T.C.

ISTANBUL KULTUR UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

THE US AND AFGHANISTAN RELATIONS AFTER 9/11 EVENT

Master of Arts Thesis by

Mohammad Feroz YAQOOBI

1600005198

Department: International Relations

Programme: International Relations

Supervisor: Associate. Prof. Dr. Çağla Gül YESEVİ

December 2018

T.C

ISTANBUL KULTUR UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

THE US AND AFGHANISTAN RELATIONS AFTER 9/11 EVENT

Master of Arts Thesis by

Mohammad Feroz YAQOOBI

Department: International Relations

Programme: International Relations

Supervisor: Associate. Prof. Dr. Çağla Gül YESEVİ

December 2018

T.C.

ISTANBUL KULTUR UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

THE US AND AFGHANISTAN RELATIONS AFTER 9/11 EVENT

Master of Arts Thesis by

Mohammad Feroz YAQOOBI

(1600005198)

Department: International Relations

Programme: International Relations

Supervisor: Associate. Prof. Dr. Çağla Gül YESEVİ

Members of Examining Committee: Associate. Prof. Dr. Nazlı Çağın BİLGİLİ

Associate. Prof. Dr. Özge ZIHNIOGLU

December 2018

PREFACE

First, I would like to thank Doç. Dr. Çağla Gül YESEVİ for her support and guidance throughout writing this thesis.

I would like to also thank my dear parents who have always been by my side not only in my education life but in every aspect of my life.

Finally, I owe the Istanbul Kultur University for offering the great kind of education and all the facilities

December, 2018 Mohammad Feroz YAQOOBI

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

USA: The United States of America

US: United States

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

AfPak: Afghanistan- Pakistan

AfPakIndia: Afghanistan – Pakistan – India

UN: The United Nations

IRA: Irish Republican Army

ISIS: Iraq Sham Islamic State

ISAF: International Security Assistance Force

SIGAR: Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction

OEF: Operation Enduring Freedom

USSR: The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CIA: Central Intelligence Agency

SCO: Shanghai Cooperative Organization

TAPI: Trans-Afghan Natural Gas Pipeline Project

NSC: National Security Council

ITFR: Independent Task Force Report

SPA: Strategic Partnership Agreement

LIST OF TABLES

University : **Istanbul Kultur University**

Institute : **Institute of Social Sciences**

Department : **International Relations**

Programme : **International Relations**

Supervisor : **Associate. Prof. Dr. Çağla Gül YESEVİ**

Degree Awarded and Date : **MA – December 2018**

ABSTRACT

The US and Afghanistan Relations after 9/11 Event

Mohammad Feroz YAQOOBI

The history of the Afghanistan could be described as the history of invasions. Due to its geographical location, Afghanistan, which is considered as the heart of Asia, has been the scene of attempts of invasions from all over the world not just today but throughout the history.

Afghanistan is a country located at the crossroads between central and south Asia, the Middle East and the Caucasus. It has borders with strategically important countries such as Iran, Pakistan, China, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan, which have rich energy resources. Due to this important geographical location, Afghanistan is geographically, historically, culturally and strategically a key country in Central Asia.

Terrorism is the main problem of all the countries in the world. Today in many part of the world terrorist attacks are causing great sorrow not only in the target country but also in other countries. Because terrorist attacks result in many innocent people death. It also causes countries to suffer great economic, social and cultural destructions.

Afghanistan is a country, which is affected adversely from Terrorism. The most significant terrorist group occurred in the Middle East is Al-Qaeda, which is established in Pakistan in 11 August 1988. Al-Qaeda terrorist organization carried out many terrorist attacks throughout the world. The most important of these attacks is 9/11/2001 attacks, which killed many innocent people.

The terrorist attack of 9/11 was the main cause of the US intervention in Afghanistan. US has been as the superpower of the world, changed its whole polices which effected and still affects the whole world politics, especially Middle East. The 9/11 attacks resulted in the United States to do military operations in different parts of the world under the name of fighting with terrorism. As a result this settlement of US in Afghanistan in the framework of the war against terrorism took place in 2001, deeply affected the geopolitics of Central Asia.

The US set two main strategic goals for Afghanistan when it started its operation and tried to act on the axis of these strategic goals during the George W. George W. Bush administration. These were the elimination of the Taliban administration in Afghanistan, which provided a safe zone for Al-Qaeda, and the stabilization of the region until the establishment of a legitimate Afghan government. The US and NATO implemented a strategy related to Afghanistan. They have provided economic aid, dealt with security, trained Afghanistan army and rehabilitated military. In addition, they carried out anti-smuggling activities and anti-terrorism operations against Taliban and Al Qaeda.

President Barack Obama administration revised the US Afghanistan policy in terms of America's interests. However, the Obama's Afghanistan Policy is not only a policy that is just for Afghanistan but also it deals with Pakistan. The reason for this was that the administration realized that the stability in Afghanistan was inseparably connected to the developments in Pakistan. Therefore, Obama's Afghanistan Policy was named as Obama's AfPak Policy, which was a new term used in Obama's period for US foreign policy in order to describe Afghanistan and Pakistan as a single threat of operations.

Donald Trump rejected approaches such as the complete withdrawal of US forces from Afghanistan or the transfer of Afghanistan's mission to fully private war companies, Donald Trump thus virtually embraced America's longest-running war in Afghanistan. When Donald Trump assessed the problems that President Barack Obama had before him, he had a similar result: more training and support had to be given to Afghan forces to eliminate Taliban.

The purpose of this study is to make a comparative analysis of the George W. Bush, Barak Obama and Donald Trump administration's foreign policy of Afghanistan.

Keywords: Afghanistan, George W. Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump.

Enstitüsü : **Sosyal Bilimler**

Enstitüsü Anabilim Dalı : **Uluslararası İlişkiler**

Anabilim Dalı Programı : **Uluslararası İlişkiler Programı**

Tez Danışmanı : **Doç. Dr. Çağla Gül YESEVİ**

Tez Türü ve Tarihi : **Yükseklisans – Aralik 2018**

Degree Awarded and Date : **MA – December 2018**

KISA ÖZET

9/11 Olayı sonrası Amerika-Afganistan İlişkileri

Mohammad Feroz YAQOOBİ

Afganistan tarihi istilalar tarihi olarak tanımlanabilir. Asya'nın kalbi olarak da görülen edilen Afganistan, sahip olduğu coğrafi konumu sebebiyle tarihte birçok kez istilalara uğramıştır.

Afganistan, Orta ve Güney Asya, Orta Doğu ve Kafkaslar arasındaki kavşakta yer alan bir ülkedir. Zengin enerji kaynaklarına sahip olan İran, Pakistan, Çin, Türkmenistan, Özbekistan ve Tacikistan gibi stratejik öneme sahip ülkeler ile sınırları vardır. Bu önemli coğrafi konumu nedeniyle, Afganistan coğrafi, tarihsel, kültürel ve stratejik olarak Orta Asya'da kilit bir ülkedir.

Terörizm, dünyadaki bütün ülkelerin ana sorunudur. Bugün dünyadaki birçok terörist saldırıları sadece hedef ülkede değil, başka ülkelerde de büyük üzüntülere neden olmaktadır. Çünkü terörist saldırılar birçok masum insanın ölümüne sebep olmakta ve

ayrıca ülkelerin büyük ekonomik, sosyal ve kültürel yıkımlara maruz kalmasına neden olmaktadır.

Afganistan, Terörizm ‘den olumsuz etkilenen bir ülkedir. Orta Doğu'da meydana gelen en önemli terörist grup, 11 Ağustos 1988'de pakistan'da kurulan El Kaide'dir. El Kaide terör örgütü, dünya çapında birçok terörist saldırı gerçekleştirmiştir. Bu saldırıların en önemlisi, birçok masum insanı öldüren 9.11.2001 saldırılarıdır.

11 Eylül terörist saldırısı, Afganistan'daki ABD müdahalesinin temel sebebidir. Çünkü 1812 savaşından beri, ABD kendi topraklarında ilk defa saldırıya uğramıştır. Böylece, dünyanın süper gücü olarak kabul edilen ABD, tüm dünya politikasını, özellikle Ortadoğu'yu etkileyen ve hala etkilemeye devam eden tüm politikasını değiştirmiştir. 11 Eylül saldırıları, ABD'nin terörle mücadele adı altında dünyanın farklı yerlerinde askeri operasyon yapması ile sonuçlandı. ABD 2001 yılında gerçekleşen terör olayından sonra başlattığı terörizmle mücadele çerçevesinde Afganistan'daki ABD yerleşimi Orta Asya'nın jeopolitiğini derinden etkilemiştir.

ABD, faaliyete başladığında Afganistan için iki ana stratejik hedef belirlemiştir ve George W. Bush yönetimi boyunca bu stratejik hedeflerin ekseninde hareket etmeye çalışmıştır. Bu stratejilerin amacı Afganistan’daki El Kaide terör örgütüne güvenli bir bölge sağlayan Taliban yönetiminin yok edilmesi ve meşru bir Afgan hükümetinin kurulmasına kadar bölgenin istikrarının sağlanmasıydı. Zamanla ABD bu stratejik hedefleri genişletmiştir. Bu bağlamda, 2002 ve 2009 yılları arasında ABD ve NATO tarafından uygulanan strateji ile Afganistan’a ekonomik yardım, ülkenin güvenliği, Afganistan ordusunun eğitimini, askeri iyileştirme ve ülkede istikrarı sağlamak, kaçakçılık karşıtı faaliyetlerini yürütmek ve Taliban unsurlarına ve El Kaide teröristlerine karşı terörle mücadele operasyonlarını devam ettirmekti.

Başkan Barack Obama yönetimi Amerika'nın Afganistan politikasını Amerika'nın çıkarları açısından tekrar gözden geçirmiştir. Ancak Obama'nın Afganistan Politikası sadece Afganistan için değil, aynı zamanda Pakistan'ı da ilgilendiren bir politikadır. Bunun nedeni, yönetimin Afganistan'daki istikrarın Pakistan'daki gelişmelere ayrılmaz bir şekilde bağlı olmasıydı. Bu nedenle Obama'nın Afganistan Politikası, Obama'nın ABD dış politikası için Afganistan ve Pakistan'ı tek bir operasyon tehdidi olarak tanımlamak için kullandığı yeni bir terim olan Obama'nın "AfPak Politikası" olarak adlandırılmıştır.

Donald Trump, ABD kuvvetlerinin Afganistan'dan tamamen çekilmesi veya Afganistan'ın misyonunun tamamen özel savaş şirketlerine devri gibi yaklaşımları reddetmiştir, Donald Trump böylece Amerika'nın Afganistan'daki en uzun soluklu savaşına sahip çıkmıştır. Donald Trump Başkan Barack Obama'nın kendisinden önce gördüğü sorunları değerlendirdiğinde, benzer bir sonuca ulaşmıştır. Taliban'ı ortadan kaldırmak için Afgan güçlerine daha fazla eğitim ve destek verilmesi gerekmektedir.

Bu çalışmanın amacı, 9/11 olayından sonra Amerika – Afganistan ilişkilerinin incelenmesi ve George W. Bush, Barack Obama ve Donald Trump yönetimlerinin Afganistan'ın dış politikalarının karşılaştırılmalı bir analizini yapmaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Afganistan, Terörle Savaş, George W. Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump.

INTRODUCTION

The history of Afghanistan could be described as the history of invasions. Due to its geographical location, Afghanistan, which considered as the heart of Asia, has been the scene of attempts of invasions from all over the world not just today but throughout the history. Afghanistan is a country located at the crossroads between central and South Asia, the Middle East and the Caucasus. It has borders with strategically important countries such as Iran, Pakistan, China, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan, which have rich energy resources. Due to this important geographical location, Afghanistan is geographically, historically, culturally and strategically a key country in Central Asia.

Terrorism is the main problem of all the countries in the world. Today, in many part of the world, terrorist attacks are causing great sorrow not only in the target country but also in other countries. Because terrorist attacks result in many innocent people death. It also causes countries to suffer great economic, social and cultural problems. Afghanistan is a country, which is affected adversely from terrorism. The most significant terrorist group occurred in the Middle East is Al-Qaeda, which is established in Peshawar Pakistan in 11 August 1988. Al-Qaeda terrorist organization carried out many terrorist attacks throughout the world. The most important of these terrorist actions is September 11 attacks, which killed many innocent people. The terrorist attack of 9/11 was the main cause of the US intervention in Afghanistan. The US, being superpower of the world, changed its whole foreign policy, which effected, and still affects the whole world politics, especially Middle East.

The collapse of the twin towers of the World Trade Center had been considered as one of the greatest events in American history. It changed world political, economy and ideology order. Following these attacks, the US intervened in Afghanistan and Iraq. As a consequence of these interventions, Taliban regime was ended in Afghanistan, and Iraqi Saddam regime collapsed and the leader Saddam Hussein was executed in 2006.

The US intervention in Afghanistan was a turning point for the future of Central Asia. Attacks against the US Al-Qaeda brought all attention to Central Asia and Afghanistan. The region could not reach a certain level of stability since the collapse of the Soviet Union. The 9/11 attacks resulted in the US to do military operations in various parts of the world under the name of fighting with terrorism. For this purpose, the US cooperated with many countries.

The US set two main strategic goals for Afghanistan when it started its operation and tried to act on the axis of these strategic goals during the George W. Bush administration. These were the elimination of the Taliban administration in Afghanistan, which provided a safe zone for Al-Qaeda, and the stabilization of the region until the establishment of a legitimate Afghan government. They have provided economic aid, dealt with security, trained Afghanistan army, rehabilitated military. In addition, they carried out anti-smuggling activities and anti-terrorism operations against Taliban and Al Qaeda terrorists.

In the period of President Barack Obama, the United States policy regarded Afghanistan was revised according to national interests. Obama's Afghanistan Policy was not only a policy that is just for Afghanistan but also Pakistan because in Obama period it was realized that the stability in Afghanistan was inseparably connected to the developments in Pakistan. Therefore, Obama's Afghanistan Policy was named as Obama's AfPak Policy, which was a new term used in Obama's period for United States foreign policy to describe Afghanistan and Pakistan as a single threat of operations.

Donald Trump rejected the complete withdrawal of the US forces from Afghanistan or the transfer of Afghanistan's mission to fully private war companies, Donald Trump thus virtually embraced America's longest-running war in Afghanistan. When Donald Trump assessed the problems that President Barack Obama had before him, he had a similar result: more training and support had to be given to Afghan forces to eliminate Taliban. He also stated that US would no longer use its military to build democracies or to reconstruct other countries, which are far away from their lands.

Donald Trump administration announced the commitment for an open-ended war and ordered the deployment of additional troops rather than a gradual withdrawal of troops, and eventually, ending the war in Afghanistan. Moreover, as Stephen D. Krasner noted, there are two fundamental ways to study the national interest: "logical-deductive" – assumes that states will pursue certain objective in particular, preserving territorial and political integrity. This approach is powerful but limited in range, especially when a hegemonic state with secured national interests is considered. However, the other one, which is adopted in this study is "empirical-inductive" assumes that national interest is induced from the statements and behavior of central decision makers. Hence, it understood that the US withdrawal of troops would create a power vacuum and deployment of additional troops would ensure safe havens for terrorists including ISIS and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan.

In the period of Barack Obama administration, Barack Obama gave a great importance to Pakistan and his one of Afghanistan strategy was AfPak policy. However, in the Donald Trump administration, Obama's AfPak strategy was replaced with Donald Trump's AfPakIndia. Because according to Donald Trump, Pakistan's role in ensuring a safe harbor for Taliban and al-Qaida was often a thorn in the side of US military. For this reason, Donald Trump threated to cut off US support to Pakistan. Donald Trump mentioned India's importance and its significant role in stabilizing Afghanistan. In this context, Donald Trump's strategies differ from Obama's strategies.

The purpose of this thesis is to make a comparative analysis of the George W. Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump administration's foreign policies of Afghanistan taking realism theory as a guiding model, The US policy of Afghanistan is profoundly influenced by realist theories. These realist theories could be considered as an explanation for intervention. Therefore, this thesis will demonstrate that the George W. Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump Administration's policy, strategy, and objectives match the principles of realism, and this strategy supports the US-Afghanistan fundamental national interests.

Realism is an approach to the study and practice of international politics. Realism highlights the role of the nation-state and makes a broad assumption that all nation-states are motivated by national interests. National interest can be defined that all states try to protect their political autonomy and their territorial integrity. When these two interests are secured, however, national interests can take various forms. For example, some states may have an interest in securing more resources or land; other states may wish to expand their own political or economic systems into other areas; some states may only wish to be left alone. National interest can also be defined in terms of power. National power has an absolute meaning because it can be defined in terms of military, economic, political, diplomatic, or even cultural resources. However, for a realist, power is primarily a relative term: does a state have the ability to defend itself against the power of another state? Does a state have the ability to coerce another state to change that state's policies? Realists claim that they deal with the world as it actually functions. Realist theories emphasis on the state and national security issues. The concept of balance of power has played a dominant role in realist theory.

Realism is a comprehensive model ranging from the classical realism to the structural realism of Kenneth Waltz. Hans J. Morgenthau, as a classical realist, had the greatest impact on the realism. In his book "Politics among Nations", Morgenthau deal with the roots of the war and

international conflicts in human nature. Morgenthau emphasizes the effects of nationalism, ideologies, the diplomatic skills, and domestic as well as international popular support on state's behavior.

The study will investigate the US and Afghanistan relations after 9/11. In the study there will be a comparative analysis of Afghanistan policies of the George W. Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump administrations considering realism theory as a guiding model. The US Strategy of Afghanistan is profoundly influenced by realist theories. These realist theories about terrorism could be considered as an explanation for intervention. Therefore, this thesis will demonstrate that the George W. Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump Administration's policies, strategies and objectives in conformity with the principles of realism, and this strategy supports the US fundamental national interests.

In this study, I am taking Morgenthau's classical theories as a model to conduct this research. Therefore, explaining Hans J. Morgenthau's Six Principles of Political Realism from his book '*Politics among Nations, The Struggle for Power and Peace*' is necessary.

Morgenthau proposed six fundamental principles of realism to reflect the tenets of political realism:

1- "Political realism believes that politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature.

2- "The main signpost that helps political realism to find its way through the landscape of international politics is the concept of interest defined in terms of power.

3- "Realism assumes that its key concept of interest defined as power is an objective category that is universally valid, but it does not endow that concept with a meaning that is fixed once and for all."

4- "Political realism is aware of the moral significance of political action. It is aware of the ineluctable tension between the moral command and the requirements of successful political action."

5- "Political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with moral laws that govern the universe. As it distinguishes between truth and opinion, so it distinguishes between truth and idolatry."

6- “The difference, then, between political realism and other schools of thought is real, and it is profound. However much of the theory of political realism may have been misunderstood and misinterpreted, there is no gainsaying its distinctive intellectual and moral attitude to matters political.”

Taking these realist theories into consideration, It can be said that the three President of the US (George W. Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump) have applied realistic theories after the 9/11 attacks.

This study also aims to reveal the political economic and strategic implications of the United States' intervention in Afghanistan. The questions are “How did US intervention with the coalition forces effect political and economic situation in Afghanistan? In addition, “What are the impacts of the US on Afghanistan's security, development, and democracy?

The targets of the US intervention in Afghanistan can be listed as follows:

- Eliminating of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, which provided a safe zone for Al-Qaeda and fighting against terrorism
- Protecting of territorial integrity and independence of Afghanistan,
- Establishing a political and economic system that can meet the expectations of the people of Afghanistan,
- Building democratic government for Afghanistan,
- Constructing powerful Afghanistan to prevent the pressure and effects of neighboring countries.

The importance of this thesis can be classified as follows:

- Revealing the historical and strategic importance of Afghanistan,
- Seeing how the political system formed after 2001 in Afghanistan,
- The position of Afghanistan after the American invasion and its relations with other countries.

- The comparison of George W. Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump's policies and speeches on Afghanistan.

In the first chapter various meanings of terrorism will be examined from various points of views. Historical process of terrorism, its emergence and development, objectives and ideologies will be analyzed in details. Terrorism definitions will also be analyzed according to principles of realist theories as Kenneth Waltz, Hans Morgenthau, John Mearsheimer. In the second chapter, the general situation of Afghanistan before the US intervention in 2001 will be analyzed. In this chapter, there will be details about Afghanistan history, geographical position and its strategic importance in the Central Asia. I will also explain Soviet period and its effects in Afghanistan, Taliban period and establishment of Al-Qaeda & Osama Bin Laden. The third chapter will be about the September 11 attack. In this chapter, there will be explanations about consequences of American intervention in Afghanistan and how this intervention affected the relationship between Afghanistan and the rest of the World. In the last chapter I will analyze Afghanistan policies of George W. Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump administration. The importance of Afghanistan for the United States will also be examined.

Secondary data was used in this dissertation. Data was collected from different sources. The analysis of this thesis is based on books, articles, speeches of some political figures during Summits. To collect and adopt data, screening and comparative methods were used. Information was obtained from the sources, notes and publications that are collected from media and internet researching. Data was also collected from the library, both written and online, in Istanbul Kultur University through academic journals. Other sources of up-to-date information were collected through well respected professional articles related to my topic. As a result, the speeches of three US presidents related to Afghanistan are main sources.

1. WHAT IS TERORISM

Since the 9/11 attacks, terrorism has been on the agenda of the world. As the aim of this study is to investigate the US intervention in Afghanistan after 9/11 terrorist attacks, it will be useful to begin this study by explaining various definitions of terrorism. Therefore, terrorism will be defined from different perspectives in this chapter. This chapter will also examine the historical process of terrorism, its ideologies and its objectives.

1.1. Definition of Terrorism

Since the dawn of the history, terrorism has been a significant issue that regards all nations in the world. Many leaders were assassinated; groups or individuals have committed acts of violence. There has been an ongoing debate in the literature trying to explain what terrorism is, what kind of threats it poses and what problems it creates. In the literature, there are many definitions of terrorism.

According to White, there is not a common definition of terrorism because it is a "social construct." He states that terrorism can be defined by various people according to their social and political realities. The definition of any social structure varies with the social reality of the group who provides it. Therefore, he defines terrorism as a problem (White, 2011, p. 4). According to Laqueur, although finding a common definition as to what terrorism is might be impossible, the vast majority of people are able to know it when they see it (Laqueur, 2003, p.10).

Martin defines terrorism as 'grey areas'. This means that 'political violence can be interpreted either as acts of unmitigated terrorist barbarity or as freedom fighting and national liberation', all depending on whom is defining the term (Martin, 2010, p.3). Whittaker defines terrorism as the use or threat, for the aim of advancing political, religious or ideological cases, which includes serious violence against person or property (Whittaker, 2001, p.1). Gurr describes terrorism as the use of unexpected violence against people in the pursuit of political or social objects (Gurr and Ted Robert, 1989, p.15). Gibbs describes terrorism as an illegal violence or threatened violence against human or nonhuman objects (Gibbs, 1989, p.111).

