

# GÜVENLİK ÇALIŞMALARI DERGİSİ

*Turkish Journal of Security Studies*

ISSN: 2148-6166

Cilt / Vol: 26

Sayı / Issue: 2

Yıl / Year: 2024

Andaç KARABULUT

**The Role of Intelligence in America's Grand Strategy**

Atalay BAHAR

**Büyük Çaplı Krizlerde Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü'nün Kullandığı  
Stratejik İletişim Yöntemleri: X Sosyal Medya Platformu Örneği**

Yunus ÖZTÜRK

**What Makes Civil Wars Protracted? A Review of Systemic, Organizational  
& Individual-Level Factors**

Esra Merve ÇALIŞKAN

**State Cyber Warfare: The Strategic Shift Towards Private Sector Targets**



# GÜVENLİK

## ÇALIŞMALARI DERGİSİ

Turkish Journal of Security Studies

ISSN: 2148-6166 • Yıl/Year: 26 • Cilt/Volume: 26 • Sayı/Issue: 2 • Aralık/December 2024

### Yayın Sahibi / Owned by

Polis Akademisi Başkanlığı Güvenlik Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü adına

### İmtiyaz Sahibi / Published by

Prof. Dr. Murat BALCI, Polis Akademisi Başkanı

### Sorumlu Yazı İşleri Müdürü / Issuing Editor

Murat GÜNAY, 2. Sınıf Emniyet Müdürü

### Yayın Kurulu / Editorial Board

- Prof. Dr. Ahmet Kemal BAYRAM, Marmara Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Ahmet UYSAL, İstanbul Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Ali BALCI, Sakarya Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Ali Resul USUL, İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Alim YILMAZ, İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Bayram Ali SONER, Polis Akademisi  
Prof. Dr. Birol AKGÜN, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Hamit Emrah BERİŞ, Çukurova Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. İbrahim DURSUN, Polis Akademisi  
Prof. Dr. Mehmet Akif KİREÇCİ, Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Mesut ÖZCAN, Diplomasi Akademisi  
Prof. Dr. Murat OKÇU, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Murat ÖNDER, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Orçun İMGA, Polis Akademisi  
Prof. Dr. Sıtkı YILDIZ, Polis Akademisi  
Prof. Dr. Yusuf Furkan ŞEN, Polis Akademisi  
Doç. Dr. Hüseyin ARSLAN, Polis Akademisi  
Doç. Dr. Kevser Begüm İSBİR, Polis Akademisi  
Dr. Anselmo del Morral TORES, Centro Universitario de la Guardia Civil  
Dr. Vince VARİ, Macaristan Ulusal Kamu Üniversitesi

### Danışma Kurulu / Advisory Board

- Prof. Dr. Ahmet İÇDUYGU, Koç Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Ali BİRİNCİ, Polis Akademisi, Emekli  
Prof. Dr. Eyyüp Günay İSBİR, Emeritus, Ankara  
Prof. Dr. Martha CRENSHAW, Stanford University  
Prof. Dr. Musa Mohammed MAHMOUD, National Ribat University  
Prof. Dr. Nigel FIELDING, University of Surrey  
Prof. Dr. Omar ASHOUR, University of Exeter  
Prof. Dr. Onur Ender ASLAN, Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi  
Prof. Dr. Ruşen KELEŞ, Kapadokya Üniversitesi  
Doç. Dr. Jaishankar GANAPATHY, Norwegian Police University  
Dr. Szabolcs MATYAS, Macaristan Ulusal Kamu Üniversitesi

**Editör / Editor in Chief:** Prof. Dr. Şenol YAPRAK

**Editör Yardımcısı / Managing Editor:** Doç. Dr. Ömer ÖZKAYA

**Alan Editörleri / Section Editors:** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hande BİLGİN - Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Birce BEŞGÜL ve Dr. Aslıhan KÜÇÜKER

