-NATO relations were based on mutual interests and benefits as it was before the Cyprus problem.

¹⁵ Güney, *op. cit.*, 58.

CHAPTER II: NATO AFTER THE COLD WAR: FROM COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TO "EUROPE WHOLE AND FREE"

2.1. The Collapse of the Soviet Union

During the Cold War, the Atlantic Alliance turned into a political-military organization with a colossal and complicated decision making mechanism.¹⁶ Being unable to bear the heavy expenses of armament, the Soviet Union commenced to get weaker on account of the financial crises in the 1980s. Undeniably, NATO helped Allies to win the Cold War "by outlasting the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact in a war of attrition by diverting scarce resources to the defense sector".¹⁷ Germany's unification and entrance of East Germany into NATO automatically on 3 October 1990, the fall of the Ceausescu's regime in Romania on 22 December 1989, the coalition government's coming to power in Czechoslovakia on 7 December 1989 and lastly the collapse of the Soviet Union on 20 December 1991 changed the security priorities of European security to a large extent.¹⁸

By the sudden collapse of the Soviet Union and the fall of the Warsaw Pact, NATO had become an institution whose existence had become in a position to be questioned. During the Cold War years, NATO had resisted successfully against the Soviet threat, and managed to maintain the security of its allies. NATO was needed at that time as WEU was ineffective for the defense of Europe. However, in the period after 1991, NATO was no more needed due to the fact that Europe could defend itself without the existence of NATO as there was no more a Soviet threat coming from the East.

¹⁶ MAJ Scott A. Sendmeyer, "NATO Strategy and Out of Area Operations" (School of Advanced Military Studies United States Army Command and General Staff College, Kansas, 2010), pp. 52-55.

¹⁷ Sandler, *op. cit.*, 1.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 40.

How could a defense organization sustain its existence and legitimize itself without any power to resist against? While these debates were going on, various incidents broke out to justify those vindicating the existence of NATO. By the collapse of the Soviet Union, a serious security vulnerability was formed in the Central and Eastern Europe. Especially, the beginning of the fall of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia emerged as the precursor of new conflicts in Europe and reminded everyone that NATO was still needed.

There was still need for NATO and the World was still a dangerous place. The democratization process of the former Soviet Union states and the ethnic hostilities in former Yugoslavia territory turned into ethnic conflicts.¹⁹ The ethnic conflicts in Bosnia, Croatia, and Kosovo were causing civilian deaths and the situation was getting worse. This time, the alliance, which was in search of its own reason of existence, was on the agenda with a new definition of task. From that time forward, the security weaknesses in the neighboring countries of the NATO member countries also concerned NATO.

2.2. The New Strategic Concept

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, EU has had a crucial role in the construction of a new security structure in Europe. Primarily, by the help of the political, economic and social support of the EU, ex-Soviet countries have transformed their systems and become a part of the European security structuring. After the transformation of the Central and Eastern European countries from communism to democracy, they have developed their level of democracy, human rights, freedoms and introduced

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 1.

a market economy.²⁰ However, Europe, being deprived of the required hard power, was not effective enough in conflict resolution. Hence, military capacity of NATO had to be used actively and effectively.

After the end of the Cold War, NATO had to justify its continued existence and show that the costs of the alliance are not more than the benefits.²¹ By the end of the Cold War, NATO's area of operation expanded immensely. Many things that could not be considered to be reasons for a war during the Cold War period were no more in the same scope. A period, in which NATO could be comparatively more effective, commenced. After the speech of George Bush about the creation of a Europe "whole and free" the "political" importance of NATO has become prominent rather than the military power and capabilities. The adaptation of the alliance to the new world was only possible by making some deviations and improvements in the strategy of the organization.²²

2.3. The Transformation of the Alliance: Out of Area or Out of Business?

The European allies of the US opposed Bush's idea of a European security order in which NATO is the center organization. Mainly, France and Russia and partly Czechoslovakia supported the effectiveness of CSCE (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe).²³ Jacques Poos, the president of Council of Europe, in his remarkable speech, emphasized that

²⁰ Ramazan Gözen, "Turkey's Delicate Position Between NATO and ESDP" Paper prepared for SAM (Strategical Research Center), http://www.sam.gov.tr/perceptions/sampapers/ramazan_gozen.pdf (accessed December 01, 2011) 8.

²¹ Sandler, *op. cit.*, 2.

²² Rebecca R. Moore, *NATO's New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World* (Praeger Security International, London, 2007), 15.

²³ *Ibid.*, 16.

Yugoslavia was the problem of European countries as it was also a European country and United States didn't have anything to do with the solution of the problem.²⁴

Despite all these objections, NATO was determined to be adapted to the system in the post-Soviet period, and the first meeting was held in Rome in 1991 in order to carry out the required reforms. On 7-8 November 1991, NATO members gathered in Rome to adjust the security doctrine of NATO to the new environment after the Cold War. The responsibility of NATO was extended and the new mission definition included providing security for Europe outside the borders besides providing security inside the borders.²⁵ The new concept was designed to struggle with the problems occurring in the post-Cold War era such as ethnic conflicts, territorial problems and economic problems.²⁶ In this meeting NACC (North Atlantic Cooperation Council) was founded to unify the former enemies and provide a chance for the both sides to solve the problems by dialogue and cooperation. However, the CSCE and NACC had the same function. The weakness of NACC was that it didn't include Sweden, Finland, Ireland, Austria and Switzerland although they were European states.²⁷ Despite this disadvantage, NATO had the military assets and capabilities which would prove to be highly essential in future conflicts.

Out of area missions were first discussed in June 1992, in Oslo at the NAC (North Atlantic Council) meeting. It was stated that "to support, in a case by case basis in accordance with our own procedures peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the CSCE, including by making available Alliance resources and expertise"²⁸ was of great importance for the stability

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 40-41.

²⁶ Rebecca R. Moore, *NATO's New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World* (Praeger security International, London, 2007), 19.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 20-21.

²⁸ Medcalf, *op. cit.*, 14.

of the Central and Eastern Europe. In December 1992, it was declared by the Foreign Ministers of NATO member states that NATO was also ready to take part in the missions under the UNSC authorization.²⁹

In other words, acceptance of New Strategic Concept, foundation of NACC and George Bush's emphasis on the continuation of NATO were the steps to protect the effectiveness of NATO. The prospective success of these steps was vital to the future of the Alliance.

2.4. Disintegration of Yugoslavia and the Conflict in Bosnia

2.4.1. Rise of Nationalism and Fall of an Empire

There are five basic reasons to the fall of Yugoslavia.

1. Following the death of Marshall Tito, there was no alternative charismatic leader to hold ethnic groups in Yugoslav Federation together. Milosevic was not much respected as Tito, and had no charisma to hold Yugoslav Federation together.³⁰
2. After the period of Tito, Serbian nationalism constantly increased, and the dream for Greater Serbia revived. While the Serbs thrust themselves forward with their ethnic identities, the same tendencies occurred in the other regions of Yugoslavia.³¹
3. Slovenia and Croatia were the more developed regions in terms of economy, which by the time being brought them closer to Europe, especially to Germany.

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 4.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 5.

4. Collapse of communism in the Soviets triggered disintegration in Yugoslavia.
5. Financial problems and high inflation paved the way for the doubt whether it could be possible to live under the roof of a federation.³²

Sheltering various ethnic groups, Yugoslavia was like a bomb ready to explode. Moreover, harsh statements of Milosevic furthered the complexity of the situation. First, Slovenia declared its independence. Since, Slovenian military was highly ready and powerful, Yugoslav military could just watch the disengagement. Then followed the disintegration of Croatia, but Serbian population in Krajina region wanted to either unite with Serbia or declare their own independence. That's why there occurred some clashes in Croatia. However, the situation was not so serious to require international involvement.

All started with Bosnia Herzegovina's desire to be an independent country. While Yugoslavia withdrew from the region, it left all the weapons to the Serbian paramilitary forces and thus weapon embargo was good for the Bosnian Serbs.³³ This situation led Bosnian Muslims and Croatians to be on the ropes for the fact that when the internal conflicts broke out, UN implemented arms embargo to the country. The Serbs, who had arms, began to have massacres in the Croatian and Muslim regions.

³² *Ibid.*, 4.

³³ Tayyar Arı and Ferhat Pirinççi, "Soğuk Savaş Sonrasında ABD'nin Balkan Politikası," *Alternatif Politika vol. 3, no. 1(2011): 6.*

2.4.2. The Approach of EU and UN to the Conflict in Bosnia

The problems emerged with the disintegration of Yugoslavia first caused huge excitement in Europe. If the European Union could solve these problems through Common Foreign and Security Policy that it was trying to implement, a great acceleration could be maintained and thus for the time being, the need for NATO might be no more required. However, the CFSP was far from being an effective mechanism and it wasn't effective outside the borders of the EU as it was realized during the Balkans crisis. EU couldn't implement a common policy over the recognition of Croatia and Slovenia. Even if it was possible to take common positions, the military capabilities of WEU was not enough to conduct military operations without the support of NATO.³⁴ Especially, France did not want NATO to get involved in the crises. However, nothing happened in the way French government expected.

Through European Union's Lisbon Conference, London Conference, Vance Owen Plan and Owen Stoltenberg Plan, the crises in Yugoslavia were attempted to be solved without using weapons but the attempts failed.³⁵ There are four main reasons for European Union's failure to bring about a solution to the crises.

1. European Union did not have just a single opinion. France didn't want the involvement of NATO and US, it was Europe's problem and it had to be handled without outside interference. Also Greece, throughout the Bosnian War, did not act together with the rest of the EU. While the EU was against Serbian aggression, Greece supported Serbs and broke the embargo on Yugoslavia.³⁶

³⁴ Medcalf, *op. cit.*, 1.

³⁵ Ari, *op. cit.*, 8.

³⁶ Zehra Eroğlu, "Turkey's Foreign Policy Towards the Balkans in the Post-Cold War Era" (M.A. Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, 2005), 12.

2. Countries like Spain, which shelters separatist ethnic minorities, were in favor of the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia.
3. Being devoid of required military capacity in order to carry out diplomacy, European Union was not being able to form effective pressure to solve the problem. Military capacity of WEU was not sufficient to conduct operation without NATO, and the Serbs were aware of it.
4. The USA did not want NATO to be left out of the game.

When the events had reached a point that the European Union could not solve, UN involved in the crises. After the UNSC resolution 816 on 31 March 1993³⁷ a no fly zone was implemented to protect the Bosnians from Serbian aircraft bombings. However, it was impossible to implement the plan completely. The Serbian attacks against the civilians continued even after this date. When Vance Owen Plan was rejected, in order to protect Bosnian civilians, the Security Council decided to establish a "secure zone", just like what it established in the Kurdish regions during the Gulf War. Srebrenica on 16 April 1993, and then Zepa, Tuzla, Sarajevo, Garadze and Bihac in May 1993 declared as safe zones.³⁸

In order to protect the secure regions, while a military force of 35.000 UN soldiers was anticipated, only 7.600 soldiers could be deployed. Furthermore, although air operations were being conducted by NATO, its effect was also limited as it had to take UN approval for each air attack. The authority to use weapons, which was given by the UN to the UNPROFOR soldiers, had never been used; instead the Peace Force used arms only when they faced counterforce.³⁹ As a result of not providing sufficient support during the implementation of the plan of Security Zone, these regions could not be

³⁷ United Nations Security Council Resolution 816
<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/187/17/IMG/N9318717.pdf?OpenElement>

³⁸ Merve İrem Yapıcı, "Bosna Hersekte Gerçekleştirilen Müdahale'nin Uluslararası Hukuktaki Yeri", *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika*, Vol. 2, No. 8, (2007), pp. 1-24, 4.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

disarmed and demilitarized. Hence, "Secure Zones have become everything but secure"⁴⁰

2.4.3. Seeking for Security outside the Borders: Bosnia and Herzegovina

There have been numerous statements to give an account of why the NATO forces, led by the USA for Bosnia, were too late in interfering into the crises. One of them is that Bosnian crises took place in a period coinciding with election period of the USA. Considering being reelected in 1992 election, George W. Bush did not want to send US soldiers to the region where there were no direct American interests. Moreover, American public opinion was not ready for such an operation. It is only after the images and videos from Bosnia, killing of American diplomats there and the Srebrenica massacre demonstrated the severity of the situation that a NATO operation became imminent.⁴¹

On 12 April 1993, Operation Deny Flight commenced to monitor the air zone of Bosnia and Herzegovina. After that time, NATO forces, from time to time, conducted air operations to Serbian targets based on the request of UN, but these operations were too limited. One month after the Operation Deny Flight started, NATO and EU together commenced Operation Sharp Guard to check the Adriatic Sea. The main aim of this operation was the implementation of UN embargo and preventing the entrance of weapons to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁴¹ Ari, *op. cit.*, 6.

The violence didn't stop until August 1995. Furthermore, 37 people were killed in the Sarajevo bazaar that forced international community to take action. The fact that EU and UN became ineffective in Bosnia paved the way for NATO to be given more initiatives. By ending the system of double keys, NATO had chances to act more rapidly and effectively. The operations before had to be approved by the UN one by one.⁴² In the NATO operation that began with the death of 37 civilians on 30 August, nations providing combat and support aircraft included the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, Spain, and Turkey. Allied war crafts had more than 2000 sorties⁴³ but it was underlined that it had been a UN protection operation.⁴⁴ The Operation Deliberate Force was conducted between August 30 and September 14, 1995 and became successful in convincing Serbs to stop violence.

NATO intervention stopped civilian losses but the casualties were too heavy. Waiting for the solution of the problem by EU initiative caused the death of thousands of civilians. This operation showed that EU had a long way to go for a Common Foreign and Security Policy.