According to Kiras, terrorism is a ‘complex phenomena and it is open to a subjective interpretation. He states that there is not a common definition of terrorism because of the difference on ‘the legitimacy of terrorist means and methods (Kiras, 2001, p. 480).

In International Relations theory, realism is a school of thought, theorizing world politics as a field of conflict among actors pursuing power. Moreover, the core realist theories describe international relations "as it is, not as it ought to be" (Jorgensen, 2010, p. 78). In other words, it is an "empirical" rather than a normative paradigm (Morgenthau, 2005, p. 3). Nonetheless, Realism is a broad paradigm that varies from the classical realism to Kenneth Waltz’s structural realism, which was introduced in 1979. Although the intellectual roots of realism goes back to Thucydides' classical record of the Peloponnesian war in the 5th century B.C., the study of realism as an institutional academic discipline begun with the emergence of classical realists nearly 25 centuries later (Riotti and Kauppi, 1993, p. 35). In that matter, as a classical realist, Hans J. Morgenthau has a significant impact on the field. In his book ‘*Politics Among Nations*’ Morgenthau considered the roots of war and international conflicts in human nature (Morgenthau, 2005, p. 15). In contrast to Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, the founding father of neorealism, developed a systemic theory of realism in his book ‘*Theory of International Politics*' that has given importance to the causes of international conflicts and the war in an anarchic international system . Thus, this school of thought was divided into two main blocks: Classical Realism and Neorealism (or structural realism). In general, as Morgenthau also wrote the ‘will to power' was unlimited, all realists believe in the struggle for power to be the main motivator in international politics.

Realism highlights the role of the nation-state and makes a broad assumes that all nation-states are motivated by national interests. National interest can be defined that all states try to protect their sovereignty, political autonomy and their territorial integrity. National interest can also be defined in terms of power. National power has an absolute meaning because it can be defined in terms of military, economic, political, diplomatic, or even cultural capabilities. But, for a realist, power is primarily a relative term: does a state have the ability to defend itself against the power of another state? Does a state have the ability to coerce another state to change its policies?

Realism highlights the role of the nation-state and assumes that all nation-states are motivated by national interests (Morgenthau, 2005, p. 15). National interest can be defined that all states try to protect their sovereignty and their territorial integrity. When these two interests are secured, however, national interests can take various forms. For example, some states may have an interest in securing their resources or their territories; other states may wish to expand their own political or economic systems into other areas; some states may only wish to be self-sufficient. National interest can also be defined in terms of power (Riotti and Kauppi, 1993, p.61-64). National power has an absolute meaning because it can be defined in terms of military, economic, political, diplomatic, or even cultural capabilities. But, for a realist, power is primarily a relative term: does a state have the ability to defend itself against the power of another state? Does a state have the ability to coerce another state to change that state's policies? Realists claim that they deal with the world as it actually functions (Smith and Steve, 1993, p.109). Realist theories emphasis that states deal with national security issues. The concept of balance of power has played dominant role in realist theory (Viotti and Kauppi, 1993, p.67). Realists point out that state leaders have 'monopoly on legitimate use of force (Shimko, 1992, p. 297). From a realist perspective, war is a necessary to preserve power and ensure stability and safety. From this perspective, there are no limits in principle to the exercise of power. The US policy of Afghanistan is profoundly influenced by realist theories. This theory explains the US intervention.

Alternatively, terrorism is regarded as legitimate if its methods in conformity with principles. As it can be seen that there are various interpretations and disagreement on the issue of legitimacy. The term, in general, suggest the use of violence as a main characteristic of terrorism to instill fear and terror in nations. Terrorism has been considered a weapon of the weak used by small groups of individuals who conduct such violent attacks because they feel that terrorism is the only way to realize their views. Such violence is employed to bring about change in the government and society. Consequently, a key feature of terrorism, which distinguishes it from other types of violence, is political because the use of violence is employed to succeed political aims (Kiras, 2001, p. 480).

Öktem states that between 1936 and 1981, total of 109 definitions of terrorism were laid down at international level (Öktem, 2007, p. 34). As mentioned above, although there are many different definitions of terrorism, states or international organizations should define this concept. According to Bal, practitioners and academics define terrorism as the killing of

civilians or security officers with propaganda-oriented, spontaneous actions in order to achieve certain purposes (Bal, 2006, p. 7).

Defining terrorism is difficult, because it has many aspects. Terrorism stems from various parties that resorted to violence. In addition, there are many different grounds for the use of this violence, and there have been many different parties involved in terrorism, each having their own views and in many cases having interests in a certain way to define terrorism. Thus, it is not much surprising that many various definitions of terrorism emerge (Record, 2003, p. 6).

To define 'terrorism' for the purposes of this study, it will be useful to begin with a brief historical insight. The use of violence for creating fears in a wider audience to prevent various parties from doing something, or, on the contrary, to coerce them into a certain behavior is as old as mankind. Such use of violence has served states and various regimes over a long period. The Roman Empire applied violence ranging from crucifixion of individuals to full-scale genocide to force individuals and nations into submission. The French Revolution sent more than 20,000 people to the guillotine over a period of a few months. Modern examples of drastic State terrorism include Nazi Germany, Stalinist Soviet Union, communist China of the Mao period, Pol Pot's Cambodia, and several other dictatorships and totalitarian regimes (Mockaitis, 2007, p. 19-21). These examples enable only a glimpse of the very wide spectrum of actors and goals that have been related to the use of violence in a way named 'terrorism'. Hence, it is not surprising that the United Nations Organization (UN) still does not have an official definition for terrorism.

The United States faced with similar problems in defining terrorism. According to the US Department of Defense, terrorism is the calculated use of unlawful violence or the threat of violence to instill fear; In general, terrorism aimed to force or threaten governments or societies in the pursuit of political, religious or ideological goals. The problem with the definition of the Ministry of Defense is that it involves any act of terrorism, it does not discern it clearly enough from other forms of violence. The European Union considers terrorism as acts as seriously weakening or terminating the essential political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or an international organization (Rapoport, 2004, p. 45).

David Rapoport pointed out four key waves of international terrorism in his seminal work on the history of international terrorism. The first wave of modern terrorism which he calls as anarchist, originated in Russia in the 1880s and continued until the 1920s. The second wave that he calls as “anti-colonial” arose in the 1920s and ended in the 1960s. The third wave which he calls as new left, arose in the 1980s, and the fourth wave which he calls as religious, appeared in 1979 and continued until this day (Rapoport, 2004, p. 47). The first wave of terrorism, which began in1890s, continued until 1940. This period was called as the "Age of Assassination" and throughout that period, an important European ministers or heads of states were assassinated every 18 months (Wofendale, 2007, p. 78)

The first period of international terrorism witnessed the first attempt by states to combat with terrorism internationally after assassination of US President William McKinley in 1901. States failed to form a consensus for joint action. The Anti colonial terror wave arose by signing the Treaty of Versailles. The principle of self-determination used to destroy the renewed empires, provided a basis for the aspirations of a new kind of terrorist organization such as the Irish Republican Army and various Jewish organizations working against the British forces in Palestine.

The second wave of terrorism received broad support from various diasporas abroad and applied less to assassinations. The strategy of the second wave of terrorism was more complex. Because the primary objective of the terrorists was the elimination of the local police force, and replacing the military forces, which were too incompetent to deal with the terrorists, but powerful enough to cause grievance among the population through their disproportionate responses to the actions of terrorists (Rapoport, 2004, p. 53-4).

The target selection of the third terrorist wave was quite similar to that of the first wave of international terrorism in that there were seen some 700 hijackings, 409 international kidnapping incidents, including 951 hostages from 1968–1982. Moreover, high-ranking officials including the prime ministers of Spain and Jordan, the former prime minister of Italy Aldo Moro were assassinated. The 'new left' wave of terrorism created nearly 700 deaths, between 1968 and 1982. The emergence of the "new left” terrorism was witnessed during the Vietnam War, which proved that the modern states were vulnerable to the relatively lethal weapons and tactics. Many young people were not deeply pleased with the current system and led to terrorist organizations such as the Red Army Faction in West Germany, the Italian Red Brigades and the Director of French Action. It is important that 1/3 of the third wave of terror

targets were the US targets. International co-operation in counter-terrorism activities against third wave terrorism was witnessed. The United Nations adopted the main treaties in which the abduction, pledge and financing of the terrorist organizations were accepted illegal. The term “Freedom Fighter" was no longer a popular concept in the UN (Wofendale, 2007, p. 81; Rapoport, 1999, p. 55).

The end of Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and the Gulf War resulted in a change in the main enemy of Islamic terrorists. Osama bin Laden stated that since the 1991 Gulf War; there were large numbers of US troops in Saudi Arabia whom he feared would stay there. He wanted to destroy American targets. The most terrible terrorist act committed was on 11 September 2001. The international community's response to the 11 September 2001 attack was as astounding as the attack itself. More than 100 countries participated directly or indirectly in the attack on Taliban-led Afghanistan. Despite such a huge international support in attacking the Taliban and al-Qaeda leaders, success was only partial (Cronin, 2006, p.15-22).

Terrorism is also defined as a type of fear or violence. However, not every type of fear or violence can be defined as terrorism because terrorism has different meanings and strategies. Violent incidents are not products of terrorism unless they have a political purpose, ideology, and strategy. If necessary, legal sanctions can be applied under the Anti-Terror Law against terrorist activities (Topal, 2005, p. 7).

Before examining the historical background of terrorism, it could be better to know what new terrorism is. A form of terrorism that is more radical and devastating than traditional terrorism because of the nature its organization, political characters, motivations and strategies (Heywood, 2011, p.286).

Heywood emphasizes on four type of terrorism

1. Insurrectionary anarchism aims to revolutionary change of a state, as anarchist, and revolutionary communist terrorism.
2. Loner terrorism aims to promote a single cause. The bombing of abortion clinics in the US and 1995-sarin nerve gas attack in Tokyo can be given as examples.
3. Nationalist terrorism aims to overthrow colonial rule or occupation, to gain independence for an ethnic, religious or national group, like FLN in Algeria, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam in Sri Lanka and Hezbollah in Lebanon, Hamas in Israel and occupied territories.

4. Global terrorism aims to inflict damage and humiliation on a global power or at transforming global civilizational relations, like Al-Qaeda and other forms. (Heywood, 2011, p. 285-286)

1.1.1. The Historical Background of Terrorism

In many societies, the common idea was that terrorism initially appeared in Islamic countries, however it was later seen that this was not correct. The first terrorist organization was Zealot Siccari during the era of Roman Empire. The Zealots and the Siccaris are dual formation with separate races and enemies. The Sicarii was a well-organized religious sect, which was founded by the religious clergy in Palestine. The Siccaris attacked their enemies with small swords called sicarii in Jerusalem. They attacked people when it was crowded during the day or on holidays. These organizations assassinated the Romans in the southern part of Palestine to end Roman rule. Jews were forbidden to live in Jerusalem and their chapels were destroyed. Laqueur reported that the Sicariis was a social protest movement trying to encourage the poor to rise up against the rich. (Laqueur, 2003, p. 15-18).

The first terrorist movement for political purposes was "Hashishi", which was emerged in the 11th century and was destroyed by the Mongols in the 13th century. This organization, under the leadership of Hasan Sabbah, aimed to destroy the Seljuk Empire with a religion-motivated organization. Hasan Sabbah realized that they were inadequate in number to fight an open war against the enemy, but they could achieve an effective political weapon power with a systematic long-term terrorist act carried out by a small, disciplined force. (Laqueur, 2003, p. 21). It is stated by Kışlalı that the founder of terrorism is Hassan Sabbah (Kışlalı, 1998, p. 39).

Terrorist actions were seen in Europe since the second half of the 19th century. In the 20th century, the Russian revolutionaries rebelled against a ruling party that considers the form of government as tyranny. The other type is radical nationalists; groups such as Irish (the most concrete example of the IRA terrorist organization), Macedonians, Serbs, Armenians (e.g. Asala terrorist organization) continued terrorism with various attacks for independence (Bilgiç, 2009, p. 34).

Systematic terrorism in the Middle East emerged in 1930-1940 with the fundamentalist Muslim Brotherhood and Jewish underground organizations Hashomer, Haganah, Irgun and Lehi who

were fighting against Arabs in Egypt, and in Palestine. The most important terrorist group formed in the Middle East is Al-Qaeda, which was established on 11 August 1988. Al-Qaeda was formed at a meeting attended by Bin Laden, Zawahiri and Dr Fadl in Peshawar, Pakistan. Many terrorist attacks were carried out by Al-Qaeda not only in the Middle East but also in the West. The most important of these attacks is the 9/11 event (Wright, 2013, p. 22). Following 9/11 event, many terrorist actions were carried out consecutively in different parts of the world. In 2002, terrorist actions were seen in Tunisia, Pakistan, Indonesia and Kenya. In 2003, terrorist actions carried out in Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Indonesia and Iraq, and in the same year, terrorist attacks occurred in Istanbul against two synagogues, the British Embassy and the HSBC Bank. In 2004, a terrorist attack against a passenger train in Madrid was carried out. All these-global events show that terrorism has threatened and is still threatening the whole globe. These terrorist attacks have also been a painful experience for governments and international organizations in terms of perceiving the effects and dimensions of global terrorism (Wright, 2013, p. 23).

1.1.2. Objectives of Terrorist Activities

According to Sedgewick and Abrams, five goals were pursued with terrorist activities. These include regime change, regional change, policy change, social control and status quo maintenance. These objectives were followed by five common strategies. These strategies are attrition, intimidation, provocation, spoiling and outbidding. Suicide terrorism has also been used to follow these strategies (Sedgewick, 2007, p. 110; Abrams, 2006, p. 72). In order to achieve these goals, they resort to a number of tactics. Kuyaksil collects these tactics under the headings of propaganda, destroy authoritarianism, directing authoritarianism, raising the morale of the members of the organization, intimidating and undermining the morale of the people (Kuyaksil, 2004, p. 517-519).

According to Beşe, terrorism has two main purposes. The first one is defined as short-term aim, which includes violence, algebra, threat, intimidation, violation of public order in a fundamental way. The second one and the ultimate goal is to divide the country into parts and establish a separate state. He also states that another goal that terrorism adopts is to break the resistance of the society by paving the way to the turmoil and to weaken the public support behind the

established social and political order through violence. It will be easier to remove the state authority from the scene, which lacks public support. Thus, with the acts of violence against the masses, terrorism intends to eliminate the public's sense of trust and to cause people to suffer and to be unresponsive to the events. As a result, the masses lose their sensitivity to terrorism and there exists a big gap in terms of trust between the state and society. Therefore, the ultimate goal will be achieved (Beşe, 2002, p. 26).

Another aim of terrorism is to prevent the use of the resources of the country in productive areas. Therefore, it affects the country's economy adversely because a country that already has scarce resources uses a great deal of its national income for struggling against terrorism instead of using it on the development of the country. Moreover, economic problems can emerge. Thus, those countries having problem of terrorism have also faced with economic problems. Afghanistan is one of these countries. Even though Afghanistan has many resources such as major deposits of chrome, coal, copper, iron, and salt, as well as lesser amounts of a wide variety of minerals including gold, silver, and uranium, these resources are not being used as tools for the development of the country. A great amount of these resources have been used to prevent terrorism in the country (Signorino, 2003, p. 325).

According to Keeney, the main aim of terrorism is to pay attention to a case or political dispute. This is provided by the fear and threat. According to Keeney, there are two main goals of terrorism. These two goals are defined as short term and long term goals. In short term, terrorism aims to:

- destroy the moral power of the target nation,
- dismantle the groups that constitute it,
- reduce authority, its protectors and important people in public,
- neutralize the masses,
- reduce the situation to their own desperation.

In long run; the aims of the terrorism are to:

- weaken the political power,
- undermine the spiritual authority of the state
- lead to public revolts against the existing power (Keeney, 2009, p. 1806-1808).

In his article named “Identifying and Structuring the Objectives of Terrorists” Keeney states that the attacks on New York, Madrid, and London, along with other attacks in several countries demonstrate the intent of Islamic terrorist groups is to conduct violent attacks on the populations of the Western World. According to Keeney, the basic aims of terrorists are to kill large numbers of people in Western countries, to disrupt and destabilize their economies, and instill fear and insecurity in their populations. He also states that the most visible and prominent terrorist group threatening the Western World is Al-Qaeda. He classifies the objectives of Al-Qaeda terror organization into three basic categories. These are strategic, fundamental and mean objectives. Strategic objectives supply guidance for all decisions. They provide a mechanism with which leaders conduct decisions made by different individuals and groups within an organization. As Keeney states, if strategic objectives are not carefully defined and communicated, the guidance becomes minimal and some separate decisions simply will not make sense in the larger context of the organization’s affairs. Fundamental objectives serve guidance for particular decisions that are generally carried out over the medium to long-term. If fundamental objectives are routinely accomplished, this can give way to the eventual achievement of the strategic objectives. Means objectives are the short term, day-to-day actions, which promote the achievement of fundamental and strategic objectives. Some means objectives pertain directly to strategic objectives, but most of them are meant to achieve fundamental objectives. With the case study of Al-Qaeda, he shows the objectives as shown in Table 1 (Keeney, 2009, p. 1810-1812).

Table 1: Overview of the Interrelationships among Al Qaeda Objectives

Means Objectives	**Fundamental Objectives**	**Strategic Objectives**
Purpose: Guidance for short-term actions	**Purpose:** Guidance for specific major decisions over medium-to long-term	**Purpose:** Guidance for all decisions
Examples: • Train insurgents • Win the battle of media • Put aside Muslim sectarian differences • Attack US personnel in Iraq	**Examples:** • Win hearts and minds of Muslim masses • Inflict economic cost on US -	**Examples:** • Establish Islamic authority (caliphate) • Expel western powers from Middle East

Source: Keeney, ***"****Identifying and Structuring the Objectives of Terrorists"*

1.2. Ideological Patterns of Terrorism

Wright defines ideology as a political, legal, scientific, philosophical, religious, moral, aesthetic thinking that constitutes a political or social doctrine, which directs the behavior of a government, a party. Thus, it is a system of ideas and opinions that bring about a political or social doctrine and directs the actions of a government, a party, a social class, or an organization (Wright, 2013, p.4).

Ideology is the guide of the movement. The types and targets of the violent incidents to be implemented are determined by ideology. It is only through ideological acceptance that an organization can base itself on and gain members within the society in which it operates (Cragin, 2007, p. 4).

According to Stepanova, ideology can be defined as a set of ideas, doctrines and theories that describe the thought of an individual or a group and may turn into political and social plans, actions or systems. Although the ideological views and beliefs of those involved in terrorist activities are defined as extremist, this is possibly the only aspect of ideological basis.
The author also states that there is no agreement about whether there is a special "ideology of terrorism" (i.e. whether terrorism itself is an ideology or whether terrorists are driven by various extremist ideologies and exploit them to provide grounds for the use of terrorist means). In addition, he adds that there is not a separate, specific ideology for terrorism and terrorism is not in itself an ideology in the way that socialism, fascism and anarchism are. According to Stepanova, terrorism cannot be seen as an ideology, instead, it is a particular hyper-extreme tactic of using or threatening violence and terrorists justify this tactic with different ideological frameworks (Stepanova, 2008, p. 28-29).

On the other hand, Herman and O'Sullivan define terrorism as an ideology and cultural industry (Herman and O'Sullivan, 2007, p. 117). According to Aksoy and David, ideology is the most important factor of an organization. Thanks to ideology, the terrorists can easily risk their life, The terrorists who are the prisoners of an ideology have been serving for the ideology. Thus, ideologies settled at the center of all social experiences by destroying individual's own selves, their families, relatives, freedoms, destiny, and all relations. Terrorists aim to dominate their ideology primarily in a specific geography and then spread the same ideology to the whole world.as a point of action ideology is protected by strict rules, and all kinds of propaganda for the adherence of the supporters are maintained by the organization (Aksoy and Carter, 2012, p. 196-197).

According to Wright, in order to be able to talk about the existence of terrorism, it is necessary to have an ideological sub-structure. This is the point of terror. This infrastructure is also the basis for the behavior of terror organization, because the organization behaves in the direction of this sub-structure. Therefore, ideology considered an "indispensable" element (Wright, 2013, p. 10).

As various forms of terrorism have developed over the time, the necessity to justify the use of terrorist tools and the role of ideology as a provider of this justification has increased. Even though political terrorism was still widely selective in the second half of the 19th century and terrorists preferred to kill specific people who were high-profile political leaders such as government ministers, presidents, at the beginning of the 20th century terrorism became a less selective and ultimately violence against civilians. Therefore, ensuring ideological justification became more difficult for terrorists (Asal et. al., 2007, p. 32).

In sum, ideology is the important key of terrorist organizations' actions and organizational structure (organization member selection, cell organization etc.) and the determinant of how action will take place. In addition, terrorist organizations have developed ideology by taking into account the ideological elements that occurred in previous years and the events that followed.

1.2.1. Marxist-Leninist Ideologies

Many ideologies have been influential in the establishment of terrorist organizations. One of the reasons of the establishment of ethnic and political terrorist organizations in Europe is Marxism-Leninism theory. The production, which came with mechanization, entered into an effort to create new areas of consumption, which led to the formation of a group of bourgeoisie who carried out production. The basic condition of production is capital. One of the basic elements of monopolization and production of capital is poor working conditions of the workers and the unfair distribution of wages, which resulted in the emergence of the working class. Karl Marx and his friend Friedrich Engels indicated that the problem is universal and all labor classes should be united (Sofronov, et al., 2008, p. 367).

The source of Marxism's practice of violence and the basis of its actions was the Communist Manifesto of Marx. In the Communist Manifesto of 1848, "Initially individual workers against the bourgeois person, who exploits them directly, then workers of a factory, then all the workers in a branch of a division participated in conflicts. Attacks are not only against bourgeois relations of production, but also against the means of production. They destroyed foreign

commodities, machines, burned factories." They also formed the belief that violence can also be considered inevitable (Sofronov, et al., 2008, p. 370-72).

The ideologies of the groups, who were involved in terrorist acts in the 19th and mostly in 20th centuries, were dominated by various radical revolutionists, leftists and anarchists. The ideologies of many left-wing terrorist groups, including socio-revolutionary organizations, had heterogeneous views that combined elements from various concepts and ideologies. They varied from the anarchist slogan of 'propaganda by deed' (Sofronov, et al., 2008, p. 375).

During the last decade of the 20th century and after the end of the cold war, communist, radical socialist and other leftist ideologies experienced a general weakening. This was largely due to the disintegration of the Soviet bloc, the end of the East-West ideological struggle and the breakdown of the bipolar world system. The role of these ideologies as a basis for groups, who were involved in terrorist activity, decreased. Though the communist and other left-wing terrorism were noteworthy or even rose in 1998 and 2006, the significance of the movement was severely diminished compared to rising nationalist and religious terrorism. This relative decrease coincided over time and linked to the slow decrease in the state support of terrorism in the direction of the bipolar division. For most of the Cold War era, various radical groups, led by communist and other leftist ideologies, attained some political and financial support from the states dominated by these ideologies (Sofronov, et. al., 2008, p. 370-372).