**Mizanpaj Editörleri / Technical Editors:** Arş. Gör. Yasemin KAYMAZ ve Arş. Gör. Zeynep ŞİMŞEK

**Türkçe Dil Editörü / Turkish Language Editor:** Öğr. Gör. Sena BAYKAL

**İngilizce Dil Editörü / English Language Editor:** Öğr. Gör. Nurefşan TERCAN ÇETİNKAYA

**Sekretarya / Secretary:** Barış ZAFRAK - Yusuf DENİZ

**Tasarım / Design:** Muhammed DELİBAŞ

Her hakkı saklıdır. © Güvenlik Çalışmaları Dergisi yılda iki kez yayınlanan bilimsel hakemli ve süreli bir yayındır. Güvenlik Çalışmaları Dergisi'nde yayınlanan makalelerdeki görüş ve düşünceler yazarların kendi kişisel görüşleri olup, hiçbir şekilde Polis Akademisinin veya Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü'nün görüşlerini ifade etmez. Makaleler sadece dergiye referans verilerek akademik amaçla kullanılabilir. Güvenlik Çalışmaları Dergisi, ULAKBİM TR Dizin, Index Copernicus, Eurasian Scientific Journal Index ve Akademia Sosyal Bilimler İndeksi'nde (ASOS Index) taranmaktadır.

**Yazışma Adresi / For Correspondence:** Polis Akademisi Başkanlığı, Güvenlik Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü, Necatibey Cad: 108, 06580 Anıttepe - Çankaya - Ankara / TÜRKİYE Tel: +90 (312) 462 90 43  
E-posta: guvenlikcalismalari@pa.edu.tr

**Baskı:** Polis Akademisi Başkanlığı Basım ve Yayım Şube Müdürlüğü Fatih Sultan Mehmet Bulvarı No:218, 06200 Yenimahalle, Ankara Sertifika No: 45724

## İÇİNDEKİLER / CONTENTS

Editörden ..... 2

### Makaleler

Andaç KARABULUT

**The Role of Intelligence in America's Grand Strategy..... 140**  
*Amerika'nın Büyük Stratejisinde İstihbaratın Rolü*  
*(Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article)*

Atalay BAHAR

**Büyük Çaplı Krizlerde Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü'nün Kullandığı**  
**Stratejik İletişim Yöntemleri: X Sosyal Medya Platformu Örneği..... 156**  
*Strategic Communication Methods Used by the Turkish National Police in*  
*Large-Scale Crises: The Case of X Social Media Platform*  
*(Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article)*

Yunus ÖZTÜRK

**What Makes Civil Wars Protracted? A Review of Systemic,**  
**Organizational & Individual-Level Factors ..... 180**  
*İç Savaşları Uzatan Nedir? Sistemsel, Örgütsel ve Bireysel Düzeydeki*  
*Faktörlerin Bir Değerlendirmesi*  
*(Derleme/Review)*

Esra Merve ÇALIŞKAN

**State Cyber Warfare: The Strategic Shift Towards Private Sector Targets.... 200**  
*Devlet Siber Savaşı: Özel Sektör Hedeflerine Doğru Stratejik Değişim*  
*(Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article)*

## The Role of Intelligence in America's Grand Strategy

Andaç KARABULUT\*

**Abstract:** The importance of intelligence in the American Revolutionary War is undeniable. However, although George Washington, the commander of the Continental Army and the first president of the United States, was an influential figure in American intelligence during this war, the conditions of the time did not allow for the institutionalization of intelligence practices. Indeed, after World War I, the United States abandoned its isolationist foreign policy. This shift not only influenced the liberal policies adopted by Woodrow Wilson but also led to significant changes in American state policies and intelligence strategies. During the Cold War, the perception of communism as a threat to liberal policies and the global economic order led the United States to adopt a more rational and pragmatic approach to dealing with this threat. As a result, the United States not only developed a more disciplined approach to intelligence operations but also institutionalized them. The indirect victory of the United States in the Cold War and the dominant role of the US dollar in the global economic system significantly contributed to the strengthening of American hegemony and the implementation of the American Grand Strategy. This study seeks to answer the question: What role does intelligence play in the American Grand Strategy?

**Keywords:** Grand Strategy, Intelligence, International Relations, Liberalism, Hegemony

---

\* Lecturer Dr., Yozgat Bozok University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Political Science and International Relations - Andaç, andaç.karabulut@bozok.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5620-2344