2.4.4. Turkey's Activism during the Bosnian War

In the post Cold War era, Turkey was thought to turn its direction towards Central Asia and that it would form a new area of effect in the territories on which Russia lost its impact.⁴⁵ Maintaining a distance with the Arab world, Turkey could turn towards the Central Asia as it could not

⁴² Yasin Şafak, "Bosna Savaşı ve Yugoslavya'nın Parçalanması" (M.A. Thesis, Kadir Has Üniversitesi, İstanbul, 2010), 105.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 108.

⁴⁵ Birgül D. Coşkun, "Ankara ve Berlin'in Bosna Savaşına Yönelik Politikaları: Karşılaştırmalı Bir İnceleme", *Uİ Dergisi*, Vol. 4, No. 13, pp. 57-88, p. 60.

achieve its expectations in relationships with the European Union.⁴⁶ It seemed for Turkey, whose NATO membership was also debated on, there were no other chances. As a result, even if NATO continued its existence, Turkey had no chance of being a vital country for NATO.

Meanwhile, there had been unexpected developments and Turkey again became a prominent member in NATO. Turkey, as it happened before, was approaching towards the crises in the Balkans neutrally, and supported the solution of the crises in peaceful means. In December 1991, it was stated by Turkish Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel that Turkey was expecting a peaceful solution for the conflict in Yugoslavia with the help of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.⁴⁷

Turkey had been very sensible towards Bosnia as both countries shared a common historical heritage. There were three basic reasons that pushed Turkey to be effective regarding the case of Bosnia:

1. There were many similarities between the Muslims in Bosnia and Turkey. Both countries wanted to be integrated with the West although they both had population of Muslim majority. Izetbegovic states these common features: "The future of Bosnia is to be a European country. However, in order to be a European state, Bosnia has to solve the problem of identity. At this point, the fate of Turkey and Bosnia coincides for the fact that Turkey has also had the same problem for years. Bosnia also had to be a bridge between the East and the West just like Turkey."⁴⁸
2. Turkey, with the effect of the Balkan immigrants in its territory, used to think that it was her historical responsibility to look after the Muslims in the Balkans. Turkey's interest over the Bosnian case was

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ Zehra Eroğlu, "Turkey's Foreign Policy Towards the Balkans in the Post-Cold War Era" (M.A. Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, 2005), 18.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 20.

mainly connected with the Ottoman legacy and it was emphasized that the interference into Bosnian problem was a historical duty for Turkish statesmen.⁴⁹

3. Another important factor that was making Balkans very important for Turkey was the existence of many Balkan immigrants. Because of the waves of migration since the loss of the Balkan territories in 19th century, nearly %20 of the total population of Turkey was of Balkan origin.⁵⁰ If the war had continued, another wave of migration could have caused serious economic problems in Turkey.

Due to these reasons, Turkey had active foreign policy in the case of Bosnia. Turkey changed its attitude towards the dissolution process of Yugoslavia after the violence against civilians increased greatly. When the civilian killings increased in a large amount Hikmet Çetin declared that Turkey was ready to provide military power for a Bosnia operation if the UN asked.⁵¹ He went to London, Paris and New York between 4 and 12 August 1992 and tried to form a consensus on taking necessary precautions to end the bloodshed in Bosnia.⁵² Even though no tangible result was obtained, with the impact of Turkish President Turgut Özal, Islamic Conference Extended Presidency Council meeting regarding Bosnia was conducted in Dakar on 11 January 1993.⁵³ After the UNSC resolution 816 on 31 March 1993 a no fly zone was implemented to protect the Bosnians from Serbian aircraft bombings. Turkey sent 18 F-16's to Operation Deny Flight conducted by NATO.⁵⁴

The Welfare Party was supporting the idea of launching an air attack on Serbian forces unilaterally, but it wasn't possible because of three reasons:

⁴⁹ Eroğlu, *op. cit.*, 15.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 11.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 28.

⁵³ Şafak, *op. cit.*, 110.

⁵⁴ Eroğlu, *op. cit.*, 36.

1. There was a strong opposition from international community on this matter. If Turkey attempt to have single sided operation, it might be accused of being neo-Ottomanist. It did not seem to be possible to take risk of being an invader while going to protect peace.
2. The second reason was the Greek approach to the problem. A military operation to Serbia could cause a Turkish Greek war. The sensibility of Greece was complicating even the diplomatic visits. When President Turgut Özal went on a Balkan tour in February 1993, the Greek Defense Minister named it as a provocation. Moreover, Serbia and Greece accused Turkey of following neo-Ottomanist policy.⁵⁵
3. The last reason was the lack of enough military capabilities because it was too far for Turkish aircraft, and Turkish military didn't have air refueling capacity at that time. Furthermore, Albania, Macedonia, Greece and Bulgaria refused to open their airspace for Turkey's unilateral military intervention in Bosnia.⁵⁶

Turkey's existence in Organization of the Islamic Conference was of great importance, because Iran's struggle to define the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina as a "Religious War" was opposed by the Turkish side.⁵⁷

At the beginning Ankara vindicated the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia. Upon the recognition of the independence of Slovenia and Croatia by the EU, Turkey recognized Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia and Bosnia in August 1992. Being the second country after Bulgaria to recognize Bosnia, Turkey showed the entire world its sensitivity towards Bosnia.⁵⁸

Turkey had always been eager to take initiatives regarding the case of Bosnia. When Izetbegovic was captured by the Yugoslav army in May 1992, Turkey stated that such a situation was unacceptable. Throughout the war,

⁵⁵ Sylvie Ganglof, "The Impact of the Ottoman Legacy on Turkish Policy in the Balkans", 1. Paper written for CERI <http://www.ceri-sciences-po.org/archive/nov05/artsg.pdf> Accessed in 02.03.2012

⁵⁶ Eroğlu, *op. cit.*, 20.

⁵⁷ Ganglof, *op. cit.*, 4.

⁵⁸ Coşkun, *op. cit.*, 65.

ICO was put on pressure, and decisions in favor of Bosnia were attempted to be taken, and, in addition, a "plan of action" consisting of military and diplomatic cautions was presented by the Turkish government in the UN Security Council in August 1992.⁵⁹ In regard to showing single sided initiatives, it is a highly significant development that despite the reluctance of the USA, a Balkan conference was held in Istanbul in November 1992.⁶⁰

The President Turgut Özal stated that the war in Bosnia had to be stopped by the intervention of UN or NATO before it spreads to the Balkans.⁶¹ Throughout this process, we see that Defense Minister Nevzat Ayaz, in all the NATO meetings he attended, expressing Turkey's enthusiasm to take initiative in the solution of the problem.⁶² One of the main contributions of Turkey to the problem took place in 1992 Helsinki meeting of the foreign ministers of NATO member countries. Turkish diplomatic activism helped the unification of the allies to form a naval force in Adriatic.⁶³

Turkey did not want the rising death toll for civilians. In order to have at least a balance between the parties that fight, secret arms supplies were provided to Bosnia despite the embargo.⁶⁴ As it was told before, in US, the public was not ready for military engagement until the massive killings of civilians. However, in Turkey from the beginning, the sensitivity of the public of Turkey towards Bosnia pushed politicians to implement a more active policy. During the war, the Prime Minister Tansu Çiller visited Sarajevo twice; first in February 1994 before the local elections and in November 1995 a month before the parliamentary elections.⁶⁵ The US Secretary for Foreign Affairs Richard Holbrooke came to Turkey in September 1995 to find

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 65-66.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 68.

⁶¹ BM veya NATO Müdahale Etmeli, *Milliyet*, 21.05.1992

⁶² Türk Hükümeti Kaygılı, *Miliet*, 27.05.1992

⁶³ Metin Toker, *Miliet*, 12.07.1992

⁶⁴ Coşkun, *op.cit.*, 69.

⁶⁵ Ganglof, *op. cit.*, 3.

supports in solving Bosnian crises. The USA wanted Turkey to convince Izetbegovic to be more flexible.⁶⁶

By 1995, the fact that the USA wanted Turkey to be more effective in the solution of the problem shows that Turkey's strategy in Bosnia had been successful. If there had been a single sided operation as proposed by the Welfare Party, an impression of forming an area of effect on the Ottoman heritage could have caused serious tensions. Instead, having the war parties to meet on common grounds through diplomatic initiatives gave positive results. Hence, Bosnian crisis was solved temporarily with the intervention of NATO.

In conclusion, this event explicitly illustrates the role of Turkey in NATO in the post Cold War era: to play an active role in conflict resolutions as a NATO member country which has Ottoman heritage and population with Muslim majority.

⁶⁶ Coşkun, *op. cit.*, 71.

2.5. Kosovo Conflict

2.5.1 Out of Area or Out of Business

Although in some respects Kosovo case shows similarities with Bosnia, there are significant basic points that two cases differ from each other. Firstly, when Bosnia declared its independence, it was an autonomous state and wanted to be separated from the Yugoslav Federation. The main reason for the problems in the process of disintegration originated from the problems of sharing among the Serbs, Croats and Muslims in Bosnia Herzegovina. Bosnian Serbs did not consent to the share they had obtained through the agreements. However, the situation was completely different in Kosovo. Kosovo, whose autonomous status was taken away before in 1981, was a part of Serbia. Such a situation would move the problem of Kosovo to a completely different adventure. International community, which supported Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia Herzegovina during the disintegration of Yugoslav Federation, remained silent in the Kosovo case. The countries that did not object when Kosovo's autonomy was removed in 1981 now were not enthusiastic to recognize the independence of Kosovo for they did not want to contradict with themselves. Despite the fact that the independence of Kosovo was declared with the overwhelming majority of the votes in the referendums of 1990 and 1992, the results were not recognized by the Yugoslav Government and international community.⁶⁷ However, passive resistance still continued in this period.

After the Bosnian War, a peace agreement was signed between Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia, but the situation in Kosovo was neglected. The international community still didn't recognize Kosovo as an independent state. That's why the problem was being seen as an internal

⁶⁷ Ari, *op. cit.*, 9.

conflict of Yugoslavia.⁶⁸ The fact that nothing was discussed about Kosovo in the Dayton negotiations paved the way for the transformation from passive resistance to an active one in the solution of the crises. Hence, Kosovo Liberation Army began armed resistance against the Serb forces.⁶⁹

Having no adequate sources, Kosovo Liberation Army had very little chance of being victorious against the strong and experienced Serbian army. However, they were well aware of the situation. The main aim was to draw the attention of the international community to Kosovo rather than being victorious in the war of independence. With their armed resistance, Kosovar-Albanians, who wanted their demands to be taken into consideration, forced Serbian army to act more severely.

The result of armed resistance was highly destructive for the people in the region. Hundreds of thousands of people were forced to leave their houses and live in the forest, and still the situation was getting more fatal. It could be like Bosnia, even worse than that unless there would be some interventions. In Kosovo, the tension started rising up and the violence against civilians by Serbian and FRY armed forces reached at its peak. International society took a more responsible stance compared to past events and showed rapid action by inviting two parties to sit down at a table for the political solution of the problem. In the same resolution, a mandatory arms embargo was imposed on both parties. However, these measures and warnings didn't work and the situation got worse, the conflict intensified. With the excessive use of force by the Serbian forces and Yugoslav army, many civilians died, wounded or removed from their homes.⁷⁰ In September 1998, the Security Council adopted the resolution 1199, naming the situation

⁶⁸ Armend R. Bekaj, Berghof Conflict Research, "The KLA and the Kosovo War: From Intra State Conflict to Independent Country", 43. http://www.berghof-conflictresearch.org/documents/publications/transitions8_kosovo.pdf Accessed in 09.16.2011.

⁶⁹ Ari, *op. cit.*, 10.

⁷⁰ Bruno Simma, "NATO, the UN and the Use of Force: Legal Aspects," *EJIL*, Vol. 10 (1999): 5-6.

in Kosovo as a “threat to peace and security in the region.”⁷¹ The Security Council called on the parties to a ceasefire and settle the dispute in a peaceful manner.⁷²

In February 1998 when the Yugoslav/Serb forces killed 24 civilians, the action was condemned by the international community. On 5 March, Serbian attack on the moral leader of the Kosovo Liberation Army that resulted with the killing of fifty six members of his family increased the support for KLA and the number of guerillas started increasing in large amount. Until October, 1500 Kosovar Albanians were killed and many of them were displaced, being forced to live in the forest. After this, a ceasefire was signed between the two sides with American mediation, but it didn't last long.⁷³

The attacks that turned into ethnic cleansing, which the Yugoslav army started against the Kosovar Albanians in Kosovo, had to be intervened rapidly and effectively on account of the fact that when NATO member countries did not show collective as well as individual reactions to the incidents occurred between the years 1991-1995, there were severe results. NATO's speedy response was the only option that could prevent another Srebrenica.⁷⁴

Although there was a massive violation of human rights in Kosovo, after some time, it became evident that Russia would veto any resolution containing an authorization of use of force against the FRY. Thus, the members of NATO gave the authority to use military force against FRY if the situation continued like that. A SC resolution containing a statement of “use

⁷¹ United Nations Security Council Resolution 1199
<http://daccess-ods.un.org/TMP/6225358.84380341.html>

⁷² Simma, *op. cit.*, 6.

⁷³ Bekaj, *op. cit.*, 43.

⁷⁴ Institute for International Studies, Brown University, NATO and Humanitarian Action in the Kosovo Crisis, 128., http://repository.forcedmigration.org/show_metadata.jsp?pid=fmo:1572
Accessed in 01.02.2012

of force” was not possible in the foreseeable future, while FRY didn’t obey the demands of the international community to stop violence. At the same time, the situation in Kosovo was also a threat to security of the region. These hesitations paved the way for the military operation in Kosovo.⁷⁵

Chapter VII of the UN charter⁷⁶ is the main pillar for global system of collective security. According to chapter VII, if Security Council decides that a state is breaching the peace, threatening the peace or showing an act of aggression then it may take military action and the Council can authorize the use of armed forces. In these kinds of circumstances, generally willing states form an ad hoc coalition or they use international organizations such as NATO.⁷⁷

The Security Council considered some of the conflicts within a country as “threat to peace” under the scope of the Article 39⁷⁸, and on several occasions, it authorized states and regional organizations to use forces.⁷⁹ However, there is no standard in this respect. Whereas the Security Council took rapid and determined decisions in some cases, it remained silent and ineffective in other cases. The Security Council issued authorization to use forces in Bosnia Herzegovina in 1991-1995, while due to the objections of Russia and China, it did not give any authorization in the conflicts in Kosovo during 1998-1999.⁸⁰ The fact that permanent members have veto right makes the Council ineffective in many occasions. As a matter of fact, NATO has a more harmonious structure of taking decisions. Because all the

⁷⁵ Simma, *op. cit.*, 7.