1.2.2. Religious Ideologies

Religious ideologies emerge when terrorist organizations use people's religious feelings. Religious people can easily sacrifice their life. Terrorist organizations use this situation by exploiting religious beliefs of people. Thus, religious sentiment used by terrorist organizations as a means of reaching their goals (Cragin, 2007, p. 23).

Organizations with this ideology use religion as a means of terrorist actions. Some have a vision of a management system to be established in line with their religious beliefs. Most of these organizations exploit religion and aim to use it as a tool in line with their goals. Therefore, when these organizations are deeply examined neither the ideologies they defend nor the actions they conduct are compatible with the religion they defend. It seems that people and organizations,

which carry Islamic identity in the globe, prefer violent acts as an indirect means. Religious terrorist groups do not restrict themselves to the use of sacred texts. They use and regulate religion and religious rituals and cults, such as self-sacrifice and martyrdom cults for their goals. (Ekici et al., 2010, p. 49).

During the 1990s, a global vacuum emerged in the secular protest ideology because of the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the end of the cold war and the decline of leftist movements. This gap began to be filled with radical currents, clearly extremist ethnic-nationalist or religious ideologies. Religious terrorism can be associated with any religion and religious categories that have been executed by various religious groups to justify terrorist activities. At the end of 20th and at the beginning of the 21st centuries, the foremost terrorist threat to international security and to the security of many states, such as the US and its Western allies, such as India, Russia, China and many Muslim countries has been posed either by Islamist terrorism or by ethno-nationalist terrorism which has been Islamized to varying degrees (Barton, 2005, p. 26)

At the beginning of 21st century, the rise of militant Islamism, which includes Islamist terrorism, indicates the full power of religious extremism as an ideological source for terrorism both at international and local levels. Moreover, the ideology of militant Islamist groups that include those using terrorist means, apply the radical interpretation of the concept of jihad. Jihad has included combination of some principal concepts and the extremist interpretations of Islamic rules. The concept of faith is evoked by skepticism by the proponents of the manipulative interpretation of the relationship between religious extremism and terrorism (Bokhari et. al., 2006, p. 10-11).

Transformation of the phenomenon of religion into a purpose instead of a tool causes the emergence of oppression and terror. According to Schmid, in some countries in the Middle East such as Iraq, Egypt, Libya, Algeria and Sudan, the army seized the power of ruling leaders. These countries have long been governed by a rigid dictatorship (Schmid, 1992, p. 8-12).

Religious terrorism is often associated with Islam, however Hitler's action against Jews, considering the events in Northern Ireland, the Bosnian genocide and Muslim massacre in Myanmar could be stated that religion based actions cannot be associated with Islam. For whatever purpose and ideology, the acts of terror should be considered as acts against humanity. Although, terrorism has based on ideological grounds, terrorism has no religion. Some terrorist

groups, such as, al-Qaeda and ISIS have been using religious beliefs for their own interests. They motivate their members to be "activists" and persuade them to be accepted as "martyr" by removing the real concept of "martyrdom". Because, according to Quartermaine, no other justification will make death and massacre so charming and encouraging (Quartermaine, 2016, p. 21-25).

2. THE GENERAL SITUATION OF AFGHANISTAN BEFORE THE US INTERVENTION IN 2001

It could be stated that the clash of interests between foreign powers in Afghanistan has played a very significant role in the modern, recent and contemporary history of the country. In the 19th century, Afghanistan became part of a colonial order and the "Great Game" between Tsarist Russia and British Empire. In the second half of 20th century, Afghanistan was a victim of the cold war between the SU and US currently in the 21st century; Afghanistan is suffering from clashing interests of Pakistan and India. Therefore, in this chapter it was aimed to give a general description of Afghanistan before the US intervention in 2001. For this purpose, a general description of Afghanistan history will be given. This chapter will also examine Soviet and Taliban periods in Afghanistan.

2.1. An Overview of the History of Afghanistan

The history of Afghanistan could be described as the history of invasions. Due to its geographical location, Afghanistan, which has been considered as the heart of Asia, has been the scene of attempts of invasions throughout the history. The Iranians carried out the first invasion movement of the region in 500 BC. The Iranian emperor Dara's armies ruled Afghanistan for nearly 200 years. Persian sovereignty in Afghanistan ended when Macedonian King Alexander the Great began the eastern route in 300s B.C. After this, the Bahtari State established by the Greeks. It was destroyed in 50 A.D. due to the pressures coming from the north. The Afghan land, which was divided into two as Khorasan and Sistan had conquered by Turks (Scythians, Seljuks, Ghaznevids, Babur, Karakhanids). Islam spread in Afghanistan with khalifa Osman who sent Basra's governor Abdurrahman bin Semure to Afghanistan. Later, the country had been ruled by tribal chiefs. In the second half of the 9th century, the Ghaznavids kingdom was established in Afghanistan, where a large part of it handed over by the Samanians (Rasanayagm, 2003 p. 29-35). After the Ghaznevid kingdom, the Seljuks dominated the country. Islamic armies organized conquest campaigns in Afghanistan. During the conquests, the people in control of Khalaj Turks easily adopted Islam. Thus, in the end of the 7th century, Afghanistan come across with the Islamic tradition (Roy, 2010, p. 547). In some sources, it

stated that Islamic armies came to Afghanistan via two important cities (Harat, Balkh) of Khorasan (Barfield, 2010, p. 158-160).

Following the Arabs, local administrators called "Shah" ruled the country because there was not a central authority in Afghanistan. Then Muslim-Turkish states such as Samani, Ghaznevid, Great Seljuk State and Kharazem Shah States became dominant in the region. In the late 10th century, a century-old domination of the Samani state ended. Ghaznevid Mahmud, the largest Sultan of Asia until 1030, conquered India and established a base in Lahore. After the death of Sultan Saljuk Sanjar in 1157, Ghurids who came from the Šansabānī family and Kharazems ruled Afghanistan for a while (Rasanayagm, 2003, p. 45-47).

Afghanistan was divided into three parts in the 16th-17th and 18th centuries. The northern part has ruled by Uzbeks, the western part by Persians and the eastern part by Mongolian Empire. The Persian army was defeated and the Afghans took over the whole Persian Empire in the following years. Later, Gilzay Pashtuns disguised by Durrani Pashtuns and Durans became the new rulers of Afghanistan. After Ahmad Shah Durrani killed in 1747 by the Iranian Shah Nadir, who ruled Afghanistan, took over Kandahar and expanded his dominance over time (Norling, 2011, p. 12).

In 1747 Nadir Shah Afshar killed by Ahmad Durrani who was one of his servants in his palace. Ahmad made Kandahar his capital, the capital of his own region, and founded today's Afghanistan. In the first, Loya Jirga (National Assembly of Afghanistan) Ahmad Shah Durrani elected as the king of the country. All ethnic groups in Afghanistan accepted him as leader. Ahmad Shah Durrani succeeded in consolidating the small states, tribes, and divided provinces during his rule. Although Ahmad Shah who seized Uzbekistan Bukhara Emirates and Afghan Turkestan which was known as the broad region, sent armies on the Bukhara Emirate in India. These two armies did not wage war because they were Muslims. After the death of Durrani in 1772, Afghanistan lost its power and tribal division has seen again. The country ruled by Dost Muhammad Khan (1826-1863) Abdurrahman Khan (1880-1901) and Habibullah Khan (1901-1919) respectively. In 1839, the Britain invaded Afghanistan in cooperation with the Sikhs. However, Afghan Emperor Dost Muhammad succeeded to remove them, the Britain invasion led to the destruction of the unity in the country. Moreover, internal disturbances were seen in the following years. The Britain occupied the country for the second time in 1878 with Russians cooperation. This second occupation finalized in 1880, Abdurrahman Khan came to the power. Abdurrahman Khan had to leave his throne to his son Habibullah Khan in 1901 because of his poor health (Downing, 2008, p. 20).

However, the Britain ambitions on Afghanistan did not end because of Russian threat. Due to the Russian threat, the occupation of Afghanistan was always on the agenda. British-Afghan war began for the second time in 1878-1880 when Amir Shir Ali, the son of Dost Muhammad, did not accept Britain delegation in Kabul. After this dispute, Amir Abdurrahman who supported by the Britain was appointed to the throne. In his administration, the borders of present-day Afghanistan have drawn by the Russia and the Britain at the end of the nineteenth century (1880-1901). The foreign relations of Afghanistan were under Britain control. In 1893, the Durand Border Agreement signed between Britain and Amir Abdurrahman khan, which stood on the eastern and southern borders of Afghanistan. This agreement forced him to a new agreement because he was desperate. The existing borders of Afghanistan, which drawn at those times, are the basis of today's political problems. This new border, 2450 km long was called the 12 November Durand Line. The Durand line divided the Afghan people artificially and it is considered as an unnatural border. The Durand Agreement, which has widely been criticized by Afghans, had seen as submission agreement signed by Amir Abdurrahman. When Habibullah Khan was killed on February 19, 1919, he was replaced by his son, Amanullah Khan. Amanullah Khan's close relations with the Russians led to a war between the Britain and the war ended on 8 August 1919 with the Rawalpindi Agreement. In 1921, Britain invaded Afghanistan for the third time when Amanullah Khan attacked India. However, Britain defeated Afghanistan once more (Rasanayagm, 2003, p. 49-55).

Afghanistan signed the Treaty of Rawalpindi in 1919. This treaty ended the Third Anglo-Afghan War. It also determined the history of Afghanistan's official independence. In the period of wars, Afghanistan was a balance between two world powers; Ghazi Amanullah Khan, son of Habibullah Kalakani (ruled 1919–29) manipulated the new British-Soviet competition and set up relations with great powers. Ghazi Amanullah Khan introduced country's first constitution in 1923. (Rasanayagm, 2003, p. 55).

Nadir Khan, who was in exile in France, came back and took power by taking advantage of the turmoil in the country that contributed to the stability of the country in a short period. He came to power by The Afghan Tribal Council (Loya Jirga). They gave him the title "Shah" in October 16, 1929. Considering the religious sensitivity of the people, Nadir Shah established a new administration. As a result, he was killed by a personal enemy in 1933, his child-aged son Zahir Shah had brought to the throne. In 1933 Amanullah's nephew Mohammad Zahir Shah, the last

king of Afghanistan, began his 40-years reign. Zahir Shah was in power for many years, thanks to his father's administration (Matinuddin, 1999, p. 25-28).

Zahir Shah had close relations with the Soviet Union when the Britain began to support Pakistan. Zahir Shah regarded that Pakistan is dangerous. Afghanistan shifted its foreign policy and made close relations with the Soviet Union. The Soviet administration took advantage of this and trained supporters for itself in Afghan army. Zahir Shah, who was uncomfortable from this situation, tried to prevent further spread of Soviet influence, therefore, Zahir Shah dismissed Prime Minister Dawoud Khan. However, in 1973, with the support of the Soviets, Dawoud Khan made a coup and dethroned Zahir Shah. The Soviets began to follow the staffing policy and brought their men to key positions in Afghanistan. Disturbed by this, Dawoud Khan arrested some Marxists. Then, the Marxist officers in the army carried out a coup against Dawoud Khan in April 1978 and killed him. The Marxist leader Nur Muhammad Tarakki who had been sent to prison, was brought to the throne. Nur Muhammad Taraki began to pursue a strict Marxist policy. This led to armed rebellion in the country. Opposing the policy of Taraki, Hafizullah Amin made a coup in September 1979 and killed him. On December 27, 1979, direct military intervention in Afghanistan began in order to suppress Hafizullah Amin, the person whom Soviet administration did not want, and the rebellions that began against the communist regime, which aimed to dominate the country. On 24/12/ 1979, the Soviets overthrew Hafizullah Amin by sending their troops to Kabul. Despite not being in the country, it was declared that Babrak Karmal had to run the presidency of the Council of Revolution. They also occupied the whole country in 28 December 1979 upon the invitation of the government they founded. Babrak Karmal who was seen a pawn, returned from Moscow on 1 January 1980 and headed the Soviet-led administration (Safranchuk, 2009, p. 141-144).

Anti-Islamic practices of Nur Mohammed Taraki, who came to power in 1978, paved the way for the establishment of mujahedeen groups, such as the Islamic Society and Hizb-i Islami. The invasion strengthened the two major mujahedeen groups also resulted with the birth of the new groups. Nearly all the Afghan army and police force joined to the mujahedeen groups. Having 115 thousand troops of Red Army, Babrak Karmal could not overcome mujahedeen groups whom he described as 'a few muggers'. (Safranchuk, 2009, p. 148).

Strong reaction from the international community against occupation was witnessed. The Islamic Conference in Islamabad in 1980 described Soviet Union as occupant. At the UN, It

decided to withdraw foreign troops from Afghanistan. The United States gave intense support to the mujahedeen groups who fought against the occupation. Taking the support of Pakistan, Iran and many other Islamic countries, mujahedeen became powerful against Red Army. In 1987, Babrak Karmal, who failed because of the Islamic resistance, had replaced with Muhammad Najibullah by the Soviet Union. Muhammad Najibullah sought reconciliation with the opposition. He declared a unilateral ceasefire in the first stage. The name of the state as an extension of its policies was changed to Republic of Afghanistan (July 1987). However, these initiatives did not change the result. Abdul Rashid Dostum, who had the support of the most important commanders of Muhammed Najibullah, had joined Mujahedeen group and Kabul was captured by the Mujahedeen who led by Ahmad Shah Massoud (Byrd, 2012, p. 6).

The Soviet Union agreed to form a neutral Afghan State in 1988. Therefore, the Soviet troops left Afghanistan in 1989. The agreement put an end to the war, which killed thousands of people and created about 5 to 6 million refugees. The 1988 agreement did not resolve differences between the government and the mujahedeen, and in 1992, this turned into a civil war that worsened the Afghan economy. Ahmad Shah Massoud, who was a Tajik; Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, a Pashtun; and the Uzbek Abdul Rashid Dostum were among the leaders of these warring groups. Despite some temporary alliances, the struggles among armed groups continued until the Taliban, an Islamist fundamentalist, seized major parts of the country in 1996. Taliban used an extremist interpretation of Islam. The economy was in ruin and most of the government services were not working. Moreover, it was claimed that Taliban gave Al Qaeda the right to use Afghanistan as a base. Taliban rejected international pressure to hand over Al-Qaeda leader Usama bin Laden, while Al-Qaeda carried out a series of international terrorist acts. The most important act on the United States was September 11 Attacks. When the US and its allies attacked Afghanistan in the fall of 2001, the Taliban government collapsed. Moreover, Taliban and Al Qaeda leaders fled. A United States–led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) was established (Byrd, 2012, p. 8-10).

2.2. Afghanistan's Geographical Position and Its Strategic Importance in Central Asia

The history of Afghanistan could briefly described as history of invasions. Afghanistan, which also considered as the heart of Asia, has been the scene of invasions not only today but also throughout its history. Afghanistan, which called as Aryana in ancient times and Khorasan in

the middle ages, has known as Afghanistan Islamic Republic since 1747. It is a country located at the crossroads between central and south Asia, the Middle East and the Caucasus. Due to this important geographical location, Afghanistan is geographically, historically, culturally and strategically a key country in Central Asia. Its position as an intersection point between Iran-Arab Sea -India and Central Asia - South Asia has given the country great importance throughout history (Nojumi, 2002, p. 45-47).

Afghanistan is located between Central Asia, Indian Peninsula and Middle East with a total area of 652,100 km. It has borders with many strategically important countries such as Iran in the west, Pakistan in the east, China in the northeast, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan in the north, and Tajikistan in the northeast. Afghanistan has 76 kilometers borders with China, 936 kilometers with Iran, 2,430 kilometers with Pakistan, 1,206 kilometers with Tajikistan, 744 kilometers with Turkmenistan and 137 kilometers with Uzbekistan. It is composed of plains on the mountain ranges and plains on the ground.

The vast majority of Afghanistan, especially the central and northeastern part, is plateau. More than 49% of the mountains are higher than two thousand meters. The largest of these mountains, starting in North Pakistan and covering the center of the country, is The Hindu Kush Mountains extending into Afghanistan. This mountain is a border between the north and the other parts of the country and it divides the country into three different geographical parts. The height of the mountains in the eastern parts of the country, called the Wahan Corridor, is up to 7 thousand meters, which makes it possible for the terrorists to hide easily. Thus, mountain's geography makes it difficult to destroy terrorism completely in Afghanistan. As long as Afghanistan does not have a powerful air force, terrorist attacks will always be inevitable in Afghanistan. Overall, it is evident that Afghanistan's geographical location has a negative impact on Afghanistan's security (Nojumi, 2002, p. 55-56).

As for Afghanistan geostrategic importance, in addition to its common historical and cultural resemblance, Afghanistan is also geographically a part of central Asia. Geographically Central Asia can be defined in many different forms. It was described as a region from Istanbul to China; it can also be defined as the region between Amu darya and Syr darya rivers. The Soviets, administratively and politically, gave importance to central Asia being a region including today's Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan and Tajikistan (Nojumi, 2002, p. 182-183). The region is an intersection between Central Asia, the Middle

East and the India basins. Because of this strategic location, there has been a rivalry of major powers on the region since the ancient times. By the 19th century, there was a rivalry between the Russia and Britain for this region. Trenin and Malashenko emphasized that this rivalry could be named as "Great Game". Powers by the name of “Balkans of Eurasia” was used to reverse but they are more crowded in religious and ethnic diversity. For this reason, these regions regarded as the center of global instability. In these regions, Afghanistan is one of the countries, where global instability is prevalent and it never seems to be finalized (Trenin and Malashenko, 2010, p. 66-70).

The most important feature of this region could be power vacuum. Thus, great powers have been trying to gain influence in this region. It is important to state that it has important economic resources. Great powers desire to dominate Eurasian Balkans because of its rich minerals, natural gas and petroleum resources (Trenin and Malashenko, 2010, p. 78).

Agricultural sources of Afghanistan are primarily grazing land fertile crop-growing land, which are mostly in Kunduz province in the north and Helmand Province in the south. Afghanistan has major deposits of chrome, coal, copper, iron, and salt, as well as lesser amounts of a wide variety of minerals including gold, silver, and uranium. Natural gas is the most abundant hydrocarbon source in the region.

According to a SIGAR report, which published in July 2017, the cost of war and construction activates in Afghanistan for the US was estimated to be $714 billion, and since 2001, the cost of war in Afghanistan has been about $3.9 billion in a month (Noorani, 2017, p.3). Afghanistan holds natural and mineral resources in abundance. These are including deposits of copper, iron, barite, sulfur, talc, chromium, magnesium, salt, mica, marble, rubies, emeralds, lapis lazuli, asbestos, nickel, mercury, gold and silver, lead, zinc, fluorspar, bauxite, beryllium, and lithium (Irwin, 2017, p.11). The US government in 2010 estimated the unknown Afghan mineral deposits worth nearly $1 trillion. General David Petraeus the head of US and NATO-led ISAF central command in Afghanistan mentioned about the "stunning potential" of Afghanistan's mineral resources, and called Afghanistan "Saudi Arabia of lithium” (Noorani, 2017, p.8) which is a light metal, and an essential component in all high-tech electronics. Therefore, the demand for Lithium is swiftly increasing.

There are many mineral resources in Afghanistan. However, most of these mineral sources remain unexploited. Bauxite, emeralds, gold, iron, lead, magnesium, mercury, silver, sulfur, tin, uranium, and zinc are among these sources. Due to the transportation obstacles, local conflicts, inaccessible terrain, and limited investment, only barites, chromium, coal, copper, natural gas, and salt are extracted for commercial purposes. Prior to Soviet invasions, natural gas had been

the most vital natural source of export. In 2008 the China Metallurgical Group's lease of the Aynak Valley, including extensive copper deposits, opened the potential for Afghanistan's mineral wealth, which significantly improved the national economy. A large iron deposit, discovered in 2008 at Hajigag in Bamiyan Province, expected to lease to a private company for extraction to begin in 2009. A substantial new coal reserves also discovered in 2008 in Bamiyan Province. The largest coal mining operation is at Karkar Dodkash in north-central Afghanistan. Before the wars of the late twentieth century, Afghanistan industry and manufacturing sectors were primarily based on domestic agricultural products such as textiles, sugar, and chemical fertilizers made from natural gas or coal (Baizakova, 2014, p. 94-104).

During the summer of 2017, Donald Trump's advisers met with Michael N. Silver who was a chemical executive, owner of the firm American Elements. Silver's firm specialized in minerals, which used in a wide range of high-tech electronic products. Henceforth, he considered mining as a "win-win" game that could boost both Afghanistan's and United States economy, produce jobs and generate a new valuable foothold in rare-earth minerals for the US President Donald Trump's interest reflects his military advisers' struggles in sending more troops to Afghanistan, and President Ashraf Ghani in his first meeting with President Donald Trump argued the prospects of mining in Afghanistan, and supported mining with persuasive reasons as an economic prospect for both countries. President Donald Trump who was "deeply skeptical about sending more American troops to Afghanistan, suggested that this could be one justification for the United States to stay engaged in the country. Nonetheless, while Donald Trump is bearing in mind the potentials of the US making a fortune from an impoverished and war-torn country's minerals, US rivals have already started it. For example, Northern Afghanistan's natural gas reserves have attracted Russia's attention for decades. During the Soviet invasion, Russia laid the framework to control Afghanistan's natural gas but abandoned the effort after the Taliban seized control of the country. Other than US rivals, Afghanistan's lithium deposits have attracted Germans too. In July 2017, President Ashraf Ghani and German President Frank-Walter Steinmeier officially started the talks about Lithium deposits in Helmand province. Because this element is a key ingredient in rechargeable batteries used in smartphones and electric cars, and for its part, Germany has been dealing with Afghan lithium for its automobile industry (Amini, 2017, p. 28).

Another important thing about Afghanistan is that Afghanistan has been a natural pipeline route between Central Asian natural gas fields and the Arabian Sea, and Trans-Afghan Pipeline. It is considered that Trans- Afghan pipeline would affect Afghanistan economy in many positive

ways, but the line would pass through territory that controlled by the Taliban in 2007-2008. Therefore, security issues have prevented construction since the original agreement was signed by Afghanistan, Pakistan (the main consumer), and Turkmenistan (the supplier). Moreover, Afghanistan, which British call it as "the Watchtower of Asia" because of its important position in Asia, is one of the transition gates between central and south Asia (Byrd, 2012, p. 18).