## Amerika'nın Büyük Stratejisinde İstihbaratın Rolü

**Andaç KARABULUT\***

**Öz:** Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nin Bağımsızlık Savaşı'ndaki istihbaratın önemi tartışmasızdır. Ancak, bu savaşta Kıta Ordusu'nun komutanı ve ABD'nin ilk başkanı olan George Washington, Amerikan istihbaratında önemli bir figür olmasına rağmen, dönemin koşulları istihbarat uygulamalarının kurumsallaşmasına olanak tanımamıştır. I. Dünya Savaşı sonrasında Amerika Birleşik Devletleri, izolasyonist dış politikasını terk etmiştir. Bu dönüşüm, yalnızca Woodrow Wilson'un benimsemiş olduğu liberal politikaları etkilemekle kalmamış, aynı zamanda Amerikan devlet politikalarında ve istihbarat stratejilerinde de önemli değişikliklere yol açmıştır. Soğuk Savaş dönemi, komünizmin liberal politikalara ve küresel ekonomik düzene tehdit olarak görülmesiyle ABD'nin, bu tehditle başa çıkabilmek için daha rasyonel ve pragmatik bir yaklaşımı benimsemesini sağlamıştır. Sonuç olarak, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri, istihbarat faaliyetlerinde daha disiplinli bir yaklaşım geliştirmekle kalmamış, aynı zamanda bu alanda kurumsallaşmaya gitmiştir. ABD'nin Soğuk Savaş'taki dolaylı zaferi ve Amerikan dolarının küresel ekonomik sistemdeki belirleyici rolü, Amerikan hegemonyasının güçlenmesine ve Amerikan Büyük Stratejisi'nin hayata geçirilmesine önemli katkılar sunmuştur. Bu çalışmada, şu soruya yanıt aranacaktır: İstihbarat, Amerikan Büyük Stratejisi'nde nasıl bir rol oynamaktadır?

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Büyük Strateji, İstihbarat, Uluslararası İlişkiler, Liberalizm, Hegemonya

---

\* Doktor Öğretim Üyesi, Yozgat Bozok Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, andaç.karabulut@bozok.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5620-2344

## Introduction and Methodology

With Christopher Columbus' discovery of the Americas in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, this region quickly attracted the attention of the leading states of the time, eventually becoming a territory of colonies. A rapid wave of migration to the Americas began, primarily led by Spain, Portugal, France, and England. As a result, the Americas became a new region of exploitation, particularly for Europe. This colonial period also laid the foundations for what would later become the United States, a key player in the 21<sup>st</sup> century international system.

In contrast to countries like Germany, which have its roots in the Germanic tribes, France in the Franks, and England in the Anglo-Saxons, the United States is a unique state composed of colonies. For example, regions like New York, Delaware, and New Jersey were formed after the dissolution of Dutch colonies (Sencer, 1987, p.15). As mentioned above, the United States is a significant actor in the international system. When assessing the elements of U.S. national power within the framework of national power components, it is evident that the U.S. has notable policies in the international arena. A closer examination of the characteristic features of U.S. policies reveals that American political approaches are often influenced by those of England (Kılıçaslan, 2002, p. iii).

In the contemporary United States, scientific approaches play crucial role in shaping its political, foreign, and security policies. Scholars like Hans Morgenthau and Zbigniew Brzezinski, who have examined international relations within a scientific framework, have influenced American policies and contributed to the broader international field. However, the most significant factor underpinning America's modern political approach is its intelligence system. While scholars like Hans Morgenthau and Mert Bayat have emphasized national power elements, they have mostly overlooked intelligence, leading to a lack of focus on this critical aspect. Nevertheless, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, intelligence has undeniably become a key component of national power for states (Karabulut, 2023, pp. 20-100).

The technological advancements brought about by the Cold War, along with the U.S.-led cooperation to establish supranational organizations in Europe, laid the technological and political groundwork for globalization in the international system. This development, especially following the terrorist attacks on the U.S. in 2001, also gave rise to the concepts of "global terrorism" and "global security." (Manfred, 2006, pp. 100-105).

With the dynamic nature of the international system, the role of intelligence in the implementation of the global policies of the United States, a dominant actor in the system, is undeniably significant. Franklin D. Roosevelt made the following statement on June 8, 1934: "*Fear and anxiety based on the unknown danger contribute to social unrest and economic demoralization*" (SSA, 2024). According to Franklin D. Roosevelt, identifying threats and dangers in advance is essential for

ensuring public order and maximizing social welfare. With the onset of the Cold War, the United States abandoned its isolationist policies. The rapid emergence of the communist threat, particularly after Nazi Germany, posed a significant danger even within U.S. borders.