⁷⁶ UN Official Website

<http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter7.shtml>

⁷⁷ Simma, *op. cit.*, 4.

⁷⁸ Text of the UN Treaty Article 39

http://untreaty.un.org/cod/repertory/art39/english/rep_supp1_vol1-art39_e.pdf

⁷⁹ Funda Keskin, “İnsancıl Müdahale: 1999 Kosova ve 2003 Irak Sonrası Durum”, *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, Vol. 3, No. 12, pp. 49-70, p. 53.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 55.

member states are Western, democratic countries and can meet in common interests to lead the process of taking decisions more effective and faster.

NATO, with its conceptual changes made after 1991, being an organization that stated its eagerness to intervene in the crises outside its boundary, wanted to take initiatives in the case of Kosovo. However, this was considered as the first step of a new polarization by Russia and China. In order to prevent the expansion of NATO and EU's area of effect against Russia and China, the latter two pursued policies indicating that they would object military intervention to Kosovo if there would be any voting in the Council regarding the matter.

The Serbs did not take part in agreements as they knew that Russia and China would object if the Security Council discussed a decision stipulating a military operation to Serbia. This condition was reducing the deterrence of the Council. It is obvious that a criminal who does not take any punishment because of committing his crime, he will continue to commit crimes. This is what happened in Kosovo and the Serbian army constantly increased the severity of violence.⁸¹

NATO operation, which began at an unexpected time without the decision of the Security Council, is very significant regarding the matter. The bombing campaign, which had many causes, marked a significant break from NATO's previous policy and practice.⁸² Although it seems to be an arbitrary decision, it has been highly positive when the outcomes are considered. The NATO forces that acted to prevent another Srebrenica compelled the Serbs to withdraw and the Serbs had to withdraw their forces after a bombing campaign for 11 weeks. This event illustrated that NATO can take initiatives and intervene in crises, while the Security Council was dysfunctional. It can

⁸¹ Keskin, *op. cit.*, 54.

⁸² Institute for International Studies, Brown University, NATO and Humanitarian Action in the Kosovo Crisis, 125., http://repository.forcedmigration.org/show_metadata.jsp?pid=fmo:1572
Accessed in 01.02.2012

be claimed that, for this specific situation, the action of NATO was right, but illegal.

Following the operation of NATO, the situation was legitimized as it was based on rational reasons. General Secretary Kofi Annan admitted that use of power for the sake of peace could be legitimized but in such conditions, the Security Council must involve in the matter.⁸³ Although the Kosovo operation was the one carried out without taking any authorization, conscientiously what had to be done was done and as a consequence, NATO obtained prestige. In addition, it is anticipated that when the Security Council becomes ineffective, intense human right violations can be prevented with NATO's single-sided use of power. Even if it never happens again and NATO would never breach international law, we can claim that it is going to have a psychological effect in future conflicts.

2.5.2. Kosovo and Turkey

Although it was one of the most active states in Bosnian issue, from the beginning, Ankara stayed distant to the situation in Kosovo. There were two main reasons for Turkey's irrelevance to the conflict.

Firstly, when the situation in Kosovo was compared to the one in Bosnia, it showed a basic difference. With the 1974 Yugoslav constitution, Kosovo was given autonomous status like Vojvodina. The status of autonomous province was nearly the same as the status of republic.⁸⁴ After that, in 1981, the granted rights of the Kosovo were retaken and Kosovar Albanians were put under immense pressure by the federal government.

⁸³ Keskin, *op. cit.*, 61.

⁸⁴ Independent International Commission on Kosovo, Kosovo Report Conflict, International Response, Lessons Learned, Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 35.

During the protests hundreds of people were arrested, tried and sent to prison.⁸⁵ While all these were happening, the international community kept its silence along with Turkey. Later, when Kosovo declared its independence, none of the countries that hadn't done anything for the Kosovo issue before, didn't want to contradict with themselves. That's why Turkey stayed silent in Kosovo issue until 1998.

At that time, in Turkey, the PKK problem started rising. From 1992 to 1998 the violent attacks of PKK militants to the military personnel and the civilians caused many casualties. PKK had strong connections with Europe and there were many assets of the terrorist organization in various parts of the Europe. The militants were being seen as the "freedom fighters" by many Western states. In those circumstances, it was really hard for Turkey to recognize the Ibrahim Rugova government as the legitimate ruler of the Kosovo. Turkish politicians had the fear that if Kosovo's status was recognized legitimate, a similar demand might have been asked for the Eastern Anatolia by international community. That's why Turkey kept its silence on that matter. Until the last moment, a peaceful solution for the problem was expected from Milosevic.⁸⁶

After it became apparent that Milosevic had no intention to stop massive violation of human rights and that NATO operation was so close, Turkey started to support the use of military means.⁸⁷ In the following NATO intervention, Turkey played an active role. However, it did not effectuate the military participation that it desired because it wasn't welcomed by the other states in the region. In the meetings about Kosovo it was decided that none of the states in the region would be given advantage of sending too many troops to Kosovo. There was still a fear of Turkey's pursuing a Neo-

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 36-37.

⁸⁶ Fatih Aydoğmuş, "Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Türkiye'nin Balkanlar Üzerindeki Etkisi" (M.A. Thesis, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul, 2009), pp. 94-95.

⁸⁷ *Id.*

Ottomanist policy and expanding its sphere of influence in the Balkans. Turkish war crafts joined the operations but they had to go through Italy as Greece and Bulgaria did not issue permission. Turkish soldiers were not given permit for transfer even after the Serbian forces surrendered; hence, the transfer was carried out through Italy.

2.6. A General Evaluation

During the Cold War threats were easy to identify and all the planning was being done according to a possible Soviet attack. However in the post-Cold War era, it was not easy to characterize enemies as they included states and non state actors.⁸⁸ NATO, which carried out its task as a deterrent power throughout the Cold War, changed its mission when there was no more superpower left to deter, and by taking active roles in beyond border operations proved that it is still a required and powerful organization.

In 1991, the coalition forces under the leadership of US defeated the Iraqi army and liberated Kuwait. Although these forces didn't include NATO, the positive effect of NATO was undeniable during the decision making process of the operation. NATO was used as a forum for the UN efforts to stop the war by finding a peaceful solution and after the failure of the diplomatic efforts it also helped the coalition forces to decide on the details and planning of the war. The experience of NATO countries on sharing assets and making operations made the things easier.⁸⁹ The common training programs and standardization of the ammunition and the weapons was also really helpful for the conduct of the operation.

⁸⁸ Sandler, *op. cit.*, 5.

⁸⁹ The NATO Handbook; 50th Anniversary Edition, (Brussels: Office of Information and Press, 1999), p. 29.

Following the operation Desert Storm, Yugoslavia began to collapse, which led the region to unsteadiness and chaos. After the Cold War, NATO redefined its mission and the tragic events in the Balkans helped NATO to fit into new circumstances. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, European Union failed to settle the dispute because it lacked the necessary hard power to deter Serbian aggression against the Bosnian Muslims and Croats. How much the intervention of NATO to the conflicts in the Balkans was important for the people in the region, that much it was important for NATO to intervene.⁹⁰ It is due to the fact that the results of these interventions would show if NATO was still needed. That's why NATO took the responsibility to stop the violence. Through air raids in Bosnia in 1991-1995, it can be argued that the power to force Bosnian Serbs to sign agreement was again NATO. In 1995, the Bosnian Serbs had to sign Dayton agreement. NATO became successful, but it was harshly criticized because of getting late for action. IFOR and SFOR, which were established afterwards, played a vital role in establishing peace in Bosnia once again.

Then, with the operation in Kosovo in 1998-1999, intense human rights violations were prevented and the lives of many civilians were rescued. This time, NATO response was quicker and more effective than the Bosnian case but it was against international law. There wasn't UN Security Council authorization for the operation.

While these operations were being conducted, the NATO member countries acted harmoniously and practically showed that it is a consistent Alliance that shares the same values. When we keep in mind that the decisions in NATO are taken by unanimity, how important is the situation can be understood better. And this evolution from a military pact, responsible for

⁹⁰ Medcalf, *op. cit.*, 3.

the collective defense of the Euro-Atlantic area, to a political-military institution kept it alive.⁹¹

In this regard, Turkey was an important member country due to her military capability and her cultural ties with the Balkans. From the beginning of the crisis in the Balkans, Turkey pursued an active foreign policy.

After the Cold War ended, even the existence of NATO was being questioned. Also, Turkey was being seen as unnecessary for the European security because there was no more a Soviet threat. Because of these reasons, Turkey's main aim was to redefine her position within NATO and prove her usefulness for the organization. Balkans crisis was a significant opportunity for Turkey. The Muslim population in the Balkans was in danger, and the historical and cultural ties of Turkey with the region pushed her to be active in the settlement of disputes.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo, the Muslim population was in danger. When we consider that there are many Balkan immigrants in Turkey, it can be said that Turkey was needed for the solution of the problem. Being the only member state with a Muslim majority and having the Ottoman heritage, Turkish role was redefined after the Cold War. It was seen after these crisis that; NATO was still needed for European security and Turkey was still necessary for the stability in the Balkans.

⁹¹ Rebecca R. Moore, *NATO's New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World* (Praeger security International, London, 2007), 10.

CHAPTER III: SEPTEMBER 11 TERROR ATTACKS AND THE NEW MISSION OF NATO

3.1. NATO and the "War on Terror"

London summit in 1990 declared the end of the Cold War and good relations started with Eastern Europe. The old enemies were the new candidates for cooperation and collaboration. NATO aimed to develop good relations with the ex-communist states of Eastern Europe. Right after that, the Rome Summit of 1991 was very significant in NATO's transformation because the new Strategic Concept of NATO⁹² was formed after the Cold War. This document was the official announcement of the transformation of the alliance and the new policy of NATO. Promoting dialogue, cooperation and maintaining collective defence capability were the main points of the document.⁹³ That was an important document because it gave NATO another duty rather than collective defence. Actually "promoting dialogue" was not a suitable job for a defence organization, but NATO needed a reason to exist and that could be the reason for NATO's existence.

Brussels Summit 1994 was the one in which NATO's new concept was detailed and made more concrete.⁹⁴ The new mechanisms for security and cooperation over Euro-Atlantic area were formed and potential expansion strategies were discussed. Partnership for Peace Framework document was accepted in this summit and NATO started being a political organization such as OSCE.⁹⁵ In 1997 Madrid Summit, three new states, Czech Republic,

⁹² For the original text of the Rome Declaration: <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c911108a.htm>

⁹³ *Id.*

⁹⁴ For the original text of the Brussels Summit Declaration http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-73364D74-3144351F/natolive/official_texts_24470.htm?mode=pressrelease

⁹⁵ Partnership for Peace Document www.nato.int/pfp/pfp.htm

Hungary and Poland were invited to begin the accession talks.⁹⁶ In 1999 Washington Summit, the new strategic concept was accepted. Partnership for Peace, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Mediterranean Dialogue were developed.⁹⁷

Then in 2002 Prague Summit, seven additional countries were invited to join the alliance. Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia were decided to begin accession talks. All these were ex-communist states that were once against the Alliance. Another important decision that was taken in the summit was the creation of a NATO Response Force which was capable of reaching any place quickly where it was needed, and maintaining its existence for long. When this decision was considered together with another decision to reduce the number of land forces, it could be seen that NATO was becoming a security organization rather than a defence organization. The Alliance was getting ready to intervene into the conflicts throughout the world.

Before the İstanbul Summit, NATO's Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer stated that NATO needed forces that could be deployed more quickly, that could reach further and could stay there longer. According to Scheffer, the İstanbul Summit was "the perfect setting for NATO to demonstrate its unflinching commitment to a better future for Afghans and Afghanistan".⁹⁸ Also, Turkey's Prime Minister, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan was emphasizing the ability of NATO to adapt itself into new circumstances and praising the transformation of the alliance from a collective defence organization to collective security organization. According to Erdoğan, NATO was the "most successful alliance in history" " with "operations stretching from Kosovo to Afghanistan, with Partners from Ireland to Uzbekistan, and

⁹⁶ Madrid Summit Declaration <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/1997/970708/home.htm>

⁹⁷ The Alliance's Strategic Concept: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27433.htm

⁹⁸ Jaap de Hoop Scheffer " Anticipating İstanbul" NATO Review, İstanbul Summit Special, vol. 6, 2004, p. 5.

with roles from civil emergency planning to the fight against terrorism".⁹⁹ And for Erdoğan, it was a duty of Turkey to develop and enhance relations with NATO's Mediterranean Partners and, when the possible outcomes considered, "creation of a functioning partnership with the wider Mediterranean region is arguably the most significant investment that NATO can make in the future of Euro-Atlantic security."¹⁰⁰ The duty of Turkey could be serving as a bridge between the East and the West, and the Mediterranean Dialogue was a crucial initiative for the peace in the region and peace in the Euro-Atlantic area. After September 11, everywhere in the world was the operation area of NATO and without maintaining friendly relations and forming functioning forums for the peaceful settlement of the disputes, it could be really hard to become successful in the "war on terror". For all these considerations, Turkish government willingly participated in the new mission of NATO and played a key role in Afghanistan.