2.3. Demographics of Afghanistan

Various ethnic groups are living together in Afghanistan. Afghanistan is a state, which is composed of 19 ethnic groups. The largest ethnic group constitutes Afghans, or Pashtun, which nearly account for 42 percent of total population of the country. The other main ethnic groups are Tajiks, 27 percent; Hazaras, 9 percent; Uzbeks, 9 percent; Aimaks (a Persian-speaking nomadic group), 4 percent; Turkmens, 3 percent; and Baloch, 2 percent. The biggest remaining nomadic group is the Kuchis, a Pashtun group whose population has decreased to about 1.5 million since 1979. The Pashtuns are the dominant ethnic group in the south and the east; the Tajiks are the dominant ethnic group in the northeast. The dominant groups in north-central Afghanistan are the Hazaras, Tajiks, and Uzbeks (White, 2011, p. 15).

The whole population of Afghanistan is almost Muslim. Between 80 to 85 percent of Muslims are Sunni and 15 to 19 percent, Shia. The minority Shia are economically disadvantaged and generally subjected to discrimination. Small numbers of Hindus and Sikhs live in urban centers. A Jewish population that numbered 5,000 in 1948 and had left Afghanistan entirely by 2000 (Sheikh, 2016, p.28).

2.4. Soviet Invasion and Resistance

Russian interests in Afghanistan dates back to Soviet period. With the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, Hafizullah Amin was murdered and Babrak Karmal brought to the presidency in order to suppress the internal turmoil and to defeat the external threats. He invited Soviet powers to the Afghanistan, which started the official foothold of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan (Trenin and Malashenko, 2010, p. 10-11).

Soviet Union claimed that they intervened with the invitation of Babrak Karmal. The reason was to prevent any intervention from the US Pakistan and China. Although the Soviet

considered they could provide stability in Afghanistan with an army of 50,000, it was not as expected. Afghans resisted against the Soviets. Therefore, Soviets increased their forces in Afghanistan to 150,000 (Malashenko, 2010, p. 12). However, they had great difficulties in Afghanistan and in the middle of the 1985, had lost nearly 25,000 soldiers in the region (Falkenburg, 2013, p. 382). Particularly Islamic countries such as Pakistan, Iran and Saudi Arabia took a stand against the communist regime in Afghanistan and supported Afghan people for their Soviet resistance. The United States and Pakistan intelligence services attempted to bring radical Islamists from all over the world to Pakistan and trained them to fight against Soviet Union with Afghan mujahedeen. While Iran supported the resistance movement through the Shias in Afghanistan, the US military and economic aid to Afghanistan put the Soviets in a difficult situation (Trenin and Malashenko, 2010, p. 13-17).

China reacted to Afghanistan's being a communist blog country, especially Islamic countries such as Pakistan, Iran and Saudi Arabia stood against the communist regime in Afghanistan. Therefore China supported Afghan people's resistance against Soviet Union. The United States also supported Afghanistan by bringing radical Islamists to the camps and trained them to fight against Soviet with Afghan people and provided both military and economic support, which put Moscow in an even more difficult position in the region (Katzman, 2013, p. 1-6).

In 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev became the leader of Soviet Union, which resulted in a change in the policy of Afghanistan. Gorbachev emphasized that the Soviets would stop interfering with the political developments in the bloc countries. Bringing Muhammad Nejibullah, who was a Pashtun, in place of Babrak Karmal in the general secretary of the Democratic People's Party in Afghanistan on 4 May 1986, was the first sign of the Soviet Union's policy change. The new policy was to find a formula that would lead to the continuation of the pro-Soviet Communist system after the withdrawal of the Soviet army from the country. On April 15, 1988, the Soviet Union withdrew from Afghanistan with four agreements signed in Geneva (Falkenburg, 2013, p. 385).

After the Soviet withdrawal from the country, conflicts of power emerged, stemming from political uncertainty. Following the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from the country in 1989, the communist government succeeded in maintaining power in Afghanistan for three more years, which was mainly due to the disagreement among the mujahedeen groups over the power of the government. A week after the fall of Najibullah on April 16, 1992, Tajik origin commander Ahmad Shah Massoud took over Kabul. Mujahedeen brought Sibigetullah Mujaddidi to the government for two months but later when Sibigetullah told that he would

stay in power for two years, disputes emerged among Mujahedeen. Hizbi Islamic leader Gulbuddin Hikmatyar said that he would not recognize Sibigetullah administration, so he began to attacks against the government. Therefore, the war among mujahedeen groups started. In 1992, although Rabbani brought to the presidency, Hikmatyar, the deputy prime minister, continued his attacks, saying that he would not work under Rabbbani's command.

The battles for power in Afghanistan became more intense with the cooperation of Rashid Dostum, Hikmat Yar and Shia forces. Thus, after the Soviet occupation, there was an ambiguity in the country. Mujahedeen lost their effectiveness in Afghanistan after 1992, because there were power conflicts among mujahedeen groups. Therefore, taking advantage of these power conflicts, the Pakistan-backed Taliban began to take control of Afghanistan (Matinuddin, 2002, p. 23-29).

2.5. Taliban Period in Afghanistan

The Taliban remains one of the major issues in Afghanistan and in the world. Taliban emerged because of Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Both internal and external actors especially the US played an important role in the emergence and development of the Taliban movement. For some scholars, the emergence of Taliban is not a new event in Afghanistan. One of these scholars is Musa M. Maroofi. According to him, the history of religious schools (madrasas) and Taliban is as old as the advent of Islam in Afghanistan. Both religious schools and religious students existed in Afghanistan long before modern system of schools and education implemented (Katzman, 2013, p. 26-29).

The Taliban at first emerged as a movement with the promises of bringing justice and peace, and establishing a system based on Islamic law in Afghanistan. In 1991, the first seeds of the Taliban was seen, while rivalry between the major Mujahedeen groups continued. Eventually, with the support of the US and Pakistan between 1993 and 1994, some of the former Mujahedeen, Pashtuns, who came from the rural areas of Pakistan and from poor areas, set up the Taliban movement. The US and Pakistan supported Taliban because they aimed to end the civil war in Afghanistan. After the capture of Kandahar, Taliban grew even stronger in a short period. In this case, Muslim fighters from other countries were influenced when Pakistan supported Taliban who seized control in other cities after Kandahar. Afghan people considered that Taliban could be their new hope, because they were tired of the clashes between mujahedeen groups. There were also external powers behind the formation of Taliban

government. The most important external power was the US because during the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the US did not want Soviet Union took control of Afghanistan and became a neighbor to southern Asia (Barfield, 2010, p. 154-161).

The Taliban controlled the country within five years after being organized for the first time in 1994. Shortly after being established, the Taliban became an effective force against the warlords in Afghanistan by overthrowing the Burhanuddin Rabbani government in 1996, considering that it was an enemy to Pashtuns (Stenersen, 2010, p. 42-50).

The Taliban declared the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan in 1997. Mullah Muhammad Omar, one of the old Mojahedin of Hizb-i Islami party, ruled the country under the Taliban regime. Mullah Omar helped the advisory committees. Decisions in religious group were taken according to Shari'a law unanimously. There was not a valid constitution in the country (Stenerson, 2010, p.55). The Taliban could not form a corporate state structure. It could be stated that the only institutionalized study was the Ministry of Enforcement of Virtue and Suppression of Vice, which has also known as the moral police, for the regulation and control of social life. Except from this Ministry, Taliban, was never able to have a real government and could not operate institutions even though it seized control of almost all of the country. The entire military and bureaucratic structure of the country became the organization structure of the Taliban. Afghan economy has based on agriculture, mainly planting hashish. For this reason, Afghanistan became a failed state during Taliban era (Johnson, 2007, p. 93-129).

The Taliban ruled Afghanistan from 1996 until 2001. In 2001, the Taliban insurgency began. Afghan people considered that Taliban would bring stability; nevertheless, human rights abuses were seen. The secret reports of the UN, which claimed that the Taliban government carried out 15 mass massacres, which targeted the Shiite groups. Only Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates declared that they recognized the Taliban government. Despite the reaction to the Taliban in the international community, there was not a strong opposition to the Taliban within the country (Malaiz, 2014, p. 9).

Taliban actually emerged in Afghanistan's own historical and social problems. Social life in Afghanistan based on tribes or small groups which were shaped by Islamic rules. Therefore, Sharia law regulated the political and social life. Moreover, Islam played a key role in unifying people of the region where many different ethnic groups were active. This unifying role was one of the decisive factors in the initiative of the armed groups towards foreign occupation in Afghanistan (Qassem, 2009, p. 223).

Nevertheless, long period of instability experienced in the region with continuous occupations and there were many impacts of these occupation on social, political and economic life. Because

of these problems, transformation from traditional rural life to modern life is difficult (Malaiz, 2014, p.12). However, in order to understand the genesis of the Taliban, it is necessary to understand the demographic and social structure, history, geo-strategic position of Afghanistan (Qassem, 2009, p. 222).

2.6. The Establishment of Al Qaeda

Since September 11 attacks, Al-Qaeda has become the most important terrorist organization. The organization has a multinational structure, and has active members all over the world. Al-Qaeda was established in 1988. The main aim of Al-Qaeda was to support the Afghan jihad, which launched in 1979 after the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan. Rather than creating a widespread terrorist network, Al-Qaeda is an international platform that provides technical, financial and ideological support to the extremist Islamic social segments of the Islamic world (Arı and Arslan, 2005, p. 202).

According to Al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden, the influence of the Selefi-Wahhabi ideology has been obvious in the formation of Al-Qaeda. Al-Qaeda's ideology can be described as a reinterpretation of the Selefi-Wahhabi ideology, which existed long before in Islamic history. This ideology used violence as a part of religious life. The movement, called Salafism and Wahhabism carries the character of a real fundamentalist movement. Al-Qaeda takes on a true fundamentalist identity by acting with this understanding. The organization, aimed to re-establish the Sunni Islamic caliphate in the end. It made the jihad a slogan in order to realize a global Islamic revolution. In this context, Osama bin Laden played a more visible leadership role in international terrorism by calling for an open jihad against the US and its allies. Today, many Western countries, including the US are under religious fundamentalist threat. Today's fundamentalists, whose roots depend on the Middle East, cause international security problems. Identities and locations of these people cannot easily identified. While rejecting the liberal values of the West, they prefer to use West's technology and military systems as well (Arı and Arslan, 2005, p. 215).

Al-Qaeda emerged during Cold War and developed during the fighting of Afghan jihad. It was claimed that the US Saudi Arabia and European states helped this movement at the end of the 1980s. During this jihad against the Soviet Union. Al-Qaeda term for the first time used in a report in 1997 in United States. After in 1998, Al-Qaeda defined not as an organized group but as an operational center where Sunni extremists, often with similar views, took part. For the

first time as a terrorist organization, Al-Qaeda was used in investigations launched by the US Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) about the terrorist attacks on US embassies in 1998 in eastern Africa (Gray, 2004, p. 57-60).

When Al-Qaeda's organizational structure has examined, it is different from other terrorist organizations. Al-Qaeda, which does not have a unified structure, is a global multinational structure based on independent local dynamics. Gray describes the construction of Al-Qaeda as the first multinational terrorist organization that can operate in Latin America, Japan, and all other continents. Unlike the terrorists of the 1970s and 1980s, al-Qaeda does not act in a regional context. Their forces are constantly seeking new bases and new destinations around the world, using contemporary Islamic groups instead of resisting globalization. Al-Qaeda interprets Islam as not only a spiritual religion but as a political method in line with their political aims (Gray, 2004, p. 66).

When the basic aims of Al-Qaeda examined, there are two main purposes. The first one is to remove the Western powers, especially the US from the Muslim lands, which shape the Middle East in the direction of their own, will in relation to the internal affairs of Muslim countries and in cooperation with Israel. The second aim is to remove the regimes, which they believe to be in separation with these countries. Gray defines other goals of al-Qaeda as the elimination of the state and religion, the demolition of democracy, the ending of the freedom of women, the elimination of Christians and Jews (Whelan, 2005, p. 116-120).

To summarize, the ideological education given to the activists in terms of the Al Qaeda movement carries great importance in reaching the determined political aims. Al-Qaeda members accept the tasks given to them. They considered these tasks as part of their ideological education. In this context, acts of suicide, terror and violence referred as "jihad", which they believe they have been acting in the name of Islam (Whelan, 2005, p. 159-166).

Osama bin Laden is the founder of the al-Qaeda organization. He accused in United States federal court for the claims that he was involved in the 1998, US embassy bombings in Dar e Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya. He had also linked to the 2000 USS Cole bombing, the Bali nightclub bombings, the Madrid bombings, as well as bombings in the Jordanian capital of Amman and in Egypt's Sinai Peninsula. It was claimed he carried out some violent attacks worldwide, including the September 11, 2001, attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City, The Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia, and the hijacking of United Airlines Flight 93, which killed at least 2,986 people (Mockaitis, 2010, p. 8-10).

Osama Bin Laden was born in Saudi Arabia in 1957. Although the roots of the Laden's family based on Yemen, the family announced its name as one of the most respected families of Saudi Arabia with its success in the construction sector. Muhammad Ladin, father of Osama bin Laden, who came from South Yemen to Saudi Arabia, started his life as a porter in Jeddah harbor. Having gained great reputation in the Islamic world with its construction activities and restoration works in Mecca and Medina, Laden's company became the biggest construction company in the Middle East. He established an industrial empire under the name of Bin Laden Group (Bergen, 2011, p. 440-442). Osama Bin Laden, after finishing high school, married with a Syrian girl and went to Jeddah to study in department of business and construction engineering. Osama bin Laden was educated at the King Abdul Aziz University in Jeddah, where an Islamic atmosphere prevailed, and he greatly impressed by his teacher Abdullah Azzam and the ideas of the Muslim Brotherhood organization. In particular, Azzam's ideas had a very significant impact on Osama Bin Laden. In 1981, Laden graduated from King Abdulaziz University. During his education years and after education, there was a period of radical Islamic movements. Therefore, Osama Bin Laden's religious worldview grew much more than before (Bergen, 2011, p. 435-440).

September 11 attacks changed world politically, economically and ideologically. In terms of ideological change, the U.S was strongly influenced by realist thinking in its Afghanistan strategy and policy. Afghanistan policies of George W. Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump meets the principles of Realism theory. Realism highlights the role of the nation-state and assumes that all nation-states are motivated by national interests (Morgenthau, 2005, p. 15). National interest can be defined that all states try to protect their sovereignty and their territorial integrity. Realism has state-centric assumptions. It deals with national security issues. The concept of balance of power has played a dominant role in realist thought and theory (Viotti and Kauppi, 1993, p.67). Realists point out that state leaders have the power of legitimate use of force. (Shimko, 1992, p. 297). From a realist perspective, war is a necessary expedient for preserving power. From this perspective, there are no limits in exercise of power (Baylis and Smith, 1997, p. 111). It can be claimed that the US policy of Afghanistan is profoundly influenced by realist theories. Following the 9/11 attacks, the US intervened in Afghanistan and Iraq. He attacked Al-Qaeda's camps and the Taliban regime. As a result of these interventions, the Taliban regime was ended in Afghanistan, the Iraqi Saddam regime collapsed and the leader Saddam Hussein was executed in 2006 (Wolfendale, 2007, p. 89). George W. Bush Administration, Barack Obama Administration and Donald Trump Administration changed their Afghanistan strategy to meet changing national strategic goals. The US main

concern was its own national interests in defeating Al- Qaeda in Afghanistan, which meets the principles of realism.

3.THE SITUATION OF AFGHANISTAN AFTER THE INTERVENTION OF US IN 2001

Afghanistan is a country which is affected by terrorism. The most significant terrorist group in Middle East is Al-Qaeda, which established in Peshawar Pakistan in 11 August 1988. It carried out many terrorist attacks throughout the world. The most important of these attacks is 9/11 attacks, which killed many innocent people. Therefore, this chapter of the thesis will be on the 9/11 attacks and its effects on Afghanistan. The terrorist attack of 9/11 was the main cause of the US intervention in Afghanistan. The US intervention in Afghanistan was a turning point for the future of Central Asia. Attacks against the US and Al-Qaeda brought all attention to Central Asia and Afghanistan. The region could not reach a certain level of stability since the collapse of the Soviet Union. As a result of 9/11 attacks, the US changed its whole policy which effected and still affects the whole world politics. 9/11 attacks was also the event that resulted in rise of realism in the US policy. Realism is the dominant theory of international relations because it provides the most powerful explanation for the state of war which is the regular condition of life in the international system. This is the bold claim made by realists in defense of their tradition. It emphasizes on material forces such as state power. Realist ideas are being drawn upon by state leaders who believe that the use of force is the only instrument left to insure their survival. As a result of the 9/11, the US launched military operations in different parts of the world under the name of fighting against terrorism. They give importance to their national interests applying the principles of realism.

3.1. Terrorist Attacks of 9/11 and the US Intervention in Afghanistan

Seventeen years have passed since the 9/11 terrorist attack, which shocked the world greatly. On September 11, 2001, nearly three thousand people lost their lives after terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center Towers. This attack remained in memories as the greatest terrorist act of recent human history. The 19 terrorists abducted four passenger planes and hit the World Trade Center Towers in New York. This event can be regarded as a cause of rise of realism in the US policy. Scholars tried to analyze reasons behind Laden's attack on twin towers. Lansford and Covarrubias argue that Laden felt that the Muslim society had been ashamed and humiliated' by the West (Lansford, Et al, 2009, p.17). Bergen continues by pointing out that

Osama bin Laden considered that Islam was under attack and that the only way to alter this was to attack to United States. Moreover, Laden's disproval of the US military presence in Saudi Arabia could be added (Bergen, 2011, p. 39-40).

After the Gulf War, sanctions were imposed on Iraq. Moreover United Sates supported Jewish state of Israel while attacking Palestine. This points out the disapproval of United States policies in the Middle East had important role in 9/11 attacks against United States. Yet, although Laden wanted to change the Middle Eastern policy of the United States, Bergen claims that Al-Qaeda's ability accomplishes it was not possible. The Commission Report claims that Laden wanted to confront modernity and globalization (Bergen, 2011, p. 214-220).

According to Bergen, these attacks were not prevented not because of a lack of information on Al-Qaeda's plans, but because of the fact that the George W. Bush Administration did not perceive any likelihood of such an attack on the United States. He claims that they failed to do so because the administration had focused on Iraq, which perceived as the main threat to America, According to Bergen, these show that these attacks could have been prevented (Bergen, 2011, p. 297).

The 9/11 attacks against US was the main cause of the US intervention in Afghanistan. Since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the region could not reach a certain level of stability. The 9/11 attacks resulted with US military operations in different parts of the world under the name of fighting against terrorism. For this purpose, the US cooperated with many countries. One month after the terrorist attacks, President George W. Bush ordered air operation on Afghanistan. Laden, who was the target name of the September 11 attacks, was killed in 2011. As a result, the US with the support of United Kingdom completed its political and military preparations after the 9/11 attacks on October 7, 2001, and initiated the global war on terrorism with the Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) (Bowman and Dale, 2011, p. 65-78).

The US Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld explained that eliminating the Al-Qaeda terrorist organization and the Taliban regime that hosted the Al-Qaeda terrorist organization was their main purpose. He also claimed that fight against terrorism and make humanitarian aid in the area were their other purposes. In this context, the US planned short-term operations based on an air attacks against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda elements. In those operations, it was aimed to use latest technology in the weaponry system. Therefore, the US, which planned to help the Northern Alliance and Pashtun groups who was against Taliban, sent only 1000 special force soldiers to the Afghanistan. In addition to its own forces, the US performed surgical strikes with a mixed force that includes the forces of the Northern Alliance and some Pashtun tribes, which had a force capacity with 15,000 men. On November 9, 2001, the Mazar i Sharif was the

first city that taken from the Taliban regime. On the following days, success achieved in other cities, and on November 13, 2001, the Northern Alliance has entered into Kabul, which accelerated the overthrow of the Taliban. In December 2001, the Taliban forces retreated to Kandahar. The Taliban, who could not hold control on Kandahar in December 2001, crossed the border of Pakistan and moved to the north of Pakistan (Bowman and Dale, 2011, p. 65-78). The overthrown of the Taliban government within a short period of time was considered a military achievement by the US The US set two main strategic goals for Afghanistan when it started the operation and tried to act on the axis of these strategic goals during the George W. Bush administration. These goals were eliminating Taliban administration in Afghanistan, which provided a safe zone for Al-Qaeda, and the stabilizing the region until a legitimate Afghan government was established (Bowman and Dale, 2011, p. 85). For this reason, the US began to work with international support in Afghanistan after the September 11 attacks, especially with coalition forces, for the construction of the new era. Thus, a meeting held in Bonn, Germany, in December 2001 under the auspices of the UN to resolve fundamental problems. These problems inexistence of Afghanistan from terrorist elements, establishment of political stability, economic revitalization of the country. It was claimed that the restoration of the country was the main reason of the US intervene in Afghanistan, however at the background, the main reason has been the US national interest. Moreover, the US has been frightened that Russia may become a dominant country in the region (Sheikh, 2016, p. 263-265).

According to Giustozzi, the main purpose of US in these strategies was actually to provide their own national security and preserving national interest. What meant with US national security was the security of the nuclear weapons that Pakistan and India possess, as well as to prevent the radical elements from spreading and to hinder Afghanistan from being the domain of a non-ally and rival country (Giustozzi, 2013, p. 25-28).

Four Afghan opposition groups (the Roman Group of the former King Mohammed Zahir Shah, the Peshawar Group of Ahmed Geylani, the Cyprus Group of Gulbeddin Hikmetyar, and the Northern Alliance under the leadership of Rashid Dostum) attended and signed the "Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan" which was called as Bonn Agreement in 5/12/2001. The purpose of Bonn agreement was to re-create Afghanistan following the US invasion of Afghanistan in response to 9/11 terrorist attacks. Following the fall of the Taliban in 2001, the Bonn Agreement laid the foundation for US and NATO backed state-building efforts in Afghanistan. The agreement sought to establish a new constitution, an independent judiciary, free and fair elections, a centralized security sector, and the protection of rights of

women, and minorities, such as religious and ethnic groups (Mukhopadhyay, 2009, p. 15-16). Because of the Bonn Agreement, it has decided that Hamid Karzai, a member of the Roma Group in Afghanistan, would establish a temporary government in Afghanistan. The political process, which required a new constitution in Afghanistan and for a new Afghan government election, was the other result of the agreement. Another important consequence of the agreement was the granting of an international coalition to assist the security forces in Afghanistan to establish, train and secure the security around Kabul. Because the removal of the Taliban from power did not mean the complete elimination of the Taliban. In addition, the newly established interim government with limited resources and a damaged state system did not have the capacity to prevent the Taliban from reorganizing (Bowman and Dale, 2011, p. 102-104).