During the Cold War, U.S. intelligence activities accelerated. Intelligence holds strategic importance in American security policies. However, rather than functioning within a traditional framework, the U.S. manages its intelligence activities within an institutional structure. Additionally, the U.S. evaluates intelligence work from a scientific perspective. For instance, U.S. intelligence efforts assess security issues in the international system not merely in terms of state threats, terrorism, or communism, but within the context of new security approaches. An example of this is the support provided by In-Q-Tel, a nonprofit venture capital firm, to Colossal Biosciences, which conducts genetic research on animals in the steppes of Russia, as part of its investments in 2023 (Crunchbase, 2024). The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) financed In-Q-Tel, Inc., a newly established company in July 1999, to invest in the research of promising commercial technologies and to support the agency's critical operations by developing of new technologies (Molzhan, 2023, p. 47).

Theories are essential for analyzing the relationships between relevant phenomena and events in a scientific field within a specific framework. Just as they are important in the natural sciences, theories are also crucial for preventing wars and establishing peace. For this reason, "theories" hold significant importance in Political Science and International Relations, which are branches of the social sciences. In scientific studies, data synthesis and analysis rely heavily on theories. While this may impose certain limitations on the study, it contributes to healthier analyses of relevant topics in social sciences, where experimentation is not feasible. International relations theory aims to explain why international events occur. Despite these theories, the vast majority of theorists engage in speculation regarding the relationships between sovereign states. Their goal is interpreted as finding and understanding the patterns of mutual political interactions between states (Aydin, 1996, pp. 90-95). The research article will be conducted using a qualitative method along with a literature review.

### **Theory: Realism and National Interest**

The United States seeks to maximize its national interests in line with its grand strategy. Although the concepts of national interest and national security are often examined together within the international system, there are times when the concept of national interest is prioritized over national security, or when states shape their high-level policies based on national interests (Birdiřli, 2011, p. 152). Although Hans Morgenthau directly associates national interest with military power, many international relations theorists view the joint examination of natio-

nal interest and military power as a tragic situation. According to Raymond Aron, national interest should not be solely linked to foreign policy. This is because national interest is a historical category (Trifunovic and Curcic, 2021, p. 80). Hans Morgenthau explains power as the primary objective of international politics and a means to achieve that objective. Along with this explanation, he systematically assesses a nation's power (Morgenthau, 1976, pp. 141-152). National power is defined as the sum of a nation's elements to achieve its national objectives (Tezkan, 2000, p. 11). In his work "The Relations of Nations," Frederick Hartman defines national power as the identification of a nation's strengths and weaknesses to secure itself (Hartman, 1957, pp. 118-121).

The theory of realism, which holds a significant place in international relations theories, emphasizes the importance of national security and military power. While realist theorists stress the significance of military power and maintaining control, they also highlight the absence of permanent friends or enemies for states. For instance, in Dr. Ifay F. Chang's work "Hegemony & Anti-Hegemony in US-China Relations," he references Henry Kissinger's statement, "America has no permanent friends or enemies, only interests," underscoring the enduring importance of national interest today (Machiavelli, 2002, pp. 40-45; Chang, 2023, pp. 5-15).

In 1950, the importance of the concept of "national interest" rapidly increased. This concept became the core argument of America's policy against the Soviets. Hans Morgenthau began examining the relationship between diplomacy and national interest shortly after the Soviet nuclear test. This contributed to the development of negotiation relations between the United States and the Soviet Union (Navari, 2016, pp. 47-50).

Hans Morgenthau asserts that elements such as law and international morality are of secondary importance compared to the concepts of national power and national interest. Protecting national interests has been established as the most important aspect of American foreign policy. In this context, he emphasizes that the Soviet threat directly endangers American national interest (Morgenthau, 1970, pp. 7-14).

Referring to the Cold War period, it is noted that many countries, including China and Ethiopia, emphasized concepts such as collective security, universal democracy, and lasting and just peace within the framework of liberal policies. These concepts had an impact on national interests, particularly in terms of rigid changes in territorial status. Hans Morgenthau highlights that due to the rigid changes at borders, the national interests of states will always lead to conflict (Morgenthau, 1947, pp. 57-78).

### **Hegemonic Stability Theory and America's Grand Strategy**

Hegemony was initially defined in international relations as being limited to military power. Although the expansion and strengthening of hegemony are often equated with increase in military power, this perspective is incomplete. However,



political scientists have emphasized that hegemonic control can be more effectively managed through economic power. This emphasis has led to the argument that hegemony should focus on the elements of national power. (Aydın, 2019, pp. 1346-1347).