In the Bucharest Summit of 2-4 April 2008, Croatia and Albania were invited to be members. However, Georgia and Ukraine were not invited in order not to alienate Russia. The new defense shield project was accepted in the summit. Macedonia was also refused because of its name dispute with Greece.¹⁰¹

3.2. The Road to September 11: Rise of the Taliban

It may seem irrelevant to mention the history of Taliban while discussing the transformation of the Atlantic Alliance, but it is highly

⁹⁹ Recep Tayyip Erdoğan "Right Time, Right Place" NATO Review, İstanbul Summit Special, vol. 6, 2004, 7.

¹⁰⁰ *Id.*

¹⁰¹ Bucharest Summit of NATO Official Declaration

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_8443.htm Accessed in 09.06.2012

important to know the source of the terror threat “that is coming from the East”. Why did Afghanistan host Al Qaeda and why did US wage war against a state to revenge a terrorist organization? To have a better understanding of this period, we should go back to the early history of Afghanistan.

The period of instability and war, which started by the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in 1979, still continues. In order to understand the internal conflicts of 33 years and the period of occupations, which led to political and social problems, it is important to know the historical background and the emergence of Taliban along with the factors that made the Taliban an active power in the region.

The resistance against the Soviet occupation that began in 1979 took exactly 10 years. During this time, many countries, particularly the U.S.A. and Saudi Arabia, sent discretionary financial supports to Afghanistan. In the same year, the U.S.A. lost one of her allies as there was a revolution in Iran. Furthermore, Afghanistan’s location in Soviet territory put petroleum flow at risk. In a probable war, Alliance’s deprivation of petroleum would mean that a war would progress against them. Hence, it was crucial to support Afghanistan. However, direct intervention of NATO or the U.S.A. could result in an outbreak of a war; thus, they had to intervene indirectly. Keeping all these strategic matters into considerations, the aid was provided via Pakistan. Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) agency of Pakistan was given the responsibility to coordinate military and financial assistance to Taliban.

The insurgents that were unified under the name Mujaheds commenced their resistance against the Soviet occupation. The Mujahideen included the Pashtuns, the Tajiks, the Turkmens and volunteers from various part of the world. During the Soviet invasion, in the religious schools along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, many Afghans had education and these

people have been called as Talibs (seeker of knowledge).¹⁰² These talibs frequently passed the borders and attended to the attacks against Soviet forces as members of "mujahedin". During this period, Taliban was a group with no political aim and identity.¹⁰³ Like other insurgent groups, Taliban resisted to rescue country from the Soviet occupation. After the mujahedin won the war, they started fighting with each other. In this complicated situation most of the talibs returned to religious schools in Pakistan to have free religious education and accommodation.¹⁰⁴ ISI was eager to end the internal war in Afghanistan and to form a pro-Pakistan authority. Taliban used to be more Pakistan biased alternative since the militants of this group were educated in Pakistan. Hence, first the Taliban was supported. So we can say that military and economic support of the Pakistan government played a key role in the rise of the Taliban. However, we cannot say that sole military and economic support of Pakistan was the reason for the success of a small number of madrasa students. This can be better understood when we compare the failure of the others with the success of the Taliban. Shah Masud and Burhaneddin Rabbani were given \$150 million by Saudi Arabia in 1993-1994 when they stopped approaching Iran but that amount of money couldn't help Masud and Rabbani to gain the support of the others. The Taliban received \$30 million a year from Pakistan. It can be easily argued that this aid was not enough to gain the support of the others and to unify Afghanistan when we compare nearly \$3 billion given to Najibullah regime by the Soviets.¹⁰⁵

Throughout the history of Afghanistan, whenever someone succeeded to put the Pashtuns in action, he was able to rule the country. Habibullah Kalakani and Ahmad Shah Masud, both of them without the support and

¹⁰² Robert D. Crews & Amin Tarzi, *The Taliban and the Crisis of Afghanistan*, (Harvard University Press, London, 2009), p. 64.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 93.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 64.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 73.

backing of Pashtuns, attempted and became unsuccessful. Britain and the Soviets in different times tried and failed.¹⁰⁶ But the Taliban's capability to mobilize Pashtuns made it the most powerful organization in a very short time and in five years, from 1992 to 1997, it was able to put 90% of the country under the control of Taliban forces.¹⁰⁷

On May 25, 1997 Pakistan recognized Taliban as the legitimate ruler of Afghanistan. Two days later Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates did the same.¹⁰⁸ After fifteen years of lawlessness and violence, Taliban managed to disarm other military groups, impose a strict order and abolish all the checkpoints which were collecting money arbitrarily from the traders and travelers.¹⁰⁹ Pashtun ethnicity of the Taliban helped it to easily control the captured cities. Another important factor that made it easy for the Taliban to take control of the country was the religious primacy of the movement when compared to the others and the spirit of jihad.¹¹⁰

After 1997, Taliban government took initiatives to be recognized by international community, but it did not achieve what it desired. There were two basic reasons for the failure,

1. While the Taliban was trying to take control over Afghanistan during the years of Civil War, an Al Qaeda army of three thousand militants was very helpful. Hence, Taliban leader Mollah Omar owed a debt of gratitude to Al Qaeda. Moreover, a troop of three thousand members was very crucial for the continuation of the regime. Therefore, the Taliban did not favor to keep a distance with Al Qaeda.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 60.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 68.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 65.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 74-75.

2. Taliban banned the education of women in the places where it gained power. It is on account of the fact that they believed the education was not in accordance with the Islamic standards. The Taliban authorities stated that they would give women the right to have education once peace and welfare are established in the country; however, they could not be convincing.

Owing to the fact that the Taliban government was not recognized by the international community, there was only one option left. That is to support Ahmad Shah Masud, who was against Taliban, until a legitimized government took control of the country. Masud was a highly important figure in the war against Taliban and he had a capacity to lead the anti-Taliban front to victory. However, Masud was assassinated by Taliban on September 9, 2001, three days before September 11, 2001 terror attacks.¹¹¹

3.3. The Story of Al Qaeda

Al Qaeda gained its real power and capability to have operations in different countries during the Afghan Jihad. Many people who joined Afghan Jihad from different countries participated in Al Qaeda organization. Bin Laden used to work in financial networks of the organization. The insurgency, established by the support of the U.S.A., Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Qatar fought against the Soviet Union's forces for years and forced the invaders to withdraw from the country. Being an organization that forced modern and powerful Soviet troops to withdraw, Al Qaeda began to think that they could do the same things for the entire Muslim world. Afghan Jihad was over and the new enemy was the Western powers, especially the U.S.A. In a way, the gun that America provided was directed at itself, even though,

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 116.

it was America that played a significant role in the formation of the Taliban power. Afghanistan became victorious in the war of liberation in 1989, but Al Qaeda interpreted America's permanent deployment of soldiers in Saudi Arabia as an American occupation. In its view, it was now United States, doing the same thing in Saudi Arabia when compared with what Soviet Union did in Afghanistan. From then on, Al Qaeda wanted to destroy the non-Islamist governments in the Middle East.¹¹² When the Jihad was over and people went back their homes, they did not disconnect from each other. Osama bin Laden moved the organization to international platforms through the links it made during the Afghan Jihad.

Before September 11 attacks, there had been many incidents throughout the world in which Al Qaeda militants were involved. World Trade Center was bombed eight years before, in an attack that, if fully successful, would have killed many civilians. The group had planned to bomb multiple aircraft over the Pacific and to crash a jet into an American government building. The same group succeeded in the simultaneous bombing of US embassies in Dar-es-Salaam and Nairobi in 1998. A related group hijacked an Air France airbus from Algeria in December 1994 with the intention of crashing it over Paris.¹¹³

In the time period until the 11th September, the organization had carried out activities in various parts of the world and gained sufficient experience to attack the World Trade Centre. Conducting such a devastating attack, they carried out sensational activity to change the balances, not only in America but all over the world.

¹¹² See Noam Chomsky, "11 Eylül", Translated by Dost Körpe (Om Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2002) for detailed information.

¹¹³ Mary Buckley & Rick Fawn, *Global Responses to Terrorism: 9/11, Afghanistan and Beyond* (Routledge, London, 2003), p. 11.

3.4. The Perception of 9/11 in the World

The target of terrorism is not the victims, but the audience. According to Sun Tzu, ancient Chinese strategist, by making a terrorist attack, you “kill one, frighten ten thousand”.¹¹⁴ It is in this regard that the 11th September attacks achieved its goal, and made many more people scared than it killed. It was a great panic that the U.S.A. was attacked through civil vehicles in its own territory by an organization with no territory and government. Everybody was surprised and tried to interpret what was going on. U.S.A.’s attempt to seek rival in the post-Soviet period could be said to be effective to have such outcomes.

According to Lewis, this was “no less than a clash of civilizations – the perhaps irrational but surely historic reaction of an ancient rival against our Judeo-Christian heritage, our secular present, and the worldwide expansion of both”.¹¹⁵ The most significant theory in the post Soviet era has been the “Clash of Civilizations” thesis by Huntington. To Huntington, the ongoing situation was a clash of civilizations and was natural that these conflicts take place. The number of civilizations in the world is gradually decreasing, and humanity is evolving towards a system where a single civilization is dominant. Under such a process, areas of tensions among the civilizations are formed, which paves the way for “clash of civilizations”¹¹⁶. In addition to Huntington, Fukuyama has asserted that the Western Civilization declared its victory following the collapse of the Soviets and that the best system that human beings can attain is liberal democracy. To Fukuyama, it is very unlikely that the democratic communities would fight with each other; hence, the entire world must meet under these values.¹¹⁷ As a result of the infrastructure of such an intellectual frame, the U.S.A. began to pursue more

¹¹⁴ Buckley, *op. cit.*, 28.

¹¹⁵ Bernard Lewis, “The Roots of Muslim Rage”, *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 266, pp. 47-60, p. 60.

¹¹⁶ See: Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations*, *Foreign Affairs*, Summer (1993).

¹¹⁷ See: Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, (Avon Books, New York, 1992)

aggressive policies, which led to the formation of an Anti-American group in the Middle East. September 11 attacks were carried out by Al Qaeda, to which America had aided by providing weapons and financial supports during the "Afghan Jihad".

Chomsky claimed that the reasons for the attacks are the arbitrary policies of the U.S. in the past and its disregard of international law. The U.S.A. has always directed its weapons towards some people and conquered some parts of Hawaii, Philippines and Mexico killing many people but for the first time in its history, the weapons were directed towards the U.S.¹¹⁸ Previously disregarding international law¹¹⁹ many times, the U.S.A itself paved the way for the creation of terrorism. America provided weapons and financial aids during the Afghan Jihad and also by arbitrary applications and civilian deaths in the Middle East¹²⁰, the U.S. caused these groups to have an anti-war position against the U.S.A.¹²¹. Neumayer and Plumber argued that terrorists did not attack Western targets because of the clash between their civilization and the West but high strategic value of the attacking Westerners.¹²²

Over all, whatever the reasons behind, the collapse of Twin Towers was a turning point for both the U.S.A. and the world. The U.S. government immediately had to show that it was not weak. The management of the period by George W. Bush would determine the directions of the relationships between the Muslims and the Western World. The investigations of FBI revealed that Al Qaeda was the perpetrator. In the following period, rather than Al Qaeda, "terrorism" was declared to be a new enemy. All the terror groups and States that were supporting terrorist groups

¹¹⁸ Noam Chomsky, "11 Eylül" (Om Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2002), p. 13.

¹¹⁹ For ex: Nicaragua Case of ICJ

¹²⁰ For ex: the support of US to Israel for the invasion of Lebanon which caused the death of 18 000 civilians.

¹²¹ Chomsky, op. cit., pp. 70-71

¹²² Eric Neumayer and Thomas Plumber, "International Terrorism and the Clash of Civilizations", British Journal of Political Science, Vol. 39, pp. 711-734, p. 712.

were the enemies of the U.S.A. and there were only two options left. All the other states were either with the United States or against it.¹²³

In terms of the states all over the world, they gave their full support to the U.S.A. September 11 attacks were condemned strictly in all the countries except for few. Everybody was experiencing the surprise of terror hitting the U.S. in its own territory. "Despite the USA's awesome economic strength and military power in a unipolar post-Cold War world, such resources had failed to guarantee the homeland security long taken for granted".¹²⁴ This event left deep impact in world politics. To some people, the world was going towards new polarization.

In an article written for *Daily Telegraph*, former Prime Minister of the UK, Margaret Thatcher, claimed that 'Islamism is the new bolshevism.' And she also noted that; "The enemy is not, of course, a religion – most Muslims deplore what has occurred. Nor is it a single state, though this form of terrorism needs the support of states to give it succor. Perhaps the best parallel is with communism. Islamic extremism today, like bolshevism in the past, is an armed doctrine. It is an aggressive ideology promoted by fanatical, well-armed devotees. And, like communism, it requires an all-embracing long-term strategy to defeat it"¹²⁵

However, Tony Blair was more careful in his search for a definition of the terrorist threat. When the operation against Taliban and Al Qaeda started, Blair emphasized that Islam had nothing to do with terrorism and 9/11 terror attacks. In announcing the commencement of military action in Afghanistan, he stated; "I wish to say finally, as I've said many times before, that this is not a war with Islam. It angers me, as it angers the vast majority of Muslims, to hear bin Laden and his associates described as Islamic

¹²³ George W. Bush's Speech (Sept. 20 2001)

¹²⁴ Buckley, *op. cit.*, 54.