Laden and Al- Qaeda organization, which entered the world agenda immediately after the attacks, were spoken for a long time and many things were written and drawn on them. One of the most remarkable was the claim that Laden was actually an American agent. Especially Cuban President Fidel Castro claimed that Laden is a CIA agent that emerged when former US President George W. Bush wanted to scare the world (McGreal, 2010, p. 1). Whether these claims are true or false, it could be stated that Laden and the US contacted for the first time when they were acting together on the operations of the S.U. in Afghanistan (Hoffman, 2006, p. 250)

3.2. The Consequences of the US Intervention in the Relationship between Afghanistan and the rest of the World

As the US intervened in Afghanistan, it also benefited from geo-strategic position of Afghanistan for its national interests and security. When we look at Afghanistan's foreign policy after the American occupation, major changes took place. Afghanistan was one of the poorest countries in the world and its economy was based mainly on agriculture. Main export products were poppy, fresh and dried fruits, plants used in pharmaceuticals, spices, seeds, unprocessed leather wool, carpets, rugs and some precious stones. The security problems in the country, lack of infrastructure due to the civil war and the US intervention in the country prevented the development of the country. After the elimination of Taliban and Al-Qaida, positive changes took place in Afghanistan in terms of foreign investment due to its location. Afghanistan is a country located at the crossroads between central and south Asia, the Middle East and the Caucasus. It has borders with strategically important countries such as Iran, Pakistan, China, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan, which have rich energy resources. Due to this important geographical location, Afghanistan is geographically and strategically a key country in Central Asia.

After the collapse of the Taliban regime, Turkey was the first to extend its helping hand to Afghanistan. Since 2001, Turkey has made 277 million dollars aid to Afghanistan. Moreover, 1800 military Turkish troops had been sent to Afghanistan. Turkish troops did not take place in combat roles. They dealt with aid and security (Karacasulu, 2010, p. 45; Karen, 2013, p. 2.). On 23 May 2012, during a visit to Islamabad, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan told that, “Turkey will stay in Afghanistan even after all the other forces have left, and will leave only when our Afghan brothers and sisters tell us, “Thank you, now you can go home.” (Karacasulu, 2010, p. 45). Turkish President Abdullah Gül sounded this view during the May 2012 NATO summit in Chicago, which reiterated that Turkey’s commitment to Afghanistan was not for the short-term. Some statements that show a special link between both Turkey and Afghanistan are not less than only rhetorical. There is a strong religious, historical, and cultural links between Afghanistan and Turkey. Afghanistan established diplomatic relations with Turkey after it acquired its independence in 1919 and was the second country, which was, recognized the Republic of Turkey. Numerous friendship and cooperation agreements had signed by both countries since 1921. These relations, which go back to the founding of both countries, have continued until present day. Today, Turkey regards its presence in Afghanistan

both as part of the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission, and as a "brotherhood duty" to help the Afghan people peace (Karacasulu, 2010, p. 42-53).

Another country that Afghanistan improved its relation was India. India has invested two billion dollars to Afghanistan in education, health, security, military and Afghanistan's infrastructure until now. In addition, the mutual collaboration between India and Afghanistan is increasing day by day. Since 2001, India has made various buildings, as well as buildings of the National Assembly of Afghanistan and communication network buildings along with various aids. During Hamid Karzai's visit to Delhi, a strategic and security cooperation agreement made. With this agreement, it had planned to institutionalize in bilateral relations, security, trade, education, culture and other fields (Hamidi, 2012, p. 12-13).

As for Iran, after 2001, Iran exported 52 million dollars and this amount reached 2.18 billion dollars in 2012. Iran's main export items are primarily oil products, consumer durable goods, construction materials, medical products, cement, detergents, carpets, and iron and steel products. As the basic dynamics of Afghanistan's economy are agricultural and livestock sectors, Afghanistan is therefore in a position to import products outside of the agricultural and livestock sector. Iran Since 2001 has increased its presence on the Afghanistan market. The increasing effect of Iran power in Afghanistan is due to nearly five hundred Iranian companies, which are operating in Afghanistan. Thanks to these companies, Iran is playing a significant role in the restructuring of Afghanistan (Hamidi, 2012, p. 153).

During the Taliban era, Afghanistan's relations with Pakistan were in its golden age. At first Pakistan welcomed the operation of the super powers in Afghanistan. Nevertheless, with the overthrown of the Taliban regime, relations between these two countries varied. Therefore, Afghanistan and Pakistan relations in Taliban era could be separated into three different scopes. The first one is Pakistan recognized the new government established in Afghanistan in 2003, therefore the relations between these two countries returned to normal. The second one is that the relation between these two countries declined and protests began against Pakistani Grand Embassy in 2003 as Afghan new government and people were thinking that Pakistan had trained and supported Taliban. In addition, the last one is that with the efforts and attempts of US president George W. Bush, the relations normalized (Ahmadi, 2012, p. 70-71).

China gives great importance to today's Afghanistan relations. These relations are particularly based on economy because China, with various investments, expecting to provide great benefits in the future from Afghanistan. Therefore, China has signed important agreements with the Afghan government, especially in the fields of oil, gas and precious metals. For example, with a recent agreement, China has started to oil drilling in the cities of Sari Pul and Faryab. Because

of this agreement, which will last for 25 years, it be estimated that it will provide $ 7 billion in revenue for Afghanistan (Millward, 2007, p. 285-287). In addition, China built Afghanistan's first oil refinery and has been running an enormous copper mine project in the city of Logar for several years. These copper deposits have reserves of $ 88 billion. This project also includes a thermal power plant and a railway project linking China-Tajikistan-Afghanistan to Pakistan (Ahmadi, 2012, p. 98).

China has also infrastructure projects in Afghanistan. China gives great importance to close relations with Afghan leaders in order to carry out these projects. Afghanistan is a gateway for China to trade and transport its goods to Europe. For that reason, China has begun Silk Road project in China, which will provide huge revenue for China (Ahmadi, 2012, p. 107-109). Silk Road will make countries both strong and regulate their relations culturally and economically. Those countries, which are on this route, can gain significant economic and political advantage. All the countries that are located on the Silk Road routes are aware of the importance of the Silk Road routes. The major player of this route play an important position to give directions to this road and more specifically to this trade flows. Main players on this route are China and Russia whose trade volume have more significant role for today's economy and energy market (Chene, 2015, p. 25-27 and Griffiths, 2017, p.35).

The rise of economic values of the countries on the Silk Road route can bring many contributions to the economy and political diplomacy because it begins from China and reaches to Europe over a long belt on which there are Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, Turkmenistan Russia, Turkey and Greece. This road therefore makes these countries politically important. Nevertheless, America and Russia do not want China become a power in Afghanistan for their own benefits. The major rule of the Belt and Road project is to develop Central Asian Countries to respond and function the political and economic responses in the China’s market (Peyrouse, 2008, p. 9-12).

On April 1, 2006, “the Conference on Cooperation in Greater Central Asia " was held in the capital of Afghanistan. In the conference, which hosted by Afghan President Karzai, US Assistant Secretary of State Richard Boucher and Foreign Minister of Kazakhstan Tokayev who were at the same time appointed to the South Asian Bureau at the conference attended the conference. The purpose of the Conference was to evaluate the advantages of the recent developments in Afghanistan and increase the prosperity and security of this large part of Eurasia, thanks to the reopening of commercial roads that had closed for centuries and revitalize the continental trade (Hamidi, 2012, p. 170).

Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) plays an important role in revitalizing new Silk Road project. The SCO is an international organization whose members are members of all the countries that will influence, effect and contribute to the revitalization of the Silk Road on the north-south line. China and Russia are the main founders of SCO. Since its emergence as the Shanghai association has been a unifying element, a solution to regional and bilateral problems, and China's growing interest in Central Asia. Afghanistan is not a member or observer of the SCO but invited as a guest to all the summits since 2005. On June 15, 2011, at the 10th summit of the SCO, which held in the Kazakhstan's capital Astana, Afghan President Karzai expressed his wish to join as an observer. SCO aims to combat terrorism, separatism and extremism. Afghanistan's stability is one of the most constant agenda items in Shanghai cooperation organization. At the Tenth Summit held in Astana, Afghanistan came to the forefront. President Kerimov of Uzbekistan stated that Afghanistan would be seen as a country that develops steadily in the future and will not pose a threat to neighboring countries. In the recent period, cooperation steps have taken by US and SCO related to the issues in Afghanistan (Roy, 2010, p. 550-557).

3.3. Post-2001 Afghanistan Political System

September 11 attacks is the most important elements that legitimized the US intervention in Afghanistan, as well as being a start of new transformations in the US and the world. According to US security intelligence, the presence of Laden in Afghanistan, whom shown as the responsible of the attack, caused US attention to be concentrated on this country. In response to US requests to hand over Laden, Taliban requested evidence. Therefore, on October 7, 2001, the United States launched a lasting liberation campaign against Afghanistan, after Afghanistan insisted not to hand over Laden (Bek, 2001, p. 122).

On 7.11.2001, to create a new reconciliation platform for Afghanistan and to enable all groups to unite on the platform, The Bonn Summit held on November 27, 2001 under the auspices of the United Nations and the United States. Considering the situation of all the ethnic and armed groups in this country, it proposed to establish a broad-based government and it has decided to establish a six-month interim administration in the Presidency of Hamid Karzai, who advised the American oil company Unucal. The administration established under the leadership of Karzai consisted of 29 ministries, 11 of which were Pashtun, 8, were Tajik, 5, were of Hazara and 3 were Uzbek. The absence of any ministry for the Cypriot group who was close to

Hikmetyar and the appointment of the Northern alliance's members to key ministries such as Foreign Affairs, Home Affairs and Defense Ministries to the Shûray-i Nizar fraction and the election of the five ministries who were formerly assigned to Caspian group showed that not all groups are actively represented (Akkurt, 2005, p. 159).

The "Kabul Declaration" had signed between Afghanistan and neighboring countries in 2002. With this declaration, region countries (Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Iran, Pakistan and the People's Republic of China) supported Karzai and supported Afghanistan during the reconstruction process by lending around $ 560 million. It aimed to develop relations between Afghanistan's new government and neighboring states (Gökırmak, 2011, p. 18).

The United States launched the war against Afghanistan on October 7, 2001, which was described as Crusade. This war called as an eternal justice operation. The war was actually a strategic war. The purpose of this war was not a struggle against terrorism, as it claimed. The US strategic intention was to increase its strength and initiative in Asia. In particular, it could be stated that the US did not want China increase its continental power in the region (Tardy, 2004, p. 85)

Even though aid was provided and the reconstruction process was initiated in Afghanistan, Afghanistan was affected most and devastatingly by the 9/11 events in practical terms. Afghanistan was held responsible for the 9/11 incidents, and a new state model in Afghanistan began to be built by invading forces.

3.4. Afghanistan Parliament after 2001

In Afghanistan, the establishment of parliament called "Loya Jirga" was to solve political and social problems. Likewise, electoral systems of the authorities based on the ancient history. However, before the 1965 Constitution, this electoral system was very primitive and traditional. A dominant judge of the region would meet with the candidates and inform tribal elders about their views on identity, authority, and ability of the candidates, and ask them to raise their hands, which they wanted to vote. Thus, the elections has made in a short time. The elected deputy declared to court and sent to parliament. This election system continued until Sardar Shah Mahmud Khan handed over the administration of Afghanistan with the slogan of democracy in 1946. Freedoms such as the choice of the municipalities had recognized in this period (Haşimi, 2013, p. 133).

The first parliament in Afghanistan was established by Shah Amanullah Khan, inspired by developments in the world and especially in the region. Later, during the time of Mohammed Nadir Shah, parliament in conformity with contemporary international standards had been established in the year 1311 (Haşimi, 2013, p. 135).

After the fall of the Taliban regime in 2001, Hamid Karzai became the leader of the country. He designated as the interim president. In 2003, the people of Afghanistan went to the polls for the first time in their history to choose the first head of state. Hamid Karzai, the favorite candidate in the elections, said: "My people have been voting for the first time in five thousand years to vote for their leader. I also vote for the first time in my life." 15 candidates attended this historic election. 500 international observes monitored the election. In this elections, where 10.5 million voters participated the election, women vote separately and men vote in separate places. In the centers where women vote, female officials had employed. As a result, Hamid Karzai was elected as president (Misdaq, 2006, p.65).

Parliamentary election in Afghanistan was expected to take place in the spring of 2005. However, due to various reasons in the country, the elections had not been held on the scheduled date and postponed. The International Crisis Group announced that on 21 July 2005 2,838 candidates applied for the election of 249 members of the provincial election and 3,198 candidates applied for the 420 membership of the provincial council. On August 20, 2005, Ministry of Justice announced that 76 political parties registered to participate in the elections. These groups, which played an important role in the history of the country during the 25 years of war, did not definitely enter the parliament. With the elections, 249 deputies of the People's Assembly, 102 members of the Grand National Assembly, and members of the Provincial and District General Assembly were elected (Haşimi, 2013, p. 152-153).

4.AFGHANISTAN POLICIES OF THE US ADMINISTRATIONS

Seventeen years have passed since the September 11 attacks against United States. Within these seventeen years three presidents were elected in the US but the war in Afghanistan has not been finalized yet. The country has not been cleared of terrorist elements and the country's' economy has not been stabilized. Every selected president came up with a new strategy on Afghanistan but actually their strategies were not very different from each other as a result of their applying to the principles of the realism in their policies on Afghanistan. Therefore, the aim of this chapter is to make a comparative analysis of George W. Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump administration' foreign policy of Afghanistan taking the principles of realism into consideration.

4.1. The Importance of Afghanistan for the United States

Afghanistan is strategically an important country in the Central Asia. As it is located between Central Asia, Indian Peninsula and Middle East, it has borders with strategically important countries such as Iran, Pakistan, China, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan, which have rich energy resources.

Afghanistan has always attracted great powers due to its strategic position in the especially the US and Russia. These two superpowers have always been in the history of Afghanistan because of their interests. The war in the Afghanistan is actually the war between these two superpowers. Under the name of national security and fight against terrorism, Afghanistan has turned into a prison in itself.

Diplomatic relations between the US and Afghanistan began with Afghanistan's independence in 1921, when an Afghan delegation sent to the United States to launch diplomatic relationship. From the date until the Cold War and 2001, the relations between the two countries were rather limited on the establishment and development of representative agencies. In this period, Afghanistan called for financial and military aid from the US several times in order to

strengthen and sustain the stability against the SU and Pakistan, but these requests were rejected (Raees, 2010, p. 83-85).

Afghanistan relations with the S.U accelerated in the management of Prime Minister Mohammed Daoud Khan in 1953 and 1963. This acceleration would not have been possible if the United States had supported Afghanistan with military aid repeated in 1948, 1951 and 1953. As a result, Afghanistan turned its attention to SU for the modernization of its military forces.

The Afghan power elites tended to improve partnerships with the US In August 1946, Prime Minister Zahir Shah was thinking that the US could ensure the security of his country. They think that the US would ensure economic development of Afghanistan and help Afghanistan's political freedom. However, at that time, the US had no interests in Afghanistan. (Raees, 2010, p. 87). At the period of Cold War, the U.S primarily wanted Afghanistan to be a neutral, independent, and not committed to the Soviet bloc. Afghanistan was not considered as important trade partner for the US However, this changed in time, especially since 9/11 attacks (Raees, 2010, p. 88).

Unlike the US, Afghanistan and SU, agreed on some development projects including the construction of highways, bridges, the construction of Bagram airport and the road linking Kabul with the SU border. Relations between Moscow and Kabul were deepened by oil exploration in Afghanistan. After 1957, King Zahir Shah's official visit to Moscow increased the number of oil research teams. On this official visit, the Soviets contributed to oil exploration in northern Afghanistan for $ 15 million (Rashid, 2008, p. 103). Between 1950 and 1955, the transit trade of Afghanistan through Pakistan expanded annually and increased trade with SU. The economic cooperation of the Soviet Union with Afghanistan became the basic tool of the search for influence in the Afghan army. Thousands of Afghan army and air forces were sent to SU for training. (Dibb, 2010, p. 507).

Army officers trained by the Soviet Union had important role in the ouster of the King in 1973 and, later on, in the Saur Revolution in 1979. SU military forces entry into Afghanistan in December 1979 shocked the world. Washington defined this step as a *"calculated move in Russian global strategy rather than as a response to the dangerous floundering of an incompetent puppet."* (Misdaq, 2006, p. 98-99).

September 11 attacks against the US is the most important factor that forced the U. S. to involve and act in Afghanistan. The political and military position of the U.S after these attacks formed the basis of the relations of these two countries. The claimed purpose of the US policy towards Afghanistan was to establish government and eliminate the terrorism for their national security and national interest. For these purpose, it was especially aimed to eliminate the Taliban and ensure political stability in Afghanistan, renew the country, improve the capacities of security forces in Afghanistan, and ensure social integration. In this context, the first Strategic Partnership Agreement was signed between the two countries in 2005 (Rashid, 2008, p. 103).

The US set two main strategic goals for Afghanistan when it started its operation and tried to act on the axis of these strategic goals during the George W. Bush administration. These were the elimination of the Taliban administration in Afghanistan provided a safe zone for Al-Qaeda, and the stabilization of the region until the establishment of a legitimate Afghan government. In time, the US widened these strategic objectives. In this context, the strategy implemented by the US and NATO between 2002 and 2009 was to make economic aid, provide security, training of Afghanistan army, and rehabilitation of military and provide the stability in the country, carry out anti-smuggling activities, and carry out anti-terrorism operations against Taliban elements and Al Qaeda terrorists (Bowman and Dale, 2011, p. 125-127).

The settlement of US in Afghanistan deeply affected the geopolitics of Central Asia. In 2005, the United States aimed to develop its relations with Central Asia and South Asia. It was aimed to establish new ties in trade, transport, democracy, energy and communications.

Silk Road project and Trans-Afghan Natural Gas Pipeline Project (TAPI) are important. It connects Central Asia and South - Asia Afghanistan including Pakistan and India, and delivers it to the Indian Ocean. This line is the modern Silk Road Project, which will be an important factor to end civil war in Afghanistan, as well as reconciliation between Afghanistan and Pakistan and Pakistan and India. The most important obstacle of this project, which will provide regional development and welfare when considered in a comprehensive way, is the complexity and difficulty of the problems to solved.

While describing the role of the US in the Silk Road strategy, the US Foreign Ministry noted that the strategy could provide Afghanistan the opportunity to link Afghanistan with new

markets, particularly Central Asia, Pakistan and India. He also noted that Silk Road Strategy could contribute to the investments the US would make in energy market, trade and transport (Cogan, 1993, p. 81-85).

To sum up, as it can be seen that the US conjectural behavior in relation to Afghanistan in the Cold War era and the SU-oriented approach shows that there was not an old relation between US and Afghanistan. In the post-Cold War period and especially in the Taliban era, the US and Afghanistan relations was set up on the axis of struggle against terrorism. Therefore, it is evident that while the US intervened in Afghanistan, its narrow and limited strategy developed over time. The strategic goal of ending the Taliban regime and fighting against terrorism has transformed into a strategic program that can summarized as the US benefits of the geo-strategic position of Afghanistan for its national interests and security.

4.2. Afghanistan Policies of George W. Bush's Administration

The September 11 attacks against the US was the main reason of intervention to Afghanistan. As a result of the September 11 attacks, Afghanistan became the United States' strategic forefront. It was the result of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, which the George W. Bush administration decided to develop a new national policy and strategy for Afghanistan. Due to the uncertainty and softening in the international system, there have been significant improvements in inter-state relations. Following the 9/11 attacks the main actors of the international system, had to determine new foreign policy orientations, roles, objectives, approaches and strategies. Even international and regional organizations such as the UN and NATO forced to make new job descriptions and forced to adapt their current structure to changing conditions. Throughout the 1990s, not only American scholars but also the US ministers, who were in theoretical discussions about the structure of the international system, identified new foreign policy objectives, priorities and methods of action, along with the new role of the countries (Woodward, 2002, p. 337).

President George W. Bush was the first who carried out the theoretical findings of realism after the September 11 attacks. President George W. Bush and the Neo Conservatives, made military intervention in 2002 in Afghanistan, then on 2003 in Iraq immediately after the attacks on the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001, based on the New National Security Document,

announced in 2002. These operations carried out with the slogan "Bringing Freedom and Democracy".

Morgenthau's sixth principle of his realism states that:
"The difference, then, between political realism and other schools of thought is real, and it is profound." "...the political realist maintains the autonomy of the political sphere." "He thinks in terms of interest defined as power."
This statement demonstrates how President George W. Bush utilized the moralistic sphere of international support and invoked the legalistic sphere from the United Nations, NATO and US Congressional authorization for the use of force against Al Qaeda to protect US national interests within Afghanistan following the September 11 attacks against the US George W. Bush speech on Afghanistan also support the statement of Morgenthau.

George W. Bush said that

> *On my orders the United States military has begun strikes against al Qaeda terrorist training camps and military installations of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. These carefully targeted actions are designed to disrupt the use of Afghanistan as a terrorist base of operations, and to attack the military capability of the Taliban regime. We are joined in this operation by our staunch friend, Great Britain. Other close friends, including Canada, Australia, Germany and France, have pledged forces as the operation unfolds. More than 40 countries in the Middle East, Africa, Europe and across Asia have granted air transit or landing rights. Many more have shared intelligence. We are supported by the collective will of the world. Today we focus on Afghanistan, but the battle is broader. Every nation has a choice to make. In this conflict, there is no neutral ground. If any government sponsors the outlaws and killers of innocents, they have become outlaws and murderers, themselves. And they will take that lonely path at their own peril.*

Before explaining the details of the George W. Bush policies on Afghanistan, it will be necessary to mention about Clinton's foreign policy. Because George W. Bush foreign policy has some common points with Clinton's foreign policy (Bergen, 2011, p.17).

The Clinton Administration identified itself as ready to play the roles of "Defender of the Democracy", "Catalyst in the Restructuring of the International System" and "Global Leader" for its strength and uphold democracy, free market, human rights, and prevention of the spread of weapons of mass destruction as their foreign policy basics. In this context, the US administration had mainly identified four long-term foreign policy objectives. These were; The emergence of free market economies and countries adopting democracy, to deter international terrorism, to eliminate factors that threaten American national security and international peace and security, to establish a new world trade and finance system. In order to achieve its long-term foreign policy objectives, the Clinton Administration adopted following foreign policy actions (Rubin and Rashid, 2008, p. 35-39):

- To support democratic movements in order to spread democratic understanding throughout the world.
- To condemn the countries to loneliness that support terrorist organizations in the framework of combating international terrorism alone. For this purpose, multilateral, regional and bilateral co-operation channels would develop to support the formation of regional coordination units. In this context, the American administration took the lead in the establishment of Conference on Fighting Terrorism in Central Asia, The United States -India Anti-Terrorism Working Group, and the establishment of the Counter Terrorism Center of the Commonwealth of Independent States.
- To accelerate multilateral and bilateral initiatives in the area of international security and weapons control, launching a National Missile Defense System, reducing the number of nuclear weapons, and establishing international legal regulations on the sale of weapons aimed. For this purpose, the American administration supported the disarmament initiatives.