States that possess critical raw materials, control significant capital resources, and have access to large markets for imports are described as hegemonic. From a neoliberal perspective, these states are characterized by their extensive free trade networks and economic size, while the neorealist view defines them based on the importance of political power, national income, economic growth, and social stability (Prabhakar, 2010, pp. 1-3). According to Benjamin J. Cohen, American hegemony is described as an advanced version of classical colonial imperialism. Cohen notes that American hegemony has developed following the Cold War (Cohen, 2008, pp. 22-25).

Since 1945, the primary factor guiding American foreign policy has been the maintenance of American global hegemony. For this reason, Steven Hurst argues that among the reasons for America's invasion of Iraq were the easy access to and transport of Middle Eastern oil and energy resources for the continuation of global American hegemony, ensuring Israel's security, and preventing the establishment of potential hegemony in the region (Hurst, 2009, p. 8).

Richard Rosecrance and Arthur Stein define the concept of "Grand Strategy" as "generalship in war or deterrence in peacetime." The British military historian and theorist B. H. Liddell Hart emphasizes the military aspect of grand strategy, arguing that its role is to "coordinate and direct all the resources of a nation or group of nations to achieve the political objectives of war." Liddell Hart also discusses the mobilization of material and immaterial resources to "maintain the services of war" and regulate the distribution of power armed forces and industry. Other topics frequently contemplated by grand strategists include the selection of primary and secondary theaters of war, priorities in arms production, and finding suitable allies. Looking at modern history, grand strategy evokes images of Bismarckian power balance. When these approaches are generally assessed, the interpretation of the concept of "Grand Strategy" can be understood as the integration of a state's elements of national power in both war and peace, while ensuring the security of its allies (Williams, 2021, pp. 40-41).

While the United States has rapidly begun to expand its hegemony, studies have been conducted on the topic of Grand Strategy, which is the approach defined in America. While hegemony primarily focuses on economic interests, with military power taking a secondary role, Grand Strategy differs by prioritizing security issues. It encompasses the identification of elements that pose threats to the American nation and the determination of allies. According to William C. Martel, Grand Strategy comprises elements encompassing politics, doctrine, strategy, and operations (Martel, 2015, pp. 20-55).

With the end of the Cold War, America's Grand Strategy was to expand its own hegemony. Christopher Layne points out that, unlike other hegemonic studies, the factors shaping American hegemony stem not from threats or structural necessities, but rather from American domestic politics. However, the most significant issue he discusses is the term "Grand Strategy." According to Layne, the United States has aligned its goals and means in its quest for security. During peacetime, the United States implements its Grand Strategy by defining security interests, identifying threats to those interests, and defending state interests. Creating a power imbalance in the international system is crucial for America, as such an imbalance fosters hegemony. In this context, military and economic power are essential (Layne, 1998, pp. 8-17). For example, the United States has shaped other countries' policies through the Marshall Plan to align with its global interests. A key tool in shaping this global development policy according to its own interests is the public diplomacy it employs. American public diplomacy aims to facilitate the control of raw material resources, capital exports, and the monitoring of markets without the need for direct violence or warfare (Bağçe, 2003, p. 74).

As previously mentioned, America's Grand Strategy encompasses a part of its hegemony, signifying the promotion of liberal economics and the safeguarding of the American economy. However, following the Cold War, factors such as the increase in regional conflicts and the rapid rise of regional actors have brought "security" to the forefront of America's Grand Strategy. Dr. Richard D. Hooker, who served as Deputy Commander and Dean at the NATO Defence College in Rome in 2013, emphasizes that the scope of America's Grand Strategy is related to American security. According to Hooker, the tools of Grand Strategy include alliances and bilateral security treaties, a robust military structure, and the presence of this military structure in global bases, as well as a strong intelligence service (Hooker, 2016, pp. 1-6).

### **The Role of Intelligence in American Grand Strategy**

With the discovery of America, rapid colonization and missionary activities allowed European states to penetrate the geography. In the 17th century, England's increasing influence in America, and the Dutch beginning to establish their presence in the region, impacted the Spanish and Portuguese monopoly in the area. As England quickly colonized, each colony was responsible for managing its own territory. However, at the head of the colonial assemblies were governors appointed by the King of England (Yıldız and Arslan, 2023, pp. 242-245).