¹²⁵ Buckley, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

terrorists. They are terrorists pure and simple. Islam is a peaceful and tolerant religion and the acts of these people are wholly contrary to the teachings of the Koran."¹²⁶

In his speech to the Bundestag on 19 September, Chancellor Schröder praised the 'level headed attitude of the American Administration' and declared Germany's willingness to give the US military support in its anti-terror campaign. Schröder argued that the struggle against terror had nothing to do with a putative 'clash of civilisations' or 'a war against the Islamic world either.'¹²⁷

Verbal support of the West was explicit and clear. Terror attacks were condemned in the Islamic world and the U.S.A. received messages of support. Organization of the Islamic Conference also condemned the attacks and the General Secretary of the 57 membered organization, Abdulvahid Belkaziz announced that "we condemn these violent criminal acts which are against all the agreements, moral values and monotheistic religions"¹²⁸ Even, the President of Iran, Khatami made an announcement on the same day, saying "I condemn the terrorist operations of hijacking and attacking public places in American cities which have resulted in the death of a large number of defenseless people."¹²⁹

However, far from condemning the attacks, Saddam Hussein targeted the US to gain the support of the Arab public. When all the Arab countries, even Iran were taking side by the US, he used this to blame others to compromise with US.¹³⁰ This was very helpful for Bush while he was attempting to persuade his people to attack Iraq.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 68.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 101.

¹²⁸ *Zaman Gazetesi*, 13.09.2001

<http://arsiv.zaman.com.tr/2001/09/13/dishaberler/dishaberlerdevam.htm> accessed in 21.03.12

¹²⁹ Buckley, *op. cit.*, 128.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 130.

3.5. The Perception of 9/11 by NATO

NATO's support and reaction against the September 11 attack remained at symbolic level. As it is illustrated in the press release of the leaders of the allied countries, NATO was ready to be assigned for the mission, but the U.S.A. considered it as its own matter. It was essential for the U.S.A. to show its citizens that those who aimed at the safety of the country would pay for it. Furthermore, there was a huge technological gap between the military of the U.S.A. and that of the NATO member states. The U.S.A. military consisted of highly sensitive technological equipments whereas the weapons of the allies were outdated and not appropriate to have coordinative operation with the U.S. military. The problem of military capabilities gap had never been a problem during the Cold War because the allies never had to use their military power against an outside aggressor state.¹³¹ However, there was a preparation to attack Afghanistan after the September 11 incident. The only army that the U.S. army could coordinate with was the British army. There was a dramatic difference between the British army and the others.

Even though there wasn't a demand from US for help, on 12 September, Article 5 was invoked for the first time in the history of NATO. When we consider that NATO can only take a decision by unanimity it can be said that it was a really quick response.¹³² Robertson, general secretary of NATO, said "the decision for an operation would be taken by the United States but all the assets of the NATO were going to be open for the use of

¹³¹ Medcalf, *op. cit.*, 4.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 2.

the United States in the war against terrorism.”¹³³ In addition, during the period between 12 September and 4 October, a treaty of eight articles that stipulates sharing information and flight control over American air space was signed. By 9 October, Operation Eagle Assist was launched which was essentially to free US resources to go to Afghanistan. By its conclusion on 16 May 2002, “830 crew members from 13 NATO nations have patrolled US skies for nearly 4300 hours in over 360 operational sorties.” The French also took over some US military responsibilities in the Balkans to free resources to be used elsewhere.¹³⁴

The U.S.A. did not need NATO forces against terrorism but what the ally forces could do was not limited to it. NATO was enthusiastic to evolve its role as a political actor in ex-Soviet territories after the end of the Cold War. The Partnership for Peace (PfP) initiative and the establishment of the Euro–Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) had clear political objectives of inclusive dialogue with the non-NATO countries of Eastern Europe, Russia and the Ukraine. NATO could use this PfP/EAPC framework to coordinate and improve international cooperation against terrorism and preparedness of emergencies. It organized conferences and seminars to discuss new ideas and disseminate good practice. It also sought to coordinate its work with other international organizations such as the UN, EU, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Such roles were vital in improving intelligence and trust among countries which are all to varying degrees subject to international terrorism.¹³⁵

¹³³ *Zaman Gazetesi*, Selçuk Gültaşlı 13.09.2001

<http://arsiv.zaman.com.tr/2001/09/13/dishaberler/dishaberlerdevam.htm> accessed in 21.03.12

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 260.

¹³⁵ *Id.*

3.6. The War in Afghanistan

The support of Pakistan was crucial in the fight against Al Qaeda for the fact that during the war with the Soviet Union, all the aids were carried out through Pakistan and that Pakistan intelligent service ISI played a significant role in the establishment and strengthening of the Taliban. US gave some concessions to Pakistan to gain the support of the country in the way against Taliban and Al Qaeda. American sanctions started in 1998 to stop the Pakistani nuclear program were removed. In return the ISI officers backing Taliban were either taken from the duty or assigned to another position.¹³⁶

Before commencing an operation against Afghanistan, there were meetings held with Taliban. Pakistan was thought to convince Taliban. ISI had created and supported Taliban from the beginning although sometimes it did not act according to the wishes of Pakistan. So the Pakistan government was willing to sacrifice Bin Laden to provide the maintenance of Taliban as the sole power in Afghanistan. Despite the efforts of Pakistani diplomats, Taliban didn't surrender Bin Laden.¹³⁷ After refusing the demand of US to hand over Bin Laden, the already little support for the regime started vanishing. First, Pakistani diplomats left Kabul but Pakistan continued recognizing Taliban. Then, on 22 September, United Arab Emirates, three days later Saudi Arabia ended their recognition.¹³⁸

Owing to the fact that Taliban did not hand in Bin Laden, war plans were put on the agenda. The U.S. wanted to put an end to the war without many casualties. To enter Afghanistan with many soldiers through land could lead to loss of many soldiers as it happened in the case of the Soviets. Hence, they had agreements with local war lords and all were united under

¹³⁶ Buckley, op.cit., 14.

¹³⁷ *Id.*

¹³⁸ *Id.*

the name “united front” and fought against the Taliban forces along with the U.S. air strikes.

As mentioned before US wasn’t enthusiastic about using NATO forces extensively in Afghanistan War because most of the NATO member states did not have enough technological and economic power to be compatible with the US military forces. For this reason, instead of having a multilateral partnership with NATO, to work with individual NATO member states which had enough military capacity seemed as a better option for US.¹³⁹

The United States’ operation against Taliban and Al Qaeda commenced on October 7, 2001 with the massive air attacks to the ground forces of Taliban in various parts of the Afghanistan. Correspondingly, United Front started attacking Taliban forces. In a month, United Front had captured Kabul and by December Taliban lost its last stronghold, Kandahar to the United front, which is the second biggest city of Afghanistan.¹⁴⁰

From Washington’s point of view, victory over al-Qaeda and the Taliban regime was unexpectedly swift and inexpensive. Indeed, “The U.S. commitment to overthrow the Taliban had been about 110 CIA officers and 316 Special Forces personnel, plus massive airpower.”¹⁴¹ The CIA spent only \$70 million to reward Afghan militia leaders for fighting on the ground on behalf of the United States against the Taliban. The American commander in chief called it “one of the biggest ‘bargains’ of all time.”¹⁴²

¹³⁹ Russell D. Howard, “Thinking Creatively in the War on Terrorism-Leveraging NATO and the Partnership for Peace Consortium,” PFP Consortium Quarterly Journal, Spring (2005): 4.

¹⁴⁰ Robert D. Crews & Amin Tarzi, *The Taliban and the Crisis of Afghanistan*, (Harvard University Press, London, 2009), p. 13.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid*, 310.

¹⁴² *Ibid*, 311.

3.7. ISAF mission and NATO

After the war, two types of military groups were deployed in Afghanistan. The first was the American-led coalition forces, called Combined Forces Command-Afghanistan (CFC-A), which was operating in the southern half of the country and carrying out security operations, including active combat operations. The second was the ISAF whose command was assigned to NATO in 2003. At that time, the operation was limited to Kabul, but under the terms of the October 2003 UN Security Council Resolution 1510¹⁴³, NATO expanded its area of operations and became active in Kabul and northern Afghanistan and started expanding its responsibility gradually to the rest of the country.¹⁴⁴ The main objective was to put an end to the war with terrorism and hand the control in to NATO in spring 2006.

Reconstruction of Afghanistan, maintaining security in the country and running state institutions were required in the country after the war. There were three obstacles.

1. Following the period of war, the Taliban regime was overthrown and a new government under the leadership of Khamid Karzai was formed and ISAF was founded to aid Karzai government to establish security in the country. (ISAF was not under the command of NATO when it was first built). There were a lot of things to be carried out in the country, but the forces were too inadequate. "Peacekeeping operations in Somalia, Haiti, Kosovo, Bosnia, Northern Ireland, Iraq, and elsewhere had higher ratios of peacekeepers per inhabitant. In comparative terms, for every 1,000 Afghans, there was less than 1 American or coalition soldier (0.5) to provide security in 2002

¹⁴³ Security Council Resolution 1510

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N03/555/55/PDF/N0355555.pdf?OpenElement>

¹⁴⁴ Lt. General Ethem Erdağ's speech in Washington Institute, <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC05.php?CID=2403>

(versus 23.7 per 1,000 in Kosovo in 1999, 6.1 per 1,000 in Iraq in 2003, and 3.5 per 1,000 in Haiti in 1994). Even before American attention shifted to Iraq in the winter and spring of 2002–2003, per capita aid levels—\$57 per Afghan remained well below those of other conflict environments such as East Timor (\$233), Kosovo (\$526), or Bosnia (\$679).¹⁴⁵

2. Besides, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Pakistan wanted to be dominant over the newly established administration. A civil war could breakout if the balances in the region broke down against one these states. In a speech in New York in November 2002, appreciating the efforts of the citizens of Afghanistan to re-make everything that were devastated by the thirty years of war, Hamid Karzai wanted from the neighbour countries to not to interfere into domestic politics and let the country prosper.¹⁴⁶

3. When we look at the history of the country¹⁴⁷, a person to govern Afghanistan must have two significant qualities. First is to take the support of the Pashtuns and the other one is to be independent from the external powers or give that impression. The fact that Hamid Karzai was also a Pashtun wasn't enough for the Pashtun population to be pleased because Karzai was seen as the legitimizing actor, the hand puppet of the United Front and the Foreign Coalition.¹⁴⁸ Hamid Karzai was being called as the "mayor of Kabul" in folk humor as the local warlords had more power, money and soldiers than him.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁵ Crews, *op. cit.*, 326.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 283.

¹⁴⁷ See Thomas Barfield, *Afghanistan: A Cultural and Political History* (Princeton University Press, London, 2010) for detailed information

¹⁴⁸ Crews, *op. cit.*, 287.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 320.

During the foundation of the Afghan National Army, another problem aroused in the minds of the Pashtuns because of the imbalanced ethnic representation in the number of officers. 40 percent of the population and 52 percent of the soldiers were Pashtuns but only about 36 percent of the noncommissioned officers and 32 percent of the officers were Pashtuns. Whereas, the Tajiks, constituted 25 percent of the population and 37 percent of ANA soldiers, had 53 percent of the NCOs and nearly 56 percent of the officers.¹⁵⁰ The fact that the Tajiks were more dominant in military aspects would cause restlessness among the Pashtuns and thus their confidence in Karzai would be shattered. Despite all these problems, NATO was expanding its area of effect in the country. Afghanistan elected a parliament on September 18, 2005. It was a major political development since the election in 1969. Representatives were elected for National Assembly's lower house (Walesi Jirga-People's Council) and for Provincial Councils (Shurae Welayati)¹⁵¹ When the president was elected in 2004, only 30% of the population voted, but in 2005 election 47% of the people participated which is a significant progress. In this election voter turn out was lower than 2004.¹⁵² This increase in the rate of voting would show that the intended circle of security in the country expanded day by day.

NATO needed additional reinforcement of soldiers in order to expand its effect outside Kabul. In December 2005, a new decision was taken to send an additional 6000 soldiers and increasing the total number of ISAF soldiers in Afghanistan to 15000 and the alliance was given the right of security existence throughout the 75% of Afghanistan. Until the end of the

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 288.

¹⁵¹ Nasreen Ghufuran, "Afghanistan in 2005: The Challenges of Reconstruction," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 46, no. 1 (2006): 85.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 86..

2006, the number of NATO troops increased to 33000 and the security presence was in every part of the country.¹⁵³

3.8. Resurgence of the Taliban

The U.S.A. rested on its laurels for it became victorious over a very short period of time and did not fulfill required things to preserve the achievements. It preferred to keep the number of soldiers in 20 thousand between the years 2006-2007.¹⁵⁴ As a result, the U.S.A. lost its dominance in the country. On account of the fact that Iraq was given priority, the allied powers left the initiatives to Afghan government as they could not pay sufficient attention to Afghanistan. However, as mentioned above, Karzai government could not take necessary steps as it did not have adequate charisma and power, which gradually led country to chaos once again.

The attacks were intensified again after 2005. Evidence for this new level of violence was clear statistically. Between 2005 and 2006, suicide bombings increased by more than 400 percent (from 27 to 139), the use of improvised explosive devices more than doubled (from 783 to 1,677), and armed attacks nearly tripled (from 1,558 to 4,542). "America's "good war" was now badly off track, and the seemingly discredited Taliban were back in the south and attempting to spread outward".¹⁵⁵ In 2006, a resistance group started an uprising against the government and the foreign forces throughout the whole country. They were using the name of the Taliban and also the common name for fighters that was being used during the Soviet

¹⁵³ Rebecca R. Moore, *NATO's New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World* (Praeger security International, London, 2007), 103.

¹⁵⁴ Fikret Ertan, *Zaman Gazetesi*, 10.10.2011
<http://zaman.com.tr/yazar.do?yazino=1188783&keyfield=6E61746F>

¹⁵⁵ Barfield, *op. cit.*, 320.

invasion; "mujahedeen". By October, according to Mullah Sabir, commander of the 900 hundred soldiers fighting against the government and ISAF, 50% of the Afghanistan was under the control of the Taliban again.¹⁵⁶

Taliban have begun to leak into Afghanistan through Pakistan in large numbers and settle in the south of the country since 2007. In response, the U.S.A. started to increase the number of soldiers but it was still not sufficient. Therefore, American commanders demanded 30 thousand more soldiers from the President Obama in 2009. Obama had to agree with it. At present 30 thousand soldiers are fighting in various regions. Additional 30 thousand soldiers altered the military condition and balances and Taliban's area of effect especially in the south was narrowed down. Nevertheless, it succeeded in dissuading Taliban from carrying out raid like activities. It is because of these military pressures that Taliban today rely ore on assassinations, suicide bombings and the bombs and mines placed on the roads.