Regarding the restructuring of the world economy, Clinton Administration supported to carry out the World Trade Organization. As a result, the Clinton administration adopted "multilateralism" as a basic foreign policy strategy in order to carry out its long-term foreign policy goals. That is why the Clinton administration gave importance to the support of international and regional organizations while interfering to Bosnia, Kosovo and Somalia. The US largely devoted to diplomatic instruments, bilateral and multilateral political relations and multilateral military/diplomatic initiatives rather than using unilateral military intervention options. As for Clinton’s Afghanistan policy, The Clinton Administration began meetings with

the Taliban in 1994, after taking Qandahar, and continued to take part in the region (Türkmen, 2005, p. 159-165).

Mullah Muhammad Omar, leader of the Afghan Taliban movement, seemingly had a political and individual tie with Al-Qaeda leader Osama Bin Laden, who moved to Afghanistan from Sudan in May 1996, and declined the US demands to hand over him. In April 1998, a small US delegation headed to Afghanistan with US Ambassador Bill Richardson, but the group did not meet with Mullah Omar or persuaded the Taliban to hand over Bin Laden. Following the bombing of Al Qaeda's US delegations in Kenya and Tanzania on 7 August 1998, the Clinton administration enlarged its pressure on the Taliban by imposing US sanctions on Afghanistan, controlled by the Taliban and by adopting some U.N. sanctions. On August 20, 1998, the United States launched cruise missiles in al-Qaeda training camps in Eastern Afghanistan (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2006, p. 35-38).

There is a great amount of literature on George W. Bush administration on Afghanistan. George W. Bush spent eight years at the White House. Therefore, many researchers had time to assess his policy. They researched his war policy in Afghanistan and largely his war policy in Iraq. The National Security Document, announced by the George W. Bush Administration in 2002, was in fact a reversal to the policies of the administration of Bill Clinton, but with one difference. That difference was that while Clinton was prioritizing multilateralism / multilateral intervention, George W. Bush and the New Conservatives saw the concepts of unilateralism and pre-emptive strike as foreign policy instruments. In keeping with his new political conception, the George W. Bush administration, which took action after the September 11 attacks on the US, did not carry out its foreign policy goals. On the contrary, it caused trouble in the international system. For this reason, the George W. Bush administration cooperated with other states for their national interest (Türkmen, 2005, p. 161-162).

George W. Bush revealed the great Middle East Project after the September 11 attacks. Under this project, President George W. Bush claimed that he would bring democracy, freedom and peace to the countries of the great Middle East. In this context, while the US interfered in Iraq's internal affairs, it encouraged political reforms in the Middle East countries. The Greater Middle East Initiative (GMEI) for "democratization" is not about increasing freedom and democracy for people in the region but about increasing freedom for Western capital and

ensuring continued US political control of the region. Military force, along with other US foreign policy instruments under occupation, continues to be employed to secure the resources of Iraq for US global hegemony and corporate profits. Since maintaining economic and political control over the entire Middle East through military force would prove too costly, taking control through clandestine political and economic control, under the rubric of a "democracy initiative," is to be pursued in cooperation with the European Union. The institutions for such control, through a partnership between US Government, private US capital, US corporations operating in the region, and local comprador elites, have been in place for some time, as pioneered in US economic and political control in Latin America. The great Middle East Project covered all Middle Eastern and Central Asian republics. Integration with the international system, the removal of threats arising from this region in terms of global system, ensuring economic development in the countries of the region were the main objectives of great Middle East Project (Girdner, 200, p. 25-28).

After the terrorist attacks of 9/11, the George W. Bush administration prepared and announced a new national strategy to fight against global terrorism, the terrorist organization Al Qaeda. On the evening of 11 September 2001 in National Security Council (NSC), President George W. Bush, in his address to the nation stated, *"We make no distinctions between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them"* (Renshon, 2013, p.1). In the second NSC meeting on 12 September, President George W. Bush outlined the goals and objectives of the forthcoming campaign, which went beyond Al Qaeda to recommend the *"elimination of terrorism as a threat to our way of life"* (Bowman, 2010, p. 11). At this point, the US needed to develop a strategy that would integrate all instrument of power, diplomatic, economic, and military to achieve the objectives. In the NSC meeting, President George W. Bush focused on Pakistan, and specific demands were the offered to the president of Pakistan as below:

- Stopping Al Qaeda operatives from Pakistan border, intercept arms shipments through Pakistan and end all logistical support for Laden,
- Accessing to Pakistan, naval bases, air bases and borders,
- Having immediate intelligence and immigration information,
- Condemning the 9/11 attacks and curbing all domestic expressions of support for terrorism against the US and its allies (Bowman, 2010, p. 25-28).

The embassy of Pakistan in Washington DC replied swiftly. Pakistan agreed to the US requests, and the embassy delivered president Musharraf's message that *"Pakistan would need full US support*." Secretary of State Powell described Pakistan's response in NSC meeting on 13 September. The following day, State Department presented a paper to the White House titled *"Game Plan for a Political-Military Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan."* It also contained precise US demands for the Taliban. On September 15-16 2001, President George W. Bush and his administration's national security team at Camp David discussed and finalized the intelligence, diplomatic and military plans for Afghanistan. The director of CIA George Tenet briefed execution of covert assistance to the warlords who would fight against Al Qaeda. Secretary of Defense described a military plan to destroy Al- Qaeda training camps and Taliban regime's installations in Afghanistan (Douglas, 2008, p.62-63). Moreover, after final discussions with National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice, on 20 September, President George W. Bush in the Congress of the United States announced his administration's new strategy and policies to towards global terrorism, the terrorist organization Al Qaeda, and for the country of Afghanistan. President George W. Bush with uncertain terms explained the new policy of the US that *"every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make either you are with us, or you with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime."* This new policy and recent statements by President George W. Bush described as the George W. Bush Doctrine (Woodward, 2002, p. 341).

On 7 October 2001, President George W. Bush in a global televised statement from the White House commenced the war in Afghanistan: *"on my orders, and the United States military has begun strikes."* President George W. Bush ordered military strikes on Taliban installations in Afghanistan. President George W. Bush stated, "*These carefully targeted actions are designed to disrupt the use of Afghanistan as a terrorist base of operations and to attack the military capability of the Taliban regime. The military campaign of the United States quickly defeated the Taliban regime."* In November 2001, the Taliban escaped from Kabul, and in December, they left their stronghold, the southern city of Kandahar (Douglas, 2008, p.60).

Nevertheless, President George W. Bush could not achieve the desired result. On the contrary, unexpected developments such as increased competition between the Great Powers, the issue of Democratization and the Concern for the Civil War, and the inadequacy of military methods in the Struggle for Terrorism emerged (Katzman, 2013, p. 6).

George W. Bush Administration's policy on Afghanistan prior to September 11 attacks was mainly sustained the existing policy of implementing economic and political force on the Taliban while holding some dialogue with it. Before 9/11 attacks, Administration supported anti-Taliban Pashtuns. In line with U.N. Security Council Resolution 1333, in February 2001 the State Department closed Taliban representative office in New York. However, a Taliban representative officer continued to function informally in the New York area. As there were prevalent, claims that Pakistani military advisers were serving Taliban, in March 2001, administration officials received a Taliban diplomat to debate bilateral issues, and the Administration accelerated meetings with Pakistan to reduce its aid to the Taliban. Until 9/11 attacks, nearly 75% of the country was being controlled by the Taliban. The Northern Alliance experienced a major obstacle on September 9, 2001 (two days before 9/11 attacks, and probably linked to the September 11 attacks), when Ahmad Shah Masoud was murdered by Al Qaeda terrorists acting as journalists. A senior lieutenant, succeeded by Muhammad Fahim, an experienced veteran Tajik (Jentleson, 2004, p. 17-19).

Following the 9/11 attacks, the George W. Bush Administration decided to militarily takeover the Taliban when Afghanistan declined a US demand to extradite Bin Laden. President George W. Bush initiated a policy that regarded those who harbor terrorists would be regarded as terrorists, and declared that a friendly regime in Kabul was required to permit US forces to search for Al Qaeda members there (Lindslay, 2011, p. 766).

In accordance with the policy of multilateralism, President Clinton intervened in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia and Kosovo within the framework of United Nations Security Council and NATO resolutions, and appointed military personnel in operations. Some operations held in Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo, former Yugoslavia, Haiti and Iraq. While he preferred to establish diplomatic pressure within the United Nations on the North Korean and Iraqi governments, which he described as rogue states, he secretly had diplomatic contacts with Iran, especially with moderate leader Muhammad Khatami. In the Israeli-Palestinian affair, he supported diplomatic initiatives and the Oslo Peace Process. However, President George W. Bush left the multilateral approach in Afghanistan and Iraq interventions and began unilateral military interventions especially after the September 11 attacks. In this regard, first there was total military intervention in Afghanistan against the Taliban regime and Al Qaeda

terrorist organization. During this intervention, the international community and regional organizations supported the military operation against the Taliban regime and the Al Qaeda organization (Lindslay, 2011, p. 768-770).

Main battle in Afghanistan, defined as Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), started on October 7, 2001. The purpose of the United State was to initiate US air strikes on Taliban and Al Qaeda forces. The main goal of OEF operations was to assist the to the Northern Alliance and Pashtun anti-Taliban forces. In October 2001, nearly 1,300 Marines were deployed in Qandahar to suppress the Taliban. The Taliban regime unraveled after it lost Mazar-e-Sharif on November 9, 2001 to the forces, which headed by Dostam. Taliban government ended on December 9, 2001, when the Taliban and Mullah Umar escaped to Qandahar. Afterwards, the US and Afghan forces carried out “Operation Anaconda” in the Shah-i-Kot Valley during March 2-19, 2002. In March 2003, nearly 1,000 US troops invaded suspected Taliban or Al Qaeda troops in villages around Qandahar (Operation Valiant Strike). On May 1, 2003, US officials declared an end to “major combat” (Stanley, 2013, p. 15-18).

George W. Bush administration occupied two countries for so-called "security". The war-prone policy of White House led to reaction all over the world. The September 11 attack caused the United States to carry military operations in different parts of the world under the name of fighting against terrorism. Donald Rumsfeld, US Defense Secretary, explained the purpose of this operation to eliminate Al-Qaeda terrorist organizations and the Taliban regime that hosted the Al-Qaeda terrorist organization. They decided to combat against terrorism and deliver humanitarian aid in the area. The overthrown of the Taliban government in the short term considered a military achievement of the US. The US set two main strategic goals for Afghanistan when it started the operation and tried to act on the axis of these strategic goals during the George W. Bush administration. These goals were eliminating Taliban administration in Afghanistan, which provided a safe zone for al-Qaeda, and the stabilizing of the region until a legitimate Afghan government was established (Bowman and Dale, 2011, p. 86-90).

The long-term plan of the US in the region and the involvement of NATO in the process widened the strategic targets, which was defined economic assistance, security, education, equipment and arms support for the stability of the country. Aims of the US government in these strategies were to provide their own national security and preserving their national

interest. Security of the nuclear weapons that Pakistan and India possess, as well as the prevention of the spreading of radical elements were related to national security of the US Aims of the US government was to prevent Afghanistan, which was an exit gate of Central Asia and an energy, transport and trade bridge between South and Central Asia. (Giustozzi, 2010, p. 30).

According to Ra'ees, the George W. Bush administration attempted to undertake an effort similar to the historic Marshall Plan to rebuild Afghanistan. He also states that Afghanistan also became important for the US regional interests in the context of hegemony debates (Ra'ees, 2010, p. 83). The US military presence in Afghanistan in George W. Bush period could be seen as a strategic move to provide military and economic hegemony.

According to the Bonn Agreement, which was signed during the George W. Bush era, the temporary administration, established under the leadership of Hamid Karzai, consisted of 29 ministries, 11 of which were Pashtuns, 8 were Tajiks, 5 were Hazara, 3 were Uzbek, and 3 were other ethnic groups. According to the agreement, there were three important steps for political transformation in Afghanistan. The first step was the establishment of a 30 member interim administration, under the presidency of Hamid Karzai. The second one was the establishment of a commission of 21 people. The third one was the establishment of the Afghan Supreme Court and other courts, which were expected to prepare the new constitution by elections within 18 months after the provisional government was established (Nojumi, 2002, p. 105-107).

In the George W. Bush era, the Foreign Affairs Council's report on the US policy towards Afghanistan. Establishing a democratic Afghan state, securing the borders of the country, ensuring peace and eliminating terrorists, developing Afghanistan economy, revitalizing regional trade, protecting the rights of women and minorities, and preventing drug production and trade were claimed to be main goals of the George W. Bush administration. According to this report, the US priorities for Afghanistan were ensuring territorial integrity, establishing democratic government, and integrating Afghanistan to the world politics.

Economic relations between Afghanistan and the United States established in 2004. Trade and Investment Framework Agreement signed between the two countries. This agreement has also be seen as a sign of the long-term partnership of the two countries. The US intended to increase the trade capacity of Afghanistan and make it a member of the world trade. With the support of the United States, Afghanistan became a member of the World Trade Organization in 2016.

With the new relationship initiated by the George W. Bush era, the US exports to Afghanistan amounted to $ 721 million in 2016, compared with $ 150 million in 2004 (Lindsay, 2011, p. 777-778).

The National Security Strategy prepared by George W. Bush administration dating to September 17, 2002 became the major point of the George W. Bush doctrine. The George W. Bush doctrine recognized the US has been the only superpower. The doctrine argued that any state that has the potential to threaten the security of the United States and its allies could experience military intervention by the United States under "preventive wars and pre-emptive" attacks. (Bromley, 2007, p. 90-92).

The George W. Bush Doctrine contains various foreign policy principles, practical policy decisions and a set of rationales and ideas for guiding the US foreign policy of George W. Bush. Four key themes emphasized as the core to the George W. Bush Doctrine. These are Preemption, Military Primacy, New Multilateralism, and the Spread of Democracy. The document highlighted preemption, stating,

"America is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones. We are menaced less by fleets and armies than by catastrophic technologies in the hands of the embittered few," and required "defending the United States, the American people, and our interests at home and abroad by identifying and destroying the threat before it reaches our borders."

The most important principles in the doctrine are unilateralism and the use of preventive war. Following 9/11 attacks, the doctrine stated that US had the right to protect itself against any country which harbor or support terrorist groups. This doctrine also became associated with the George W. Bush administration's decision to invade Iraq in 2003. (Lindsay, 2011, p. 765-767).

President George W. Bush, in his early days in office, maintained the formal strategy of his predecessor against Afghanistan Taliban. However, the qualitative support of the US to the Taliban changed after September 11. Until then Afghanistan had become an unsuccessful state without effective security and distribution facilities. There was hardly any army, police, industry, administration and education in the country. To build an effective and democratic Afghan state that can succeed over terrorism and provide security, the ITFR (Independent Task Force Report) urged the George W. Bush Administration to implement following topics in the region: (Schmid and Williams, 2008, p. 205-209):

- supporting and strengthening President Hamid Karzai's and intensifying support for security, diplomatic and economic reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan,
- developing the Afghan National Army and the training the Afghan police force,
- ensuring financial contributions by the United States and the international community,
- Initiating a plan to remove, reorganize and reintegrate the regional militias or the remains of anti-Afghan Soviet resistance.

4.3. Afghanistan Policies of Barack Obama Adminstration

President Barack Obama administration revised Afghanistan policy in terms of the US interests. However, the Obama's Afghanistan Policy is not only a policy that is just for Afghanistan but also for Pakistan. This was because the administration realized that the stability in Afghanistan had inseparably connected to the developments in Pakistan. According to policy makers in Washington, the safe havens of extremists and Al- Qaeda in Pakistan is needed to end the war in the region and to reintegrate Afghanistan into the community of states. Therefore, Obama's Afghanistan Policy named as "Obama's AfPak Policy." AfPak policy was used to describe Afghanistan and Pakistan as a single theater of operations.

Barack Obama Administration introduced AfPak policy in 2008. According to AfPak policy, the US regarded Afghanistan and Pakistan regions having a single, dominant political and military situation that needed a common policy in the Anti-Terrorism (Transcript of Barack Obama speech on Afghanistan, 2009). AfPak policy was criticized by Pakistan for labeling Pakistan geopolitics with Afghanistan (Bukhari and Shah, 2008, p. 267). Therefore, the US abandoned its use in 2010. Nevertheless, in 2017 this new term again used in Donald Trump's foreign policy under the name of AfPakIndia.

In his speech on December 2 in 2009, President Barack Obama stated that their goal for Afghanistan remained the same. These goals were to disrupt, dismantle, and overthrow al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and to prevent its capacity to threaten America in the future. In the speech, he says:

> *To meet that goal, we will pursue the following objectives within Afghanistan. We must deny al Qaeda a safe haven. We must reverse the Taliban's momentum and deny it the ability to overthrow the government. In addition, we must strengthen the capacity of Afghanistan's security forces and government, so that they can take lead responsibility for Afghanistan's*

*future. We will meet these objectives in three ways. First, we will pursue a military strategy that will break the Taliban's momentum and increase Afghanistan's capacity over the next 18 months. Second, we will work with our partners, the United Nations, and the Afghan people to pursue a more effective civilian strategy, so that the government can take advantage of improved security. Third, we will act with the full recognition that our success in Afghanistan has inextricably linked to our partnership with Pakistan. We are in Afghanistan to prevent a cancer once again spreading through that country. However, this same cancer has also taken root in the border region of Pakistan. That is why we need a strategy that works on both sides of the border. (*Barack Obama speech on Afghanistan, December 2, 2009).

As it can be seen that a military struggle to create the status for a transformation, a noncombatant surge that strengthens positive action; and an efficient alliance and cooperation with Pakistan was three major strategies of Obama's administration.

Another important point in his speech is that President Barack Obama criticized those who claimed that Afghanistan is another Vietnam and cannot be stabilized. By stating that unlike Vietnam, US were joined by a wide coalition of 43 nations, which recognized the legitimacy of US action. He also stated that Al-Qaeda was not only a problem of US, but also an international security problem. Because the terrorist attacks in different parts of the world (London, Bali, North Africa, and Middle East) linked to Al-Qaeda and its allies in Pakistan (Transcript of Barack Obama speech on Afghanistan, 2009).

According to Ra'ees, the difference between George W. Bush and Obama' policy in terms of reaching the goals was that Barack Obama accepted it was necessary to focus on soft power to find a solution to the situation in Afghanistan for their goals. Soft power is defined by Viotti and Kauppi as *"the non-material capabilities such as reputation, culture and value appeal that can aid the attainment of a state's objectives."* (Viotti and Kauppi, 2013, p. 203) According to Obama, George W. Bush policies brought a deadlock in Afghanistan and The United States had to consolidate the power of the central government in order to get rid of this deadlock. Otherwise, terrorist groups might come back. This necessity in fact created a goal of ensuring US to remain in the politics of Afghanistan. In Obama's time, the United States gave itself a "stabilizing" role. At this point, Obama's policy differs from George W. Bush's Afghan politics (Ra'ees, 2010, p. 80).

According to Armitage and Berger, Barack Obama valued the civilian dimension more than the military dimension in Afghanistan when compared with George W. Bush. But they also state that this value was not enough and claim that Barack Obama need have increased the number of local experts in Afghanistan that would increase civilian capacity; especially institutions that would establish basic infrastructures at local level and help develop systems. International organizations and non-governmental organizations, particularly the UN, should have encouraged Afghanistan to participate more actively in the process of reforming and making needed reforms. In addition, economic assistance for Afghanistan should provide under the headings of direct budget support, development assistance, infrastructure investments and technical assistance (Armitage and Berger, 2010, p. 43).

Another important point in Obama's policy regarding Afghanistan is that President Barack Obama and Karzai signed a Strategic Partnership Agreement" (SPA) on May 1, 2012. This agreement, which ends at the end of 2024, indicated an extensive US engagement to Afghan security, particularly in financial and administrative assistance, economic and social development, institutionalization and regional cooperation. This agreement tied to certain legal bases. The purposes of this agreement stated as (Ra'ees, 2010, p. 90-93):

- A commitment to foster US-Afghan "close cooperation" for ensuring the security of Afghanistan. This indicated that US troops would stay in Afghanistan after 2014,
- US commitment to ensure training and arms to the Afghan defense forces,
- A US commitment not to set up "permanent" US bases or use Afghan facilities against neighboring countries,
- A US pledge to request economic assistance for Afghanistan for the period of the agreement (2014-2024),
- A commitment to generate a US-Afghanistan Bilateral Commission to observe implementation of this agreement.

This agreement substituted an earlier, and limited strategic partnership agreement set on May 23, 2005, when Karzai and President George W. Bush issued a "joint declaration." The declaration ensured US forces to have admission to Afghan military services, to prosecute the war against international terror and the struggle against violent extremism. (Bukhari and Shah, 2008, p. 269-272).

The conditions for the development of Afghanistan-US relations were set after the US withdrawal. Even though Barack Obama claimed that, the agreement would be the beginning of "an equal partnership between the two independent states", the conditions of this agreement explicitly imposed by the US on "puppet" governance in Kabul (Katzman, 2013, p. 19-21). It also claimed that this agreement would make Afghanistan economically and militarily entirely dependent on Washington (Cutler, 2017, p. 59).

Afghanistan, which has bordered by Pakistan, China, Iran and three of the Central Asian republics (Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan) is at the crossroads connecting Central Asia and South Asia, Western China and East Iran. All the routes from Central Asia to South Asia go through Afghanistan. From this geographical reality, the US, which wanted to bring about a post-Taliban Afghanistan administration and a reliable ally that can stand by itself by strengthening this administration, began to make policies for making Afghanistan a center of regional trade. Especially since 2006, many different projects regarding the establishment of transport infrastructure in Afghanistan and neighboring countries in Afghanistan came to the agenda (Nojumi, 2002, p. 41).

In Obama's Period, to stabilize Afghanistan, some important projects established in order to achieve the disrupted economic balance in the country. For example, US and China developed visions for revitalizing ancient trade routes, which called as New Silk Road Project that connects Asia to Europe. The Great Central Asian initiative that putted into effect by the United States played an important role in this movement in Afghanistan and its neighbors. This process described as the building of the missing ring on the Modern Silk Road, which will bring security and prosperity to the Eurasian continent. In this project China, Russia and United Sates had the most important role. The US strategy focused on Afghanistan's economic and infrastructure integration with the hopes to support political stability as it withdrew from Afghanistan.
During the 2014 State of the Union Address, President Barack Obama stated:

"After 2014, we will support a unified Afghanistan as it takes responsibility for its own future. . .... a small force of Americans could remain in Afghanistan with NATO allies to carry out two narrow missions: training and assisting Afghan forces, and counterterrorism operations to pursue any remnants of al Qaeda."

From US perspective, this declaration would inform US policy and the new security relation with Afghanistan. From Afghanistan perspective, the change of the presidency from Hamid

Karzai to one of the two final candidates (Ashraf Ghani Ahmadzai or Abdullah Abdullah) would define the new relationship (Lindsay, 2014, p.26-28).