In Afghanistan, NATO came across what the Great Britain and Russia faced before. Even after 10 years of war period, NATO was still far from achieving what it desired. Nevertheless, NATO plans to leave Afghanistan in 2014. In that year if NATO was convinced that the Afghan government could itself stand still, it would withdraw the soldiers and leave the country to its fate. So far the loss of American forces is 1.723. The total loss of the coalition is about 2.670. Civilian loss is about 10 thousand whereas the loss of Afghan security forces is said to be about 7-8 thousand. Economic loss is believed to be about 500 billion dollars.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ Crews, *op. cit.*, 4.

¹⁵⁷ Fikret Ertan, *Zaman Gazetesi*, 10.10.2011

<http://zaman.com.tr/yazar.do?yazino=1188783&keyfield=6E61746F>

3.9. Turkish Role in ISAF

3.9.1. Turkey's Cultural Ties with Afghanistan

Geographically Afghanistan is a very rough place and the Afghans are very proud people. They are brave and warrior people who became victorious over the attempts of English and Russian occupations. While going to such a region, it is crucial not to be conceived as an occupant force. American and British forces could not form an alternative power when they overthrew Taliban with the support of the overwhelming majority of the population. Besides, the forces that were deployed in the country were totally unfamiliar to the culture of the people in the region and were the Western soldiers who had nothing common with the people. As a result, the foreign forces were conceived as the occupants and the Karzai administration was a puppet.

Turkey was in a key position in such complex situation. Being the only NATO country with overwhelming majority population of Muslims, Turkey had many responsibilities. Turkey has been the only NATO power that has three times run ISAF and so it has played a crucial role in Afghanistan. The historical ties of Turkey with Afghanistan go back to the beginning of the 20th century. During the independence war, Afghanistan sent economic aid to Turkish government. After the war was won, in the 1920s and 1930s, Turkey trained Afghan military officers and helped Afghanistan in its state-building efforts. As a result, much military terminology in Afghanistan is still in Turkish.

While joining the NATO operation in Afghanistan, Turkey laid down a condition of not participating in confrontations. Hence, Turkish soldiers do not even take part in mine clearing works. The reason behind such a decision is the long-lasting intimate relationship between the two countries. Turkish soldier went to Afghanistan only for the reestablishment of welfare in the

country and the government institutions. It was essential to explain these objectives to the public. Hence, the Turkish soldiers deployed in Afghanistan were ordered to leave their guns in Turkey¹⁵⁸. Under the prevailing conditions of Afghanistan, such a decision seemed to be bold and unreasonable. On the other hand, it shows how Turkey was in command of the facts of the region. Turkish soldiers were attacked only once despite being unarmed. According to former Foreign Minister Hikmet Çetin, who served as NATO's first senior civilian representative in Afghanistan from November 2003 to August 2006, said he didn't believe that the attack was deliberately launched on a Turkish convoy. "If the attack was launched on the convoy knowing that it was a Turkish convoy, then I believe that this attack will not find a wide approval among the Taliban itself. This will also lead to dispute among them,".¹⁵⁹

Accordingly, for instance, they chose to patrol on foot and not in cars,¹⁶⁰ and when they patrolled, they never wore bulletproof jackets, even if it meant putting their lives on the line. For the locals, this meant respect. In return, local Afghans showed admiration for the Turkish troops and were willing to cooperate with them. Thus, although there was no effort by Turkish soldiers related to gathering intelligence in Afghanistan, local people were giving significant information to the Turkish soldiers themselves owing to their confidence in Turkish soldiers.¹⁶¹

However, other forces were indifferent to the peoples of Afghanistan and this has always been a problem that has a potential to increase the support to Taliban. For instance, the coalition forces burned Taliban corpses

¹⁵⁸ Interview with a Turkish NATO sergeant who served in Afghanistan

¹⁵⁹ Taliban Attacks Turkish Diplomatic Convoy near Kabul, *Today's Zaman*, 19.06.2007

<http://www.todayszaman.com/news-117095-taliban-attacks-turkish-diplomatic-convoy-near-kabul.html>

¹⁶⁰ American soldiers can not go out without a convoy protection and in some parts of the country sometimes soldiers use Turkish flag on their clothes for protection.

¹⁶¹ Interview with a Turkish NATO sergeant who served in Afghanistan

to force the Taliban and Al Qaeda forces to get out from the place they hide in. This action got serious reaction from the Afghan government and the local people.¹⁶² Another example is the burning of Quran in an American base by the American soldiers which caused very high tension among the Afghan people.

3.9.2. Turkey's Military Support

135.000 personnel from 50 countries are participating in ISAF mission. Turkey was one of the countries that contributed to ISAF operations from the very beginning. Turkey led ISAF-II period successfully with a troop of 1300 soldiers between June 2002 and February 2003. Again in the period of February-August 2005, Turkey led ISAF-VII period, consisted of 8000 soldiers from 30 countries, of whom 1450 were Turkish soldiers. In the same period, Kabul International Airport, which was under NATO command, was run by Turkish soldiers. Furthermore, with 100 personnel from the 3rd Corps Commander, ISAF base was supported between the dates of 04 August 2008 and 04 February 2009.¹⁶³

Responsibility of being the leader country for Kabul Regional Corp, which is one of the six regional corps among ISAF operation, was taken on 01 November 2009 by Turkey. This mission is extended for a period of one year. Until 01 November 2012, Kabul Regional Corps mission would be carried out by Turkey.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶² Ghufuran, *op. cit.*, 88.

¹⁶³ Turkish Armed Forces Official Website

http://www.tsk.tr/4_uluslararasi_iliskiler/4_1_turkiyenin_barisi_destekleme_harekatina_katkilari/konular/turk_silahli_%20kuvvetlerinin_barisi_destekleme_harekatina_katkilari.htm Accessed in

15.03.12

¹⁶⁴ *Id.*

Turkey donated 24 howitzers as a contribution to building three artillery batteries as part of efforts in building up a national military in Afghanistan, the TSK announcement said. "Turkey has the conviction that there is need for a strong Afghan security force for the maintenance of security and stability, both inside Afghanistan and in the region,"¹⁶⁵ the TSK said. The TSK had also planned to give training in Turkey to Afghan artillery personnel assigned to work those batteries.¹⁶⁶

Turkish Armed Forces lead Kabul Regional Corps in Afghanistan and support ISAF with 1650 personnel. This number places Turkey in 8th position among 50 countries that support ISAF operations.¹⁶⁷

Adm. Michael Mullen, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the United States was satisfied over the contribution of Turkey to International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). Mullen, speaking at Foreign Press Center in Washington D.C., said, "the relationship we have with Turkey -- the United States has with Turkey is one of great importance and one that I see, certainly from my perspective, from the military-to-military standpoint, is on extremely solid ground, and we work very comprehensively together across a number of issues."¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵ Turkey Helping Build Afghan Military Capability, *Todayszaman*, 14.05.2007

<http://www.todayszaman.com/news-111162-turkey-helping-build-afghan-military-capability.html>

¹⁶⁶ *Id.*

¹⁶⁷ Turkish Armed Forces Official Website

<http://www.tsk.tr/4-uluslararasi-iliskiler/4-1-turkiyenin-barisi-destekleme-harekatina-katkilari-konulari.htm> Accessed in 15.03.12

¹⁶⁸ US Admiral Expresses Satisfaction over Turkey's Contribution to ISAF, *Todayszaman*, 09.12.2009

<http://www.todayszaman.com/news-195038-us-admiral-expresses-satisfaction-over-turkeys-contribution-to-isaf.html>

3.9.3. Turkey's Contribution to Education and Economic Development in Afghanistan

Although from the very beginning Turkey stated that it can support the Afghans in regard to education and infrastructure, the U.S.A. occasionally demanded Turkey to send combat forces. When Obama increased the number of soldiers to 135 000, he requested Turkey to deploy military forces to Afghanistan. Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan explained why Turkey was reluctant to send combat troops to Afghanistan, saying, "Turkey's mission in Afghanistan was clear since the beginning. Majority of Afghan people is Muslim and they trust Turkish army. If we betray their trust, we may not be able to do our job that we are capable of."¹⁶⁹ After his visit to White House, in a televised interview on PBS, Erdoğan said the issue was one of the topics on the agenda at his White House meeting with US President Barack Obama. Erdoğan said Turkey could help establish Afghanistan's national army, as it did in early-1900s, and train Afghan police, adding that he made the offer at the meeting with Obama. Erdoğan said that Turkish officers could train Afghan soldiers and police in Turkey and in Afghanistan. Upon this, the U.S.A. requested Turkish soldiers to train Afghan soldiers on the field. In fact, this meant the same as joining the war actively. The Turkish soldiers standing side by side with the Afghan soldiers would join the war and thus this request was also rejected. Turkey did not take part in the war from the very beginning, but continued to train Afghan police and soldiers both in Turkey and Afghanistan. In this context, so far, 12.000 soldiers and policemen have been trained in Afghanistan.¹⁷⁰ In addition, 2000 Afghan personnel received education in military schools in Turkey and these

¹⁶⁹ Erdoğan Explains Not Sending Combat Troops to Afghanistan, *Today's Zaman*, 09.12.2009
<http://www.todayszaman.com/news-195042-pm-erdogan-explains-not-sending-combat-troops-to-afghanistan.html>

¹⁷⁰ *Id.*

educational programs still continue. Moreover, Turkey has taken responsibility of the sponsorship of Afghanistan Military High School.¹⁷¹

Turkey used to carry out educational activities with schools in the region even before the Afghan operation commenced. These schools were not closed even during the period of the Taliban regime. Today there are many Turkish schools in various parts of Afghanistan. Today more than five thousand Afghan students receive education from Turkish teachers in line with educational standards in Turkey. These schools became so successful in the country that every year 10 out of 20 top positions in the country are achieved by the graduates of these schools. All Afghan authorities including the President Hamid Karzai wish and expect Turkey to increase the number of these schools.¹⁷²

Turkey carries out more productive activities compared to other countries in Afghanistan. When we consider that Afghan people were forced to remain illiterate due to an ongoing civil war that took a decade, the significance of educational issues become vitally important.

Turkey has two Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT) in Afghanistan; one was founded in Wardak city in 2006 and the other was founded in Shibirghan city of Jevizjan state in the North Afghanistan on 21 July 2010. Turkey provided Afghanistan financial aid of 419 million US Dollars in total, of which 307 million dollars were allocated to the projects carried out by TIKA, 37 million dollars were allocated to projects by PRT in Wardak, and 75 million dollars were allocated to those carried out by Turkish Armed Forces. Jevizjan

¹⁷¹ Turkish Armed Forces Official Website

http://www.tsk.tr/4_uluslararasi_iliskiler/4_1_turkiyenin_barisi_destekleme_harekatina_katkilari/konular/turk_silahli_kuvvetlerinin_barisi_destekleme_harekatina_katkilari.htm Accessed in 15.03.12

¹⁷² Sedat Laçiner, "Afganistan'da Ne İşimiz Var?", *Star Gazetesi*, 22.03.2012

<http://www.stargazete.com/yazar/sedat-laciner/neden-afganistan-dayiz-haber-436290.htm> accessed in 22.03.12

PRT planned 54 activities and projects, of which twenty one have been completed.¹⁷³

3.9.4. Turkey's Role as a Negotiator in Afghanistan

As stated above, Turkey has a positive image on the public of the region, which paves the way for Turkey to play active role in carrying out negotiations. It is quite difficult to unite people in a place like Afghanistan where there are many ethnic factors and different languages. Moreover, warlords are still powerful and active. This is another factor that makes it more difficult. In addition, the fact that the countries in the region have different accounts on Afghanistan makes the already complex situation more intricate. Under such circumstances, it was vitally significant to have a respected negotiator that is in equal distance to all the sides and can have its words to be heard by others. Turkey is a well-regarded country with required instruments. It does not hesitate to use this advantage occasionally.

For instance, the assassination of Burhaneddin Rabbani while the peace talks were going on with Taliban caused the deterioration of the relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Afghan government blamed Pakistan for playing both sides and hosting the assassination planning. After Pakistan also blamed Afghan and American forces for not taking necessary precautions, Turkey interfered as a mediator and assembled both sides in Ankara. In the meeting, it was decided to establish a common commission to investigate the assassination. After the summit, implying US, Zerdari said

¹⁷³Turkish Armed Forces Official Website
http://www.tsk.tr/4_uluslararasi_iliskiler/4_1_turkiyenin_barisi_destekleme_harekatina_katkilari/konular/turk_silahli_kuvvetlerinin_barisi_destekleme_harekatina_katkilari.htm Accessed in 15.03.12

"Among all the states trying to help the region, only Turkey is sincere. The guidance of Turkey is more appropriate."¹⁷⁴

While Turkey was preparing for a full agenda of meetings in October 2011 conference on Afghanistan, one conference participant, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, praised Turkey's ability to communicate with the leaders of the Af-Pak region and welcomed its presence in efforts to stabilize the Afghan state. Mentioning Turkish troops' mission in ISAF, Clinton hailed Turkey's presence in the region as very helpful to the US in a committee meeting in the US House of Representatives on Thursday.¹⁷⁵ She also drew attention to the fact that the country had a great deal of credibility with a number of countries, and its involvement was very helpful for that reason.¹⁷⁶

President Karzai commented on Turkey's importance for the consolidation of peace in Afghanistan and praised Turkey's efforts in Bonn Conference. He said "Last month in Istanbul, thanks to the leadership of our friend the brotherly Republic of Turkey, twelve of Afghanistan's near and extended neighbors came together to discuss the challenges within the region that prevent cooperation and the need for greater confidence building. I hope that the Istanbul Process will continue to generate even greater momentum for cooperation at the regional level when the region meets again at the Ministerial Conference in Kabul in June 2012."¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ Servet Yanatman and Ayten Çiftçi, "İstanbul'da Buzları Eriten Zirve," *Zaman Gazetesi*, November 02, 2011.

¹⁷⁵ Clinton Hails Turkey on Af-Pak Issue, *Today's Zaman*, 28.10.2011

<http://www.todayszaman.com/news-261272-clinton-hails-turkey-on-af-pak-issue-as-it-readies-for-afghan-conference.html> accessed in 18.03.2012

¹⁷⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷⁷ President Karzai's Statement at Bonn Conference <http://www.isaf.nato.int/article/bonn-conference/transcript-of-president-karzais-statement-at-the-bonn-conference.html>

3.10. A General Evaluation

Many mistakes were made in Afghanistan and the whole operation turned into a real mess for the allies. Many civilians were killed, and still the allies are trying to find a way out of Afghanistan. The war had been lost when the American and British soldiers were perceived as invaders, not helpers. The Americans were too busy on planning their Iraq operation, so they didn't give enough support and resources for ISAF. This situation caused a real mess and we can say that ISAF became unsuccessful.

When we consider the role of Turkey, we cannot claim that Turkey was wrong on supporting ISAF operation. If the necessary support had been given, the country wouldn't have been like this right now. Even if there were many bad things and mistakes about the ISAF mission, Turkish stance was right. As the only NATO ally with an Islamic majority, Turkey didn't provide combat forces and only tried to help Afghan people to rebuild their country. The ISAF experience proved that Turkey has an important role to play in the future operations of NATO. We see that, this failure caused Turkey and the other Allies to reconsider Turkey's position within the Alliance.

CHAPTER IV. LIBYA, NATO AND TURKEY

4.1.How did the Unrest Start in Libya?

The "Arab Spring" which started in Tunisia first and spread to other Middle Eastern countries, caused great changes in Middle Eastern politics. Many states have been affected by the democratization demands of the public. In Tunisia and Egypt, the regimes have changed without causing great tension. But in Libya and Syria, the governments used military forces to oppress the opposition. These events resulted in an internal war in both of these countries.

The waves of so called "Arab Spring" reached Libya and a fight between the army and the opposition began. Unlike Tunisia and Egypt, the leader of Libya, Gaddafi, was determined to oppress the opposition by using force. UK and France were caught unprepared to the developments in the region and they had to watch the sudden changes in Tunisia and Egypt. When the unrest in Libya began, these European powers acted more actively and tried to structure the events according to their interests. At the beginning Western world was distant to the demands of the opposition, but after much of the oil rich areas were taken by the opposition, especially France started supporting opposition.

The rebels established a provisional government named the National Transitional Council based in Benghazi and managed to take control of the eastern part of the country and the western city of Misrata. In Libya, the opposition gained many great victories, but after the counter attack of the

Gaddafi forces, most of the cities were lost. In early March, Gaddafi's forces rallied, pushed eastwards and re-took several coastal cities and finally began attacking the rebel stronghold of Benghazi on 19 March 2011. Civilian losses were increasing and the opposition was very close to defeat.¹⁷⁸

4.2. French Eagerness for Action

Regarding Libya, especially Southern European states acted more sensitively. Libya is a maritime neighbor of France and other southern European nations. It is a huge country whose hydrocarbon energy resources are presently of great importance to Europe's battered economies.¹⁷⁹ When the internal war began, from the very beginning, French president Nicholas Sarkozy behaved enthusiastically for intervening in Libya. We can give three main reasons for French enthusiasm:

1. France and most of Southern European nations were concerned about the Libyan petroleum resources. Libya has total proven oil reserves of 47.1 billion barrels as of January 2012 – the largest endowment in Africa, and among the ten largest globally.¹⁸⁰ For the France's interests, an urgent solution was important.
2. Because of the approaching elections, Sarkozy wanted to increase his popularity by showing his people that France is still an important power in international politics and that it can act without the support of Germany.

¹⁷⁸ Security Council Resolution 1970 <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/245/58/PDF/N1124558.pdf?OpenElement> Accessed in 17.06.2012

¹⁷⁹ John D. Anthony, Challenges Facing NATO in Afghanistan, Libya and Iraq, National Council on U.S.-Arab Relations, p. 2. <http://ncusar.org/publications/Publications/2011-10-12-Challenges-Facing-NATO.pdf> Accessed in 06.05.2012

¹⁸⁰ U.S. Energy Information Administration, Libya's Oil Resources <http://www.eia.doe.gov/countries/cab.cfm?fips=LY>

3. United States also supported France to act unilaterally, and to be the pioneer of an operation. Obama didn't want to be seen as the leader of Libya operation where there weren't any direct American interests. Because, while the elections were approaching and the US army was in a complicated situation in Afghanistan and Iraq, it was like a political suicide to start another operation.

4.3. UN's Response

UNSC, with resolution 1970, reminded Libya government its responsibility to protect its people.¹⁸¹ This decision was taken with unanimity. The Libyan government was called upon to act according to international law. As a precaution, an arms embargo was applied and ten Libyan administrators were prohibited from going abroad. Also, assets of these people were frozen.¹⁸² Unfortunately, these precautions didn't work and the killing of civilians continued.

On 17 March 2011, resolution 1973¹⁸³ was accepted with ten approvals and five abstentions. Although Russian Federation and People's Republic of China have veto rights, they didn't use them by staying abstained. These two permanent member states of UN Security Council didn't want to be the cause of another Rwanda or Bosnia. Because in Rwanda and Bosnia international society was late for action, and as a result many civilians died.

¹⁸¹ UN Security Council Resolution 1970 <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/245/58/PDF/N1124558.pdf?OpenElement> Accessed in 08.03.2011

¹⁸² *Id.*

¹⁸³ Security Council Resolution 1973 <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/268/39/PDF/N1126839.pdf?OpenElement> Accessed in 17.06.2012

On 17 March 2011, a military intervention was legitimized by the UN Resolution 1973,¹⁸⁴ but the main aim was to protect civilians, to apply arms embargo and to control Libyan air space. Using ground forces was not allowed by the UN Security Council.¹⁸⁵ Using ground forces was prohibited to convince Russia and China to not to veto and to give a message to Muslim states that it wasn't an occupation or a "crusade".

In Paris Summit, 19 March 2011, a decision was taken for the intervention. While the second Benghazi War was still going on between Gaddafi and National Transitional Council, French fighter planes started bombing Libyan ground forces and helped the rebels to win the war. Only nine out of 28 NATO members participated in the mission for the protection of the Libyan civilians from the attacks of Libyan armed forces.¹⁸⁶ In addition to this, only 7 of them participated in the air operation.¹⁸⁷

4.4. NATO Intervention

At the beginning, NATO didn't take the whole control of the operation. The international coalition was conducting the operation and NATO was responsible for the control of the no fly zone.¹⁸⁸ 13 days after the beginning

¹⁸⁴ *Id.*

¹⁸⁵ Segah Tekin, İnsani Müdahale Kavramı ve Libya'nın geleceği, Stratejik Düşünce Enstitüsü, p. 15. <http://www.sde.org.tr/userfiles/file/INSANI%20MUDAHALE%20KAVRAMI%20VE%20LIBYA%20GELECEGI%20analiz.pdf> Accessed in 04.04.2012

¹⁸⁶ Henning Bartels, Lessons Learned from NATO Mission Libya, European Security and Defense, Vol. 3-4, 2011 http://www.europeansecurityanddefence.info/Ausgaben/2011/03+04_2011/01_Bartels/2011_3_4_01.pdf

¹⁸⁷ John D. Anthony, Challenges Facing NATO in Afghanistan, Libya and Iraq, National Council on U.S.-Arab Relations, p. 5. <http://ncusar.org/publications/Publications/2011-10-12-Challenges-Facing-NATO.pdf> Accessed in 06.05.2012

¹⁸⁸ Tekin, *op. cit.*, 20.

of the Operation Unified Protector, NATO took the command of the operation.¹⁸⁹

Libya operation was legitimate and necessary for maintaining peace and security in Libya. NATO forces helped the opposition to win the war against Gaddafi. Within the framework of resolution 1973¹⁹⁰, the main aim was not to overthrow Gaddafi but to protect civilians. Either way, it helped Libya to meet democracy. On 6 July 2012, after more than fifty years, the first democratic elections were conducted.

Another important lesson learned from Libya is that, avoidance of land operations, is a better way for peacekeeping operations. The same strategy was used in Kosovo, and it worked. Now, for the second time, it was used and this time it wasn't against international law.¹⁹¹ The whole operation was based on resolutions 1970 and 1973 of UNSC.

According to Secretary General Rasmussen "Events in Libya have underlined that although a military approach cannot solve a conflict on its own, it is a necessary tool in a wider political effort. Europe needs to build a strong continuum of hard and soft power so that it can respond to the full spectrum of crises and threats."¹⁹²

4.5. Turkey's Position

When the Arab Spring began, the West wasn't ready because nobody could foresee the events. After Tunisia and Egypt, the democracy demands

¹⁸⁹ *Zaman Gazetesi* "Komuta Resmen NATO'da!" 31.03.2011

¹⁹⁰ Security Council Resolution 1973 <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/268/39/PDF/N1126839.pdf?OpenElement> Accessed in 17.06.2012

¹⁹¹ Ali H. Aslan, "Güvercinlikten Şahinliğe;Obama'nın Libya Savaşı" *Zaman Gazetesi* 21.03.2011

¹⁹² Anders Fogh Rasmussen, NATO after Libya (Reprinted with the permission of Foreign Affairs) http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_75836.htm?selectedLocale=en accessed in 07.03.2012

of the public spread to Libya. In these circumstances, the position of Turkey was very important for the USA. United States was eager to work with Turkey during the restructuring process of the Middle East. According to American Senator John Kerry, it was really important to work in close contact with Turkey to control the changes in the Middle East.¹⁹³ In his view, Turkey is a glorious example of progress. Once Turkey and Egypt were in the same economic and democratic level, but today there is a huge gap between them.¹⁹⁴ The American strategy was to show and put forward Turkey as a model country for the whole Middle East.

Turkish side was also enthusiastic about using her democracy experience as a model for the Middle East. It was important for the Turkish politicians to have a more democratic Middle East. Regarding Libya, at first, Turkey opposed a military intervention. This approach had two reasons. First, Turkey didn't want to be seen like a helper and ally of France in the operation. Everybody knew that, French eagerness for action stemmed from the oil rich areas of Libya. That's why, it could be dangerous for Turkey to support the operation from the very beginning. Besides this, Turkey had investments in Libya and also there were more than 10 000 Turkish workers in Libya. Opposing Gaddafi might put the life of Turkish civilians in danger.

After the UNSC Resolution 1973 was accepted, at first, Turkish side opposed the idea of a military operation. The main reason of Turkish opposition was the safety of the civilians. An operation had a potential to cause more civilian losses.¹⁹⁵ That's why, Turkey wanted NATO to reconsider operation plans. Because of Turkish veto, the decision for the operation couldn't be taken.¹⁹⁶ In the NATO meeting, it was agreed upon the

¹⁹³ *Zaman Gazetesi* "Türkiye, Ortadoğu'daki dönüşüm sürecinde kilit rol oynama yeteneğine sahip" 19.03.2011

¹⁹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁹⁵ *Zaman Gazetesi* "Türkiye, NATO'dan operasyonları gözden geçirmesini istedi" 20.03.2011

¹⁹⁶ *Zaman Gazetesi* "TürkiyeVeto Etti; NATO Anlaşmaya Varamadı" 21.03.2011

application of the UN arms embargo. After the operation plans were reconsidered, Turkey also supported the military operation, but didn't send combat forces. Turkey's F16s were sent to the region but their duty was to protect the ships that were checking the Mediterranean for the application of arms embargo.¹⁹⁷ Besides, a Turkish ship was turned into a hospital and sent to Misrata to help the injured people.

As a result, Turkey did what had to be done by opposing the military operation at the beginning. France's lead was dangerous for the success of the operation. After the UNSC resolution was accepted and NATO accepted to take the command of the operation, Turkey started supporting military operation.

The main question to be asked here is that: Was the NATO intervention really necessary? In this situation, an intervention by Muslim states would have been better, but the Muslim states don't have a mechanism to take decision and to make military intervention. That's why we can say that, the intervention was right and legal.

According to Bacık, Muslim world, as it was seen again and again in the previous examples, lacks the necessary tools and principles to solve a problem within itself. Muslim states do not have the necessary military power and technology, and also there is not a mechanism to form a consensus and get into action. Organization of Islamic Conference doesn't have the same effectiveness of OSCE or NATO."¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁷ *Zaman Gazetesi* "Davutoğlu: F16'larımız bombalamayacak." 30.03.2011

¹⁹⁸ Gökhan Bacık, "Libya'ya Müdahale ve Türkiye" *Zaman Gazetesi* 21.03.2011

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

5.1. Conclusion

Over the course of the Cold War, NATO served allies successfully and protected Atlantic Alliance from a probable Soviet attack by deterrence. It also accelerated the collapse of the Soviet Union through its surrounding strategy. Through all this period, Turkey also protected NATO's southern flank and as a deterrent power, she prevented a conflict in that region. Throughout the Cold War, Turkey was seen as an important military power for the reason that it had the second largest army in NATO after US. Turkey's main mission was to prevent or delay Soviets from reaching the Persian Gulf oil in a probable war.

As for the Post-Soviet period, at first NATO became an organization whose existence was to be questioned. Alliances are formed against common enemies and they continue as long as those enemies pose a threat. Soviet threat was no more valid and this situation gave rise to the thought that NATO wasn't necessary anymore. Especially France, as she didn't want US to be effective over European politics through NATO, wanted EU to give more importance to WEU and to assign the responsibility of NATO to WEU gradually. Furthermore, it was an important necessity in the post-Soviet period for EU to have a single voice in foreign policy within the framework of Common Foreign and Security Policy. As for US, it was crucial for the American interests to maintain its influence in EU politics. In that period, not only NATO's but also Turkey's necessity for European security was questioned. Even if NATO maintained its existence, EU didn't need the Turkish army. For that reason Turkey had to redefine its membership from a different perspective.