Barack Obama administration's strategy based on three pillars. The first one was to pursue a military strategy that would break the Taliban's momentum and increase the Afghans' capacity. Second strategy was to work with the US partners, the UN, and the Afghan people should pursue a more effective civilian strategy, so that the government could take advantage of improved security. Third strategy was to act with full recognition that the US success in Afghanistan linked to the partnership with Pakistan (Clinton, 2011, p. 58).

In his strategic speech "A New Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan", President Barack Obama stated that:

> *The situation is increasingly perilous. It's been more than seven years since the Taliban was removed from power, yet war rages on, and insurgents control parts of Afghanistan and Pakistan. Attacks against our troops, our NATO allies, and the Afghan government have risen steadily. And most painfully, 2008 was the deadliest year of the war for American forces* (Obama, "A New Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan".)

In his speech, he emphasized on the seriousness of the threat to American interests, and their allies, in Afghanistan.

> *"Al-Qaeda and its allies – the terrorists who planned and supported the 9/11 attacks – are in Pakistan and Afghanistan. Multiple intelligence estimates have warned that al Qaeda is actively planning attacks on the United States homeland from its safe haven in Pakistan. And if the Afghan government falls to the Taliban – or allows al Qaeda to go unchallenged – that country will again be a base for terrorists who want to kill as many of our people as they possibly can."*

This statement of Obama, matching the principle of Hans J Morgenthau's realist theory. Obama, in his statement, points out that Afghanistan threat is not only to the national interests of the United States, but also to the interests of their allies and partner nations, when he additionally stated:

> *"…this is not simply an American problem—far from it. It is, instead an international security challenge of the highest order[t]he safety of people around the world is at stake.*

In March of 2009, many states in the world questioned what the U. S.' purpose in Afghanistan was. Obama, as a response, answered with a realistic point of view that *"We are in Afghanistan to confront a common enemy that threatens the United States, our friends, and our allies…."* Within this declaration, Barack Obama pointed out their national purpose and identified the fact that the threat in Afghanistan was their major national interests, as well as to their allies. Obama's this declarations leads directly back to Hans J. Morgenthau's realist theory of international politics, *"[t]he main signpost that helps political realism to find its way through the landscape of international politics is the concept of interest defined in terms of power."* (Morgenthau, 2005, p. 15)

4.4. Afghanistan Policies of Donald Trump Adminstration

President Donald Trump who come to power in 20th January 2017, rejected complete withdrawal of the US forces from Afghanistan or the transfer of Afghanistan's mission to fully private war companies, Donald Trump thus virtually embraced America's longest-running war in Afghanistan. When Donald Trump assessed the problems that President Barack Obama had before him, he had a similar result: more training and support had given to Afghan forces to eliminate Taliban. However, Donald Trump tried to present his policy as a fresh start. Donald Trump pointed out that that the US troops would stay in Afghanistan for a long time. There are five key points in Donald Trump's Afghanistan policy. These are troop level, more military autonomy, and political dialogues, more focus on India rather than Pakistan and winning (Tourangbam, 2017, p. 6).

The President announced that he would no longer announce troop levels but would focus on the US forces to target the Taliban and other terrorist groups wherever they were in Afghanistan. Thus military autonomy, Donald Trump's most important military change was to relax US authorities to withstand the Taliban and other groups in Afghanistan. He also stated that the Barack Obama administration put limits on the US operations in Afghanistan after the Afghan forces took the lead on fighting the Taliban, which was a move that frequently frustrated commanders in the region. He also added, *"Micromanagement from Washington, DC, does not win battles."* Therefore, he gave military commanders the authority to act in real time and expand the authorities for the US armed forces to target terrorists and criminal networks in Afghanistan. The last goal of Donald Trump's plan in Afghanistan was to force the Taliban to

negotiate and to find a political solution to the Afghanistan war. The purpose was the same as President Barack Obama's, but Donald Trump stated that his plan had an important difference form his predecessor. This difference was that no timelines on the withdrawal of the US troops. While Donald Trump mentioned about a political solution, he at the same time expressed skepticism whether the Taliban would come to the negotiating table (Tourangbam, 2017, p. 5-6).

Donald Trump announced that there are three fundamental US core interests in Afghanistan. The first one is to seek an honorable, enduring and functional outcome of the US involvement in Afghanistan. The second one is that the consequences of the withdrawal of American forces from Afghanistan are both unacceptable and unpredictable because America has already experienced the worst terrorist attack in its history, which plotted and staffed by Afghanistan. Donald Trump pointed out that a withdrawal of US troops from Iraq created a vacuum, which instantly filled by terrorists like Al-Qaeda and ISIS. He also claimed that the US would not repeat in Afghanistan. Third, the final core interest is the security threat that comes from Afghanistan and the region. Currently, there are 20 US-identified terrorist organizations active in Afghanistan and Pakistan – the highest concentration of terrorists anywhere in the world (Tellis and Eggers, 2017, p. 13-15).

In Obama’s era, Barack Obama gave great importance to Pakistan and his Afghanistan strategy was AfPak policy. However, in the Donald Trump administration, Obama's AfPak strategy has replaced with Donald Trump’s AfPakIndia. According to Donald Trump, Pakistan's role in ensuring a safe harbor for Taliban and Al-Qaeda was often a thorn in the side of the U.S military. For this reason, Donald Trump threated to cut off the US support to Pakistan. Donald Trump mentioned India’s importance and its significant role in stabilizing Afghanistan. Donald Trump stated that the US appreciate India’s important contributions to stability in Afghanistan and India also has been making billions of dollars in trade with the United States, and wanted them to help the US more with Afghanistan, particularly in the area of economic support and development. That is why Obama's AfPak strategy replaced by Donald Trump's AfPakIndia strategy. Another important point in Donald Trump's strategy on Afghanistan is that during Obama’s time, Barack Obama tried to end up the military intervention in Afghanistan and aimed to bring troops back to the US Nevertheless, Donald Trump did not intend to bring the troops back to the US He intended a comprehensive victory in the region. He also stated that the US would no longer use its military to build democracies or to reconstruct other countries,

which are far away from their lands. Therefore, he implied that the US was not in "nation-building again" position in Afghanistan. In this context, Donald Trump's strategies differ from Obama's strategies (Tourangbam, 2017, p. 7-8).

Donald Trump has been the third the U.S president since the September 11 attacks against the US Since the September 11 attacks against the US three presidents was elected in the US and each of them introduced his strategy for resolving the conflict in Afghanistan. After all oppositions to the war in Afghanistan, the President of the US Donald Trump, announced in Fort Mayer, Virginia that his administration's strategy for Afghanistan on 21 August 2017 as follow:

> *"now the most protracted war in the history of United States…..Attacking our enemies, obliterating ISIS, crushing Al-Qaeda, preventing the Taliban from taking over Afghanistan, and stopping mass terror attacks against America before they emerge,"* (Jalali, 2017, p. 23-25).

However, on 21 August 2017, Donald Trump put forward a long-awaited strategy for resolving the conflict in Afghanistan. Donald Trump, instead of announcing a gradual withdrawal of troops or ending the war, ordered the deployment of additional American troops and committed the US to an open-ended war that he vowed to fight to win. He announced that American strategy in Afghanistan and South Asia would change dramatically as follows (Jalali, 2017, p. 35-39):

- A shift from a time-based approach to one based on conditions,
- Putting Pakistan under pressure, as he stated, "We can no longer be silent about Pakistan's safe havens for terrorist organizations, the Taliban, and other groups that pose a threat to the region and beyond,
- The US will develop its strategic partnership with India, and want them to help the US with Afghanistan in areas of economic assistance and development,
- Lifting restrictions that prevented the Secretary of Defense and commanders in the field from fully waging battle against the terrorist militants, by providing the necessary tools and rules of engagement. "This principled realism will guide our decisions moving forward.

4.5. Evaluation of Afghanistan Policies of the US after 9/11 Event

Terrorism is related the concept of security. The US President's policies to struggle with terrorism can be evaluated together with their national and international security policies. As a result of attacks on September 11/ 2001, realist policies gained importance once more. Former US President Bill Clinton's foreign policy approach, which based on liberal basis such as strategic partnership, multilateral cooperation, globalization, etc. adopted during the presidency, has abandoned. Instead of these policies and strategies, the new conservative ideology based on the preventive war came to the fore. In this context, an axis shift occurred in the main agenda of both the US and international policies. Moreover the agenda of world politics shifted from cooperation into security and military issue (Arıboğan, 2008, p. 314).

The concept of "preventive war", which was introduced by George W. Bush in the intervention in Afghanistan, was quite effective. According to the concept of preventive war, it has argued that the US has the right to self-defense by conducting pre-emptive warfare to protect its national security and national values and in this context; it can conduct military intervention in Afghanistan. Because of the operation, on December 28, US-led NATO forces took control over Afghanistan. The capital city of Kabul occupied. Subsequently, the Taliban forces fled from Kabul and a provisional government had formed under the presidency of Hamid Karzai. (Halatci, 2006, p. 85).

The reactions of the US towards global terrorism after September 11 can be handled within three periods. The first period was between 2001 and 2006. In this period, George W. Bush declared war on terrorism and gave the whole world the message *"you are either with us or against us."* The second period was the period in which president Barack Obama was in search of cooperation and partnership on global terrorism and international security after the occupation of Iraq. During Obama's presidency, the US declared that it cannot solve the global problems alone and needed international cooperation. (Özeren, Cinoğlu and Sever, 2010, p. 7). In the third period, Donald Trump focused on ‘peace through strength’ instead of Obama’s ‘soft power’ approach.

As a result of the 9/11 attacks that took place at the beginning of the George W. Bush era, war against terrorism became President George W. Bush main foreign policy. In this respect, all states that support terrorism were seen as potential threats. In this context George W. Bush,

who saw himself as the protector of humanity in the name of the United States declared within the framework of the preventive war doctrine that the United States can initiate military intervention anywhere in the world against groups or countries which have the potential to support terrorism. As a result, operations against Afghanistan and Iraq were carried out (Hook and Spanier, 2014, p.18).

In the context of the George W. Bush Doctrine, which underwent a major transformation process in the context of international politics, international law and international security, the following issues were discussed on foreign policy and global terrorism (Hurmi, 2010, p. 62-65):

- Military intervention will be made against enemy states and terrorists who want to have weapons of mass destruction.
- Strategically, any foreign power cannot compete with America's military power.
- According to the US strategy, although it is a party to multilateral international cooperation, it will not hesitate to act unilaterally to protect its own security and national interests.
- Democracy and human rights, especially in Muslim countries, will spread throughout the world.

The principal strategic steps of President George W. Bush's first-term security and counter-terrorism policy covering 2001-2006 were as follows:

- Military intervention in Afghanistan,
- Military intervention in Iraq,
- Trying to make NATO more effective within the scope of the fight against terrorism,
- Giving more emphasis on terrorism and counter-terrorism issues in bilateral and multilateral formations,
- Focusing on initiatives to be made at the UN level regarding the financing of terrorism,
- Cooperating with international community in their fight against terrorism,
- Implementing security measures on air transport security especially with the support of the member states of the European Union.

Comparing George W Bush with Barack Obama has given importance to democracy, human rights, and cooperation. (Kocakenar, 2015, p. 10). Barack Obama attached great importance to

the use of "soft power" elements in his foreign policy approach. He demonstrated policies to correct the deteriorated US image under the George W. Bush administration and negative international views against the United States.

Obama's approach to foreign policy differs significantly with the George W. Bush era policies and approaches. Barack Obama criticized George W. Bush's intervention in Iraq through a unilateral foreign policy approach and emphasized multilateralism, alliance and cooperation in international relations. Barack Obama in this direction made remarks on the importance of alliance and cooperation in international relations and security issues with powers such as Russia, China, Japan and the EU. The economic impact of the global financial crisis that started in 2008 and the increasing cost of US invasion in Iraq and the widespread use of anti-US rhetoric in the world caused Barack Obama to pursue a consensual political approach in foreign policy. (Kocakenar, 2015, pp.10). Accordingly, during the election period, Barack Obama emphasized that he would make various reforms regarding the operations carried out during the George W. Bush period in Afghanistan and Iraq. He pointed out that he would follow a different strategy on Iran and North Korea, which seen as a threat. Barack Obama also declared that dialogue and public diplomacy would be his priority in conducting foreign policy (Krey, 2009).

Unlike George W. Bush, Barack Obama dealt with the effects of the US-based global economic crisis following his position as president. In his foreign policy, he pursued a strategy based on more idealistic and soft power elements than George W. Bush did. Obama's main agenda items were the issues of terrorism, extremism and the fight against radicalism. Rather than fighting terrorism directly with military power, he favored logistics and financial assistance to those who fight against terrorism to support countries suffering from terrorism. The unilateral, dominant and harsh policies of the George W. Bush era abandoned in order to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to fight against global terrorism. During the Barack Obama period, multilateral and soft power policies implemented in the framework of cooperation, alliance and common struggle principles on the fight against weapons of mass destruction and global terrorism. Barack Obama withdrew US troops from the region to avoid costs of military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq during the George W. Bush period and tried to reconcile nuclear power with Iran via diplomacy, which has seen as a potential threat in the George W. Bush period (Hurmi, 2010, p. 72-73).

Barack Obama, successor of George W. Bush by 2009, prepared himself for reorganization of US' "destroyed image" in the world as his primary act and took over the Presidency as a

reformist. He pursued a strategy based on more idealistic and soft power elements than George W. Bush did. Obama's main agenda items were the issues of terrorism, extremism and the fight against radicalism. The unilateral, dominant and harsh policies of the George W. Bush era had abandoned in order to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to fight against global terrorism. During the Barack Obama period, multilateral and soft power policies implemented in the framework of cooperation, alliance and common struggle principles on the fight against weapons of mass destruction and global terrorism.

Compared to George W. Bush, Barack Obama was more moderate in democracy, human rights, mutual interaction and cooperation. (Kocakenar, 2015, p. 10). Barack Obama attached great importance to the use of "soft power" elements in his foreign policy approach. He demonstrated policies to correct the deteriorated US image under the George W. Bush administration and negative international views against the United States.

Barack Obama emphasized the importance of the transition from geopolitical vision to geo-economic vision. He pointed out that the multi-dimensional diplomatic pressure and economic sanctions policies would gain weight. The costs of Iraq and Afghanistan operations to the US were considerably higher than the calculated. He emphasized that because of the global financial crisis since 2008, the US economic system's ability to meet the costs of these military interventions decreased (Kandemir, 2011, p. 125).

In May 2010, the US National Security Strategy announced by President Barack Obama. In this strategy document the need to increase international alliances of the US in the fight against global terrorism, the need to adopt a multilateral foreign policy rather than a one-sided foreign policy, and the importance of meeting with the leaders of the countries, which were against United States, were emphasized. The main objective of Obama's foreign policy approach was to establish good relations with the allies. Within the framework of the Barack Obama Doctrine, the US military force in Afghanistan allowed to remain there as long as the international community permits, and the military force in Iraq has to withdraw as soon as possible. (Göngen, 2014, p. 5-7).

During his presidency, Barack Obama established close relations with Iran, which George W. Bush declared as an enemy and regarded it as a threat to terrorism. Within the framework of this relation, it aimed to provide political stability in Iraq and Afghanistan, and to support Iran in the fight against Al Qaeda and ISIS. (Hurmi, 2010, p. 66).

Barack Obama has tried to prevent radical terrorist activities by forming alliances and collaborations in the fight against the al-Qaeda terrorist organization in Afghanistan (Jones, 2010). In addition, to strengthen the struggle in Afghanistan, Barack Obama established new strategies for defense, diplomacy and development and decided to implement strategies to support Afghanistan and Pakistan through foreign aid (Hurmi, 2010, p. 69).

Donald Trump's Afghanistan strategy was the shift from a time-based approach to one based on conditions. Donald Trump stated that, "Conditions on the ground—not arbitrary timetables—would guide their strategy. The second important point of Donald Trump's Afghanistan Strategy was the "integration of all instruments of American power—diplomatic, economic, and military—toward a successful outcome". With this statement, he actually implied that talks with the Taliban was on the table. However, Donald Trump gave priority to supporting the Afghanistan government. Donald Trump stated that the US is not in Afghanistan for "nation-building". With this statement, he implied that Washington would not be micromanaging the policy for Afghanistan and would instead be acting 'just as a facilitator'. This meant that the focus was on 'defeating the Taliban' to enable Afghan government to govern peacefully. The indication that the US would have support Afghan government in its fight against the Taliban. It could be stated that new era has begun with Donald Trump. (Grevi, 2015, p. 18).

5. CONCLUSION

The history of Afghanistan overall defined as the history of invasions. Afghanistan, which is considered as the heart of Asia, has been the scene of attempts of invasions from all over the world, not only today but also throughout the history, because of its geographical location. Afghanistan is located at the crossroads between Central and South Asia, the Middle East and the Caucasus. Afghanistan is geographically, historically, culturally and strategically a key country in Central Asia. Its position being in intersection point between Iran-Arab Sea -India and Central Asia - South Asia has given this country great importance throughout history. It has borders with many strategically important countries such as Iran in the west, Pakistan in the east, China in the northeast, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan in the north, and Tajikistan in the northeast. All these countries have many natural resources that are important for the entire world. Afghanistan is a gateway for these countries to export their natural resources to the world. Afghanistan also have natural resources but because of terrorism, Afghanistan can neither use and nor trade these natural resources effectively.

Terrorism is the main problem of all the countries in the world. Today in many parts of the world, terrorist attacks are causing great sorrow not only in the target country but also in other countries because the terrorist attacks result in many innocent people's deaths. It also causes countries to suffer great economic, social and cultural destructions. The military defense systems that the countries are taking to prevent terrorist attacks and the destruction caused by terrorist attacks are damaging economic development of countries. Socially, migrations, psychological pressure and cultural destructions resulting from weakening of human communication, destroys trust in society.

The most significant terrorist group in the Middle East is Al-Qaeda, which was established on 11.10.1988. Al-Qaeda was established at a meeting attended by Osama Bin Laden, Zawahiri and Dr Fadl in Peshawar, Pakistan. This terrorist organization carried out many terrorist attacks throughout the world. The most important of these attacks are the September 11 2001 attacks against the U.S, which killed many innocent people.

After the terrorist attacks on the US on September 11, 2001, many States faced with terrorist acts, the attacks took place successively in different parts of the world. For example, in 2002, in Tunisia, Pakistan, Indonesia and Kenya; In 2003 in Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Indonesia and

Iraq, then in November 15th and 20th 2003 in Istanbul for two synagogues, the British Embassy and the HSBC bank. These all events proved that global terrorism threat all states. The terrorist attack of September 11 against the US was the main cause of the US intervention in Afghanistan. Hence, the US regarded as the superpower of the world, changed its whole politics that effected and still affects the politics of the whole world, especially the Middle East. The George W. Bush administration occupied two countries (Afghanistan and Iraq) for so-called "security". The war-prone policy of White House led to reaction all over the world.

The security relation between the US and Afghanistan has undergone important variations over the years. The domestic matters of both countries have shaped their new relationship, as well as regional issues within and between the key neighbors of Afghanistan. Today, the United States plays the dominant role in the region, but a rising China, emerging India, active Pakistan, reemerging Russia, troubled Iran, and all other regional players are actively engaged in Afghanistan, as well as multilateral and non-governmental organizations. While not all of these countries and the outside actors have divergent interests, Afghanistan has become a playing field in a multipolar struggle between regional and great powers.

The US intervention in Afghanistan was a turning point for the future of Central Asia. Attacks against the US and al-Qaeda brought all attention to Central Asia and Afghanistan. Since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the region could not reach a certain level of stability. The attack of September 11 paved the way for the United States to begin military operations in Afghanistan and other different parts of the world under the name of fight against terrorism. Although the administrations of George W. Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump had different policies and strategies towards Afghanistan, the collective purpose of the above mentioned strategies were to destroy al-Qaeda and its protectors so as to prevent any future terrorist attacks against the United States.

Terrorism is associated with the concept of security. In this context, the US President's policies to combat terrorism evaluated based on US national and international security policies. Because of the attacks on September 11, realist policies gained importance. Former US President Bill Clinton's foreign policy approach, which based on liberal basis such as strategic partnership, multilateral cooperation, globalization, etc. adopted during the presidency, has been abandoned. Instead of these policies and strategies, the new conservative ideology based on the preventive strategy came to the fore. In this context, an axis shift occurred in the main agenda of both the US and international politics and the agenda shifted from cooperation to security issue (Arıboğan, 2008, p. 314).

The reactions of the US towards global terrorism after September 11 can be handled within three periods. The first period was between 2001 and 2006. In this period, the US declared war on terrorism and gave the whole world the message *"who are either with us or against us."* The second period was the period in which the US was in search of cooperation and partnership on global terrorism and international security after the occupation of Iraq. In the third period, during Obama's presidency period, the US declared that it cannot solve the global problems alone and needed international cooperation. (Özeren, Cinoğlu and Sever, 2010, p. 7).

George W. Bush faced the September 11 attacks shortly after he elected president. Up until that time, George W. Bush criticized the countries of the Middle East and did not have any solution policy. He developed a polarizing rhetoric by saying that" you are either with us or with terrorists." This speech criticized by most of the countries. As a result, the image of the US deteriorated during George W. Bush period.

As a result of the September 11 attacks that took place at the beginning of the George W. Bush era, war against terrorism became President George W. Bush main foreign policy. In this respect, all states that support terrorism were seen as potential threats. In this context, George W. Bush, who saw himself as the protector of humanity in the name of the US declared within the framework of the preventive war doctrine that the United States can initiate military intervention anywhere in the world against groups or countries that had the potential to support terrorism and as a result, operations against Afghanistan and Iraq carried out.

Obama, on the other hand, dealt with the effects of the US-based global economic crisis following his position as president. In his foreign policy, he pursued a strategy based on more idealistic and soft power elements than George W. Bush did. Obama's main agenda items were the issues of terrorism, extremism and the fight against radicalism. Rather than fighting terrorism directly with military power, he favored logistics and financial assistance to those who fight against terrorism and support countries suffering from terrorism. The unilateral, dominant and harsh policies of the George W. Bush era abandoned in order to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to fight against global terrorism. During the Barack Obama period, multilateral and soft power policies has implemented in the framework of cooperation, alliance and common struggle principles on the fight against weapons of mass destruction and global terrorism. Barack Obama withdrew US troops from the region to get rid of the costs of military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq during the George W. Bush period

and had try to reconcile nuclear power with Iran via diplomacy, which was seen as a potential threat in the George W. Bush period

Obama, successor of George W. Bush by 2009, prepared himself for reorganization of US' "destroyed image" in the world and took over the Presidency as a reformist. Ankara and Cairo Speeches indicated his trend on reformist politics in the Middle East. Barack Obama developed doctrines based on "soft power". He pursued a strategy based on more idealistic and soft power than George W. Bush. Obama's main agenda items were the issues of terrorism, extremism and the fight against radicalism. Rather than fighting terrorism directly with military power, he favored logistics and financial assistance to those who fight against terrorism, and support countries suffering from terrorism. The unilateral, dominant and harsh policies of the George W. Bush era abandoned in order to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to fight against global terrorism. During the Barack Obama period, multilateral and soft power policies has been implemented in the framework of cooperation, alliance and common struggle principles on the fight against weapons of mass destruction and global terrorism. Compared to George W. Bush, Barack Obama was more moderate in democracy, human rights, mutual interaction and cooperation. (Kocakenar, 2015, p. 10). Barack Obama attached great importance to the use of "soft power" elements in his foreign policy approach. He demonstrated policies to correct the deteriorated US image under the George W. Bush administration and negative international views against the United States.