While all these discussions were going on, to prove that EU can protect the peace in Europe without outside help, it tried to settle the ethnic conflicts and stop the violence in the Balkans, but it failed. Nothing effective could be done in relation to the tragedy occurring in Bosnia, and the conflict between Bosnian Muslims, Serbs and Croats went for so long. Bosnian problem was solved after the bombardment that started upon UN authorization of NATO, but it was too late and many civilians had already died.

Right after that, from the beginning of 1997, many Kosovar Albanians running away from the Serbian army sought refuge in the forests and a large amount of them faced hunger and cold weather. This incident had a potential to be like Bosnia or even worse than that. International community was not able to do anything because of the Russian veto threat in the UN Security Council. For that reason, NATO operation began without Security Council authorization and the Serbian army surrendered after 14 weeks of massive bombardment.

When we look at these events from the point of NATO's transformation, we see that there has been a significant change in NATO's mission. An organization that was providing security for its members and being insurance for European security, turned into an organization which is willing and able to conduct operations outside its borders. While the failure of EU in the resolution of the conflicts was showing the need for NATO, it also showed that Turkey was still needed for European security.

In both of these two events, Turkey took an active role as a member of NATO. While the necessity of Turkey for the European security and for the NATO was being questioned, the crisis that broke out in the middle of Europe showed that Turkey was still a key ally for European security. Especially, during the Bosnian conflict, as mentioned above, Turkey pursued an active foreign policy initiative for the solution of the problem. Turkey, as a country

with a special sensibility vis-a-vis the Balkans, was still important for regional peace. In the course of events, the conflicts in the Balkans ended before turning into Third Balkan War and Turkey had a chance to re-define its position in NATO in a different way.

The second phase of the NATO's transformation took place after the incident of September 11, 2001. For the first time in its history, NATO applied 5th Article and waged war against those who were deemed to be in close contact with the perpetrators of the terrorist attacks. Before September 11, it had intervened the near abroad of EU because the conflict in the Balkans had a potential to spread into Europe and turn into a Balkan War. However, this time the Alliance was intervening in Afghanistan which is more than thousand miles away from the nearest NATO member. Lastly, in Libya, conducting Operation Unified Protector, NATO helped the opposition to overthrow Gaddafi. These events came to mean that NATO was defining the whole world as its area of responsibility. While NATO was coming into prominence as an organization which had a potential to effectively interfere in conflict zones throughout the world, Turkey had to orient itself according to new conditions.

In this conjuncture, Turkey has enhanced her influence and position within the Alliance and become very important for the success of out of area operations as she is the only state in NATO with a Muslim majority. Besides, Turkey had an important role to play as a state having the Ottoman heritage and cultural ties with the potential conflict zones. As a result, Turkey evolved its role from a source of soldiers to a more complicated one inescapably.

The common point of NATO's Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan and Libya operations is that all these countries have Muslim majority. As for NATO, the common point of NATO members, except Turkey, is that all of them have Christian majority. This situation brings along the fact that NATO operations might be perceived as an invasion by the local people. In that kind of

situation, Turkey has had to separate herself from the other members of the Alliance. It didn't cause a problem in the cases of Bosnia and Kosovo because the people of these states have been living in the middle of Europe for centuries along with Christians. However, in Afghanistan, NATO forces were perceived as invading forces and it made the resolution of the conflict much harder. From the very beginning, although Turkey was acting together with the international community, she succeeded to take itself apart from the other NATO troops, and even Taliban didn't see Turkish soldiers as an occupying force. If the US demand for sending combat troops to Afghanistan was applied, today the situation in Afghanistan would be a real impasse.

Looking at the Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan and Libya examples with critical eyes is important for the future of the alliance and the security of the Middle East. NATO perceived Turkey as a source of soldiers and the protector of its Southern flank during the Cold War, but today at the point where we stand, there are many drawbacks of seeing Turkey as a military power. Within the new mission of NATO, Turkey has to be seen as a soft power. In the conflict areas such as it happened in Libya, Turkey has to try all diplomatic ways and try to solve the problems without using military force. But if the situation cannot be controlled and a military operation is inevitable, Turkish army shouldn't take duties in combat forces. This strategy was applied in Afghanistan, Libya and proved its success. For the long term success of NATO operations, NATO has to stop making plans for using Turkish soldier as a combat force.

Among the NATO members, when military force is needed to be sent to somewhere, especially effective powers like France, Germany, Britain might act reluctantly. Because, to convince the public for action when there is no direct interest of that state in that region is really hard and politicians are stuck in a difficult situation. In situations like that, Turkey is seen as a better alternative because it is easier to convince the public in Turkey as the

potential conflict zones are somehow connected to Turkey economically and culturally. Even in situations like that when Turkey has direct interests with the conflict zone, Turkish soldiers must stay away from the military intervention. If Turkish army is perceived as acting with Western powers (occupying force), even if a short term success is gained, in the long term it may cause more serious problems for all sides.

In addition to this, Turkey should take part in peace negotiations more actively. On the part of NATO, Turkey's role as a negotiator should be underlined and the message should be given to different sides of conflicts that Turkey's and NATO's approaches overlap. Turkey should stay away from being a side of the conflicts and maintain her connection with both sides whatever happens. As long as the negotiation channels are open, there is always a chance for peace. As Turkey works for the peace as a neutral and active agent, her credibility would increase and she could be a better negotiator in the future. It shouldn't be forgotten that as a bridge between the Muslim states and NATO, Turkey can be much more effective than a military power. Turkey has to explain its position precisely to avoid other states making plans over Turkey when military options are considered on a conflict zone.

Fifteen months ago, the protests against Asad regime started and more than 12,000 people have lost their lives since March 2011, hundreds of Syrians are imprisoned, and tens of thousands have fled to neighboring countries such as Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey. In Libya, France and UK took part in the operation because they had a direct interest in the region. The Libyan oil was enough to convince these states to take part in the Operation Unified Protector. But still, most of the NATO members are distant to an operation. Another problem is that, United States is also distant to an operation because of the incoming elections. When we add the China and Russia's opposition and veto for an operation, we can claim that a NATO

operation is not foreseeable in the near future. In these circumstances, "What should Turkey do?" can be summarized in three points:

1. The most important thing is that, for an operation to Syria or somewhere else, there has to be a UNSC authorization. If Russia and China agrees upon a peacekeeping operation to Syria, Turkey shouldn't take part in combat forces. The main aim of Turkey in an operation to Syria should be the protection of her borders and controlling the activities of PKK. For that reason, ground forces can be used to form a safety zone in the Syrian border but this action has to be explained to Syrian side very well. Another important thing is the protection of civilians and refugees. Up to date, Turkey welcomed many refugees from Syria. In a possible operation, Turkish government has to be ready to host thousands of refugees.

2. After the operation ends, as in Afghanistan and Libya, in the peacekeeping operations Turkey should take part with its infrastructure, education and health services personnel rather than with her combat forces and play a key role in the coordination of all these efforts by the international community.

3. Turkey also has a role to play in the contact of peacekeeping forces with the public. As Turkey doesn't have big oil companies, her peacekeeping efforts are more trustworthy in the eyes of the public. If all these advantages can be used effectively, in the long run, Turkey, the Middle East and NATO can gain favor from the situation. Turkey would increase her credibility, NATO would maintain its existence and become a more trustworthy organization and the Middle East would become a more democratic and stable place.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Arı, Tayyar and Piringçi, Ferhat. "Soğuk Savaş Sonrasında ABD'nin Balkan Politikası," *Alternatif Politika vol. 3, no. 1(2011): 6*.

Aydoğmuş, Fatih. *Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Türkiye'nin Balkanlar Üzerindeki Etkisi*. M.A. Thesis, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul, 2009.

Barfield, Thomas. *Afghanistan: A Cultural and Political History*. Princeton University Press, London, 2010.

Bekaj, Armend R. "The KLA and the Kosovo War: From Intra State Conflict to Independent Country" *Berghof Conflict Research* Vol. 43. http://www.berghof-conflictresearch.org/documents/publications/transitions8_kosovo.pdf
Accessed in 09.16.2011

Buckley, Mary & Fawn, Rick. *Global Responses to Terrorism: 9/11, Afghanistan and Beyond*. Routledge, London, 2003.

Chomsky, Noam. *11 Eylül*. Om Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2002.

Coşkun, Birgül D. "Ankara ve Berlin'in Bosna Savaşına Yönelik Politikaları: Karşılaştırmalı Bir İnceleme", *UI Dergisi, Vol. 4, No. 13*, pp. 57-88.

Crews, Robert D. & Tarzi, Amin. *The Taliban and the Crisis of Afghanistan*. Harvard University Press, London, 2009.

Eroğlu, Zehra. *Turkey's Foreign Policy Towards the Balkans in the Post-Cold War Era*. M.A. Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, 2005.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. Avon Books, New York, 1992.

Ganglof, Sylvie. "The Impact of the Ottoman Legacy on Turkish Policy in the Balkans" *Paper written for CERİ* <http://www.ceri-sciences-po.org/archive/nov05/artsg.pdf>

Ghufran, Nasreen. "Afghanistan in 2005: The Challenges of Reconstruction," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 46, no. 1, 2006.*

Gözen, Ramazan. "Turkey's Delicate Position Between NATO and ESDP" *Paper prepared for SAM (Strategical Research Center)*, http://www.sam.gov.tr/perceptions/sampapers/ramazan_gozen.pdf.

Güney, Nursin Ateşoğlu. Ed., *Contentious Issues of Security and the Future of Turkey*. Hampshire, Ashgate Publishing, 2007.

Huntington, Samuel. "The Clash of Civilizations" *Foreign Affairs*, Summer, 1993.*

Howard, Russell D. "Thinking Creatively in the War on Terrorism-Leveraging NATO and the Partnership for Peace Consortium" *PfP Consortium Quarterly Journal*, Spring 2005.*

Independent International Commission on Kosovo. *Kosovo Report Conflict, International Response, Lessons Learned*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

Institute for International Studies. *NATO and Humanitarian Action in the Kosovo Crisis*, Brown University, Vol. 128.

http://repository.forcedmigration.org/show_metadata.jsp?pid=fmo:1572

Keskin, Funda. "İnsancıl Müdahale: 1999 Kosova ve 2003 Irak Sonrası Durum" *Uİ Dergisi*, Vol. 3, No. 12, pp. 49-70.

Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomasi*(İstanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2009), 225.

Lewis, Bernard. "The Roots of Muslim Rage", *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 266, pp. 47-60.*

Lightbody, Bradley. *Cold War*. London and New York, Routledge, 1999.

Medcalf, Jennifer. *NATO: A Beginner Guide*. London, Oneworld Publications, 2005.

Moore, Rebecca R. *NATO's New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World*. Praeger Security International, London, 2007.

Neumayer, Eric & Plumber, Thomas. "International Terrorism and the Clash of Civilizations", *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 39, pp. 711-734.

Sandler, Todd, and Hartley, Keith. *Past, Present, and into the 21st Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Scheffer, Jaap de H. " Anticipating İstanbul" *NATO Review, İstanbul Summit Special*, vol. 6, 2004.

Sendmeyer, Scott A. *NATO Strategy and Out of Area Operations*. School of Advanced Military Studies United States Army Command and General Staff College, Kansas, 2010.

Simma, Bruno. "NATO, the UN and the Use of Force: Legal Aspects," *EJIL*, Vol. 10 1999.

Şafak, Yasin. *Bosna Savaşı ve Yugoslavya'nın Parçalanması*. M.A. Thesis, Kadir Has Üniversitesi, İstanbul, 2010.

The NATO Handbook; 50th Anniversary Edition. Brussels: Office of Information and Press, 1999.

Yapıcı, Merve İ. "Bosna Hersek'te Gerçekleştirilen Müdahale'nin Uluslararası Hukuktaki Yeri", *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika*, Vol. 2, No. 8, (2007), pp. 1-24.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Bucharest Summit of NATO Official Declaration

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_8443.htm Accessed in 09.06.2012

CIA-The World Factbook

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/>

NATO's Madrid Summit Declaration 1997

<http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/1997/970708/home.htm>

NATO's New Strategic Concept (1999 Washington Summit)

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27433.htm

NATO's Brussels Summit Declaration 1994

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-73364D74-144351F/natolive/official_texts_24470.htm?mode=pressrelease

Partnership for Peace Document

www.nato.int/pfp/pfp.htm

Security Council Resolution 151

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N03/555/55/PDF/N0355555.pdf?OpenElement>

Security Council Resolution 1970

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/245/58/PDF/N1124558.pdf?OpenElement>

Security Council Resolution 1973

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/268/39/PDF/N1126839.pdf?OpenElement>

Text of the Brussels Treaty

<http://www.weu.int/Treaty.htm>

Text of the UN Treaty Article 39

http://untreaty.un.org/cod/repertory/art39/english/rep_supp1_vol1-art39_e.pdf

The original text of the Rome Declaration:

<http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c911108a.htm>

United Nations Security Council Resolution 816

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/187/17/IMG/N9318717.pdf?OpenElement>

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1199

<http://daccess-ods.un.org/TMP/6225358.84380341.html>

UN Official Website Chapter VII of the UN charter

<http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter7.shtml>

U.S. Energy Information Administration, Libya's Oil Resources

<http://www.eia.doe.gov/countries/cab.cfm?fips=LY>

WEBSITES

CIA-The World Factbook

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/>

NATO official website

www.nato.int

United Nations Security Council Resolutions.

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/187/17/IMG/N9318717.pdf?OpenElement>

Western European Union official website

www.weu.int

NEWSPAPERS

Hürriyet

Milliyet

Today's Zaman

Turkish Daily News

Zaman