The first important Donald Trump's Afghanistan strategy was the shift from a time-based approach to one based on conditions. Donald Trump stated, *"Conditions on the ground—not arbitrary timetables*—would guide their strategy.

The second important Donald Trump's Afghanistan Strategy was the "integration of all instruments of the US power diplomatic, economic, and military toward a successful outcome". With this statement, it was actually implied that talks with the Taliban was on the table. However, Donald Trump gave priority to supporting the Afghanistan government. Donald Trump stated that the US is not in Afghanistan for "nation-building". With this statement, it has been implied that Washington would not be micromanaging the policy for Afghanistan and would instead be acting 'just as a facilitator'.

From September 11/2001 until now, three presidents has been elected in the US but the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan was not won. The country has not been cleared of terrorist

elements and the country's' economy has not been stabilized. The U S should acknowledge defeat in Afghanistan and for that reason it will be appropriate to rethink about her policies in Afghanistan. They have already spent billions of US tax payers' money on the war, drugs, corruption, weak governance and with that have achieved no results. The civilian causalities have increased, the drug trade had increased, anti-government elements were able to siege and control more areas, many problems exist in regards with the training of Afghan forces, no trace of reconstructions activities foreseen in Afghanistan, the country's economic situation is weak and deteriorating and people really see no prospect for their future.

With keeping in mind the above, we can say that the US has lost the fight in Afghanistan and should acknowledge the defeat in Afghanistan as a result. The US should rethink about their policies, particularly their financial expenses in Afghanistan.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Max. (2006).Why Terrorism Does Not Work. *International Security*, Vol. 2, pp. 42–78.

Ahmadi, Kava. (2012). *Tahlil Hai az Sulh*, Kabul: Nasır khisrav Yayınevi.

Aksoy, Deniz and Carter David B. (2012). Electoral Institutions and the Emergence of Terrorist Groups. *British Journal of Political Science* , Vol. 44 (1), 181-204.

Akkurt, Mehmet. (2005). *Afganistan'ın Yapılanmasında Siyasi ve Ekonomik Stratejiler* (1st edition). İstanbul: Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.

Amini, Mariam. (2017). "At stake in US military efforts to stabilize Afghanistan: At least $3 trillion in natural resources" CNBC 21 Aug 2017. https://www.cnbc.com/2017/08/18/Donald Trumps-afghanistan-strategy-may-unlock-3-trillion-in-natural-resources.html (Accessed on 3 Oct 2018)

Arı ,Selçuk and Arslan Okan. (2005). *Uluslararası İliskiler ve Din, Tanrı Tarafsız mı?.* Ankara: PlatinYayıncılık.

Arıboğan, D.Ü., (2008). *Uluslararası ilişkiler düşüncesi: tarihsel gelişim.* İstanbul: Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Armitage, Richard L., Berger R. Samuel and Markey, Daniel (2010). *US Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan: Independent Task Force Report No. 65.* New York: Council on Foreign Relations.

Asal, Victor, Nussbaum, Brian, Harrington, D. William. (2007). Terrorism as Transnational Advocacy: An Organizational and Tactical Examination. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism,* Vol.1, pp. 15–39.

Baizakova, Kuralay. (2014). Connect Central Asia. *Role of Afghanistan, public administration & regional studies.* Vol. 14 (2), 94-104. Retrieved from http://library.bilgi.edu.tr/. (Acces date: 06.07.2018)

Bal, İhsan. (2006). *Terörizm* (1.Baskı). Ankara: USAK Yayınları.

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

Barton, G. (2005). *Jemaah Islamiyah: Radical Islam in Indonesia,* Singapore University Press: Singapore.

Baylis, John and Smith Steve. (1993). "*The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations."* Oxford: University Press.

Bayrd, William. (2012). Lessons from Afghanistan's History for the Current Transition and Beyond. Washington: United States Institute of Peace.

Bergen, Peter L. (2011). *The Longest War: The Enduring Conflict between America and al-Qaeda.* New York: Free Press.

Bergen, Peter L. (2006). *The Osama bin Laden I Know : An Oral History of al Qaeda's Leader.* New York: Free Press.

Bek, Rauf. (2001). *Afganistan Talibanlar'ın Eline Nasıl Düştü?* (1st Edition). İstanbul: Bayhakı Yayınevi.

Bergen, P.L. (2011). The Longest War: The Enduring Conflict between America and alQaeda. New York: Free Press.

Beşe, Ertan. (2002). *Terörizm, Avrupa Birliği ve İnsan Hakları*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Bilgiç, M. Sadi. (2009). "Terör ve Terörle Mücadele." *Bilge Adamlar Stratejik Araştırmalar Merkezi,* Vol. 17, 6-56.

Bowman, Steve and Catherine Dale. (2011). *War in Afghanistan: Strategy, Military* Operations and Issues for Congress. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bowman, Steve.(2010) “War in Afghanistan: Strategy, military operations, and issues for Congress”. Oxford: Oxford Diane Publishing.

Bromley, Simon. (2007). Connecting Central Eurasia to the Middle East in American Foreign Policy Towards Afghanistan and Pakistan: 1979-Present. *Perspectives on Global Development And Technology.* Vol. 6, 87-108.

Karen, Kaya. (2013). *Turkey's Role in Afghanistan and Afghan Stabilization. Military Rewiev, Vol: 93 (4).*

Bukhari, Sayed and Shah, Noor. (2008). Post 9/11 Pak-Afghan Border Dispute: A Case Study of Durand Line. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. Vol. 19 (2), 264- 272.

Carter, David B. (2013). Provocation and the Strategy of Terrorist and Guerilla Attacks. Technical report Princeton University.

Chene, Hugo. (2015). “China in Afghanistan: Balancing Power Projection and Minimal Intervention.” *IPCS Special Report 179.*

Clinton ,Hillary. (2011). America’s Pacific Century. *Foreign Policy,* Vol: 189, pp. 56-63.

Cogan, Charles, G. (1993). Partners in time: The CIA and Afghanistan since 1979. *World Policy Journal,* Vol.10 (2), 73-82.

Cornell, Svante E. (2006). Taliban Afghanistan: A True Islamic State. Brenda Shaffer (Ed.), The Limits of Culture: Islam and Foreign Policy. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Cragin, Kim. (2007). *Understanding Terrorist Ideology*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Cragin, Kim. and Gerwehr Scott (2005). Dissuading Terror: Strategic Influence and the Struggle Against Terrorism, Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Cronin, Audrey Kurth. (2006). How al-Qaida Ends: The Decline and Demise of Terrorist Groups. *International Security,* Vol.1, pp. 7–48.

Cutler, Leonard (2017). President Barack Obama’s Counterterrorism Strategy and Legacy: The Case of Afghanistan. *Political Science & Politics*, Vol.50 (1), 59-63.

Dibb, Paul.(2010). “The Soviet Experience in Afghanistan: Lessons to Be Learned?” *Australian Journal of International Affairs* Vol.64 (5), 495–509.

Douglas, Feith. (2008). *War and Decision: Inside the Pentagon at the Dawn of the War on Terrorism.* New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Downing, David. *Afganistan* . New York: Marshall Cavendish Brenchmark.

Efegil, Ertan. 2002. 11 Eylül Sonrası Büyük Devletler Arasında Artan İşbirliği. *Kök Araştırmalar,* Vol.4 (1) 163 – 172.

Ekici, and et al. (2010). İdeoloji ve Örgütsel Yapının örgüte Eleman Kazanma Etkisi. *Uluslararası Güvenlik ve Terörizm Dergisi,* Vol.1 (1), 37-57.

Falkenburg, Luke. (2013). “On the Brink: The Resurgence of Militant Islam in Central Asia.” *Small Wars & Insurgencies* Vol.24 (3), 375–393.

Fearon, J. D. and Laitin, D. D. (2003). ‘Ethnicity, insurgency and civil war’, *American Political Science Review,* Vol. 97 (1), pp. 75–90.

Girdner, Eddie J. (2004). "Operation Iraqi Freedom: Invasion, Occupation and Consolidation of US Hegemony in Iraq," *Punjab Journal of Politics* 28 (2), July-Dec. 2004, pp. 1-31; "Pre-emptive War: The Case of Iraq," *Perceptions* 9 (4), pp. 5-30.

Giustozzi, Antonio. (2013). *Negotiating with Taliban: Issues and Prospects*, Washington: The Century Foundation.

Gökırmak, Mert. (2011). Afganistan: Bölgesel Rekabet ve Yeni Açılımlar. *Security Strategies Journal.* Vol : 7 (13), 7-35.

Göngen, M.A., (2014). Arap Baharı karşısında ABD’nin tutumu. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Vol. 33, 2-14.

Gray , John. (2004). *El Kaide Modern Olmanın Anlamı.* İstanbul: Everest Yayınları.

Grevi, G., 2015. The 2015 United States National Security Strategy, *FRIDE Policy Brief*, No:194.

Griffiths, Richard, T.(2017). *Revitalizing the Silk Road China’s Belt and Road”.* The Netherlands: HIPE Publications.

Halatçı, Ü., (2006). 11 Eylül Terörist Saldırıları ve Afganistan Operasyonu'nun bir Değerlendirmesi. *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika,* Vol.2 (7), 80-98.

Hamidi, Said J. (2012) *Tarihi Siyasi*. Tahran: Bayhaki Yayınevi.

Haşimi, Muhammed. (2013). *Siyasi tedad safahat.* Ankara: Bayhaqi Yayınevi, 2013.

Herman, E. S. and O'Sullivan, G., '"Terrorism" as ideology and cultural industry', ed. A. George, Western State Terrorism (Routledge: New York, 1991), pp. 39–75;
Soares, J., 'Terrorism as ideology in international relations', Peace Review, vol. 19, no. 1 (Jan. 2007), pp. 113–18.

Hurmi, A.B., 2010. George W. Bush ve Barack Obama Karşılaştırması Çerçevesinde Amerikan Dış Politikası Analizi. *Alternatif Politika*, Vol. 2 (1), 56-81.

Hoffman, Bruce. (2006). *Inside Terrorism.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Hook, S.W., Spanier, J., (2014). *Amerikan dış politikası: İkinci Dünya Savaşı'ndan günümüze*.İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınları.

Indurthy, Rathnam. (2011). The Barack Obama administration's strategy in Afghanistan. *International Journal on World Peace,* Vol: 28 (3), 7-52.

Irwin, Clark. (2017). Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR), July 2017 report.

Jalali, Ali Ahmad (2017). "*A Military History of Afghanistan: From the Great Game to the Global War on Terror*. Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Jentleson, Bruce W. (2000). *American Foreign Policy- The Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century.* New York: W.W. Norton&Company.

Jorgensen K. Erik. (2010). "*International Relations Theory A New Introduction"*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, Thomas H. (2007). On the edge of the big muddy: The Taliban resurgence in Afghanistan. China and Eurasia Forum Quarterly. Vol. 5 (2), 93–129.

Kandemir, E., 2011. ABD Başkanları G. W. Bush ve B. Obama dönemlerinde yayımlanan ulusal güvenlik stratejilerinde ittifak söylemleri ve S. Walt'un ittifak teorisi. *Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi,* Vol.10 (2), 122-151.

Karacasulu, Nilüfer. (2010). Reconstructıon of Afghanistan And The Role Of Turkey. *OAKA,* Vol: 5 (10), 40-58 http://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423910525.pdf (Access Date: 12.07.2018).

Katzman, Kenneth. (2013). Afghanistan: Post-Taliban Governance, Security, and U. S. Policy. *Congressional Research Service Reports for Congress*.

http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rl30588.pdf (Access Date: 09.07.2018)

Keeney, Gregory. L. (2009). Identifying and Structuring the Objectives of Terrorists. *Risk Analysis, An International Journal*. Vol.30 (12), 1803-1816.

Kışlalı, A. Taner. (1998). *Siyasal Sistemler*, Ankara: İmge Yayıncılık.

Kızılkaplan, B., (2009). Obama, değişim ve yeni dünya'da Türkiye analizi. *BİLGESAM*, http://www.bilgesam.org/tr. php?option=com.content&view=article&id= 382:obama-degisim-ve-yeni-dunyada-turkiyeanalizi& catid=98:analizler abd & Itemid =135 [Access Date: 25 October 2017].

Kiras, James. D. (2001). *Terrorism and Globalization*.' In Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds.) *The Globalization of work politics: An introduction to IR*, Chapter 21, Oxford: Oxford university press.

Kocakenar, M., 2015. Amerikan dış politikasında idealizm realizm ilişkisi: çatışma mı işbirliği mi? *TASAM*, 5 August, http://www.tasam.org/tr TR /Icerik / 19550 / amerikan_dis_ politikasinda_idealism_ve_realism_iliskisi_catisma_mi_isbirligi_mi [Access date: 25 October 2016].

Korkmaz, Gürol. (1999). *Terör ve Medya İlişkileri.* Ankara: Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü Basımevi.

Krey, P., (2009). Foreign policy advice for Obama: non-interventionism! Po*litical Class Dismissed Blog*, http://politicalclassdismissed. com/?p=3877 [Access Date: 25 October 2017].

Kurtbağ, Ö., (2010). Amerikan yeni sağı ve dış politikası: hegemonya ekseninde bir analiz. Ankara: USAK Yayınları.

Kuyaksil, Ali. (2004). Türkiye'de Terör ve Terörün Kaynakları. *Polis Dergisi*, Vol.40, 515-583.

Lansford, T., Watson, R.P. and Covarrubias, J. (2009). *'America's War on Terror.' (Second Ed.).* USA: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Laqueur, Walter. (2003). *No End to War: Terrorism in the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Continuum.

Lindsay, James, M. (2011). 'George W. Bush, Barack Obama and the Future of US Global Leadership.' *International Affairs*, Vol. 87 (4), 765–779

Makarov, Igor and Sokolova, Anna. (2016). The Eurasian Economic Union and the Silk Road Economic Belt; Opportunities for Russia. *International Organizations Research Journal*, Vol. 11 (2), 40-57.

Morgenthau, Hans J. (2005). "*Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*". 7th ed. (New York: Kenneth W. Thompson, David Clinton, 2005).

Martin, Gus. (2010). *Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues.* (Third Ed.) USA: Sage Publication.

Matinuddin, Kamal. (1999). *The Taliban Phenomenon: Afghanistan 1994-1997*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

McGreal, Chris. (2010). Fidel Castro claims Osama bin Laden is a US spy. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/aug/27/fidel-castro-osama-bin-laden-us-spy (Access date: 10.07.2018).

Mearsheimer, John. J. ve Walt, Stephen. M. (2006). The Israeli Lobby and US Foreign Policy. *Middle East Policy*, Vol. 13 (3), 29–87.

Millward, James. A.(2007). *Eurasian crossroads: a history of Xinjiang.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Misdaq, Nabi. (2006). *Afghanistan: Political Frailty and External Interference.* London and New York: Routledge.

Mockaitis, Thomas R. (2010). Osama Bin Laden: A Biography. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood.

Mockaitis, Thomas R. (2007). The "New" Terrorism: Myths and Reality. Westport, London: Praeger Security International.

Mukhopadhyay, Dipali.(2009). "Warlords as Bureaucrats: The Afghan Experience." *Carnegie Middle East Programme Vol: 101,* 1-32.

Nojumi, Naematollah (2002). The Rise of Taliban in Afghanistan: Mass Mobilization, Civil War, and the Future of the Region. New York and Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Norling, Nicklas. (2011). Afghanistan's Trade With Central Asia Revives. *CACI Analyst*, Vol. 13 (8), 9-15.

Noorani, Javed. (2017). Afghanistan's Emerging Mining Oligarchy. United States Institute of Peace. Special Report. No:358.

Öktem, Emre. (2007). *Terörizm-İnsancıl Hukuk Ve İnsan Hakları.* İstanbul: Derin Yayın Evi.

Özeren, S. ve Cinoglu, H., (2006). Terörizm ve Amerika Birleşik Devletleri: 11 Eylül öncesi ve sonrası terörle mücadele politikalarının değerlendirilmesi, *Terörizm: terör, terörizm ve küresel terörle mücadelede ulusal ve bölgesel deneyimler* içinde, *İ. Bal (Der.),* ss. 159-197, Ankara: USAK Yayınları.

Pape, Robert A. (2003). The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism. – *American Political Science Review,* Vol.3, pp. 343–361.

Peyrouse, Sébastien. (2008). The new "aerial Silk Road" between Central Asia and China. *Central Asia- Caucasus analyst,* Vol.10 (19), 9-30.

Piazza, James A. (2009). Is Islamist Terrorism More Dangerous?: An Empriical Study of Group Ideology, Organization, and Goal Structure. *Terrorism and Political Violence*. Vol. 21 (1), 62-88.

Ra'ees, Wahabuddin (2010). Obama's Afghanistan Strategy: A Policy of Balancing the Reality with the Practice. *Journal of Politics and Law*, Vol.3 (2), 80-93.

Rapoport, David C. (1999). Terrorism and Weapons of the Apocalypse. – *National Security Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 3, pp. 49–66.

Rapoport, David C. (2004). Four Waves of Modern Terrorism. – Attacking Terrorism: Elements of a Grand Strategy. Audrey Kurth Cronin, James M. Ludes (eds.). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 46–73.

Rasanayagm, Angelo. (2003). *Afghanistan: A Modern History*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Rashid, Ahmed. (2008). *Descent into Chaos: The United States and the Failure of Nation Building in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Central Asia.* London: Viking Penguin Books.

Record, Jeffrey (2003). Bounding the Global War on Terrorism. Carlisle Barracks: Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College.

Renshon, Stanley A., and Peter Suedfeld, eds. "*Understanding the George W. Bush Doctrine: Psychology and strategy in an age of terrorism*." *Routledge*, 2013. p. 1.

Roy, Meena S. (2010). Role of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation in Afghanistan: Scope and Limitations. *Strategic Analysis,* Vol: 34 (4), 545-561.

Rubin, Barnett, and Ahmed Rashid. (2008). From Great Game to Grand Bargain: Ending Chaos in Afghanistan and Pakistan. *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87 (6), 30–44.

Safranchuk, Ivan. (2009). The Afghan Problem in the Regional Context. *Russia in Global Affairs,* Vol. 7(3), 146-151.

Schmid, Alex P. (1992) The Response Problem as a Definition Problem, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol.4 (4), 7-13.

Schmidt, Brian C. and Williams, Michael C. (2008). The George W. Bush Doctrine and the Iraq War: Neoconservatives Versus Realists. Security Studies, Vol.17 (2), 191-220.

Sedgewick, Mark. (2007). Inspiration and the Origins of Global Waves of Terrorism. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Vol. 2, pp. 97–112.

Signorino, Curtis S. (2003). Structure and Uncertainty in Discrete Choice Models. *Political Analysis*, Vol.11 (4), 316-344.

Sheikh, M.K. (2016), Guardians of God – Inside the Religious Mind of the Pakistani Taliban, Delhi, Oxford University Press.

Shimko , Keith L. (1992). 'Realism, Neorealism and American Liberalism', *The Review of Politics*, Vol :54 (2) p. 293.

Sofronov, Vladislav et al. (2008). The Theory of Marxism: Questions and Answers', Rethinking Marxism, *Journal of Economics, Culture & Society*, Vol. 20 (3), 367-384.

Stanley A. Renshon, and Suedfeld , Peter. (2013). *Understanding the George W. Bush Doctrine.* New York: Routledge.

Stenersen, Anne. (2010). The Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan – Organization, Leadership and Worldview. *Norwegian Defence Research Establishment (FFI).* Technical Report.

Tardy, Thierry. (2004). *Peace Operations After 11 September*. Kabul: Frank Cass, 2004.

Taşkın, Cankat (2006). Taşkın Terörle Mücadele Yasa Tasarısının Değerlendirilmesi ve Tasarıya Farklı Bir Bakış. *Bursa Barosu Dergisi*, 81, 55-72.

Tellis, Ashley J. and Eggers, Jeff. (2017). US Policy In Afghanistan Changing Strategies, Preserving Gains. Washington: Carnegie Endowment.

Topal, Ahmet H. (2005). *Uluslararası Terörizm ve Terörist Eylemlere Karşı Kuvvet Kullanımı*. İstanbul: Beta Yayınevi.

Tourangbam, Monish. (2017). US Strategy in Afghanistan: Old Wine in Donald Trump's Bottle. *IndraStra Global* Vol.3 (9), 5-9.

Transcript of Barack Obama speech on Afghanistan. CNN Politics, http : / / edition . cnn . com / 2009 /POLITICS/12/01/obama.afghanistan.speech.transcript/index.html (Access Date: 30.07.2018).

Trenin, Dmitri and Malashenko, Alexey. (2010). *Afghanistan: A View from Moscow.* Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Qaurtermaine, Angela. (2016). Discussing Terrorism: A Pupil-Inspired Guide to UK Counter-Terrorism Policy Implementation in Religious Education Classrooms in England. *British Journal of Religious Education,* Vol. 38 (1), 13-29.

Qassem, Ahmad S. (2009). *Afghanistan's Political Stability: A Dream Unrealised*. (1st edition). UK: Routledge.

Türkmen, Füsun. (2005). ABD'nin Dış Politikası: Devamlılık ve Değişim. *Doğu Batı,* Vol. 8 (32),157–181.

Waltz , Kenneth. (2000). *"*Structural Realism After the Cold War*"*, *International Security*, Vol 25, (2000) p. 23.

Whelan, Richard (2005). Al-Qaedaism: The Threat to Islam, The Threat to the World. *Survival,* Vol: 53 (2), 159-166

White, Jonathan R. (2011). *Terrorism and Homeland Security.* (7th edition). USA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Wolfendale, Jessica (2007). Terrorism, Security, and the Threat of Counterterrorism. – Studies in Conflict and Terrorism, Vol.1, pp. 75–92.

Woodward, Bob. (2002). *George W. Bush At War.* London: Simon and Schuster.

Woodwar, Bob. (2011). *Obama's Wars.* New York: Simon-Schuster.

Wright, Austin L. (2013). *Terrorism, Ideology and Target Selection.* New Jersey: Princeton University.