During America's War of Independence, England employed tactical propaganda as an intelligence tool among British mercenaries. The narrative that mercenaries would live in prosperity influenced the American War of Independence. This discourse also persuaded rival elements during the conflict (Avcı, 2018, p. 106). In addition, two critical elements were present for decision-makers: intel-

ligence and reconnaissance. The British were unable to associate reconnaissance movements with the presence of cavalry units in their army system. As a result, reconnaissance lost its significance, while intelligence quickly gained importance. Although intelligence was vital in the mid-18th century, it was organized in a primitive manner. There was no separate intelligence unit; instead, intelligence was conducted by intelligence officers. British Baron I. Amherst conducted intelligence work to identify supply routes against the French during the war. In contrast, British General Henry Clinton emphasized operational intelligence, focusing on the information regarding the weapons and ammunition in the rebels' inventories (Kaplan, 1990, pp. 115-125).

George Washington's military career significantly guided the intelligence system. His intelligence skills directly influenced the American War of Independence. With support from England, Washington conducted substantial intelligence operations against the French. George Washington emphasized the importance of intelligence: "There is nothing more necessary than good intelligence to defeat an enemy, and to obtain it requires greater effort" (Rose, n.d., p. 2).

According to George Washington, the concept of intelligence was seen as synonymous with secrecy and cunning. However, he believed that to have a strong intelligence system, he first needed the army's full support. By gaining the support of the people, Washington aimed to achieve success in the field of intelligence, as he considered intelligence the primary element necessary for success on the battlefield. Although these statements align with the paradigm of espionage activities, Washington later realized that relying solely on espionage was insufficient. During the War of Independence, the need for counterintelligence—a radical intelligence activity of the time—became essential for Washington. In response, he established a secret committee solely dedicated to counterintelligence activities (Brad and Mensch, 2018, pp. 20-55).

As previously mentioned, in addition to his military identity, George Washington was a remarkable political leader and America's first intelligence chief. During the American War of Independence, he allocated 10% of military funds to intelligence activities. Washington established offices for espionage and counterintelligence and set up special offices for military intelligence in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. He personally oversaw the management of these offices. In New York, a group of intelligence agents known as the Culper Ring, consisting of 20 members, attempted to conduct covert intelligence operations by engaging in trade to disguise their activities (DIA, 2014).

After England evacuated Philadelphia during the American War of Independence, Henry Clinton was appointed by the British to manage agents and informants. Meanwhile, between 1780 and 1790, logistical support for the revolutionaries was secretly provided by the Mount Vernon nonprofit organization, owned by the Washington family. During this period, the Indigenous people of America, known as the "Redskins," served as an important intelligence asset for George

Washington. Their skills in tracking and trailing made them particularly effective as intelligence agents against the French (Grizzard, 2002, pp. 10-20).

During the American War of Independence, George Washington attempted to conduct intelligence activities by leveraging companies, organizations, and ethnic groups such as Native Americans, even though a formal intelligence structure had not yet been established. The presence of numerous states competing for colonization, from England to Spain, also led to intelligence wars in the region. Washington's military experience did not translate effectively into intelligence operations. Initially, he relied on his subordinates to gather intelligence through reconnaissance and provide feedback, but the prevalence of inaccurate reports increased the likelihood of losing the American War of Independence. According to Sergeant Quinnus G. Caldwell, who served in the American Armed Forces, one reason for the failures in intelligence operations during the war was a lack of training for spies, as well as the absence of necessary strategies and skills to operate covertly. However, over time, American intelligence gained momentum by adopting materials such as encrypted reports and invisible ink letters developed by chemist and physician Sir James Jay (Caldwell, 2018, pp.1-3).

After the war with Spain in 1898, America took its first steps toward becoming a "global power." The United States, through the treaty signed in 1898, acquired Puerto Rico and Guam as war reparations and gained the Philippines for 20 million dollars. With Cuba gaining its independence, America emerged as an East Asian state. The post-World War I era marked the first official step in America's shift from isolationist policies to a global political role, particularly with the emergence of Woodrow Wilson, a leader from outside Europe, as a regulatory actor in the international system (Özdal and Karaca, 2015, pp. 350-355).

With the Cold War, American economic, political, and security policies underwent significant changes, leading to a transformation in the traditional understanding of American intelligence that dates back to the George Washington era. According to Hans Morgenthau, intelligence plays a crucial role in determining national interests. Accordingly, a natural relationship exists between the policies outlined in the Grand Strategy and intelligence. Intelligence can help address the major issue of uncertainty present in the policies established for the Grand Strategy (Fingar, 2012, pp. 119-121).

The United States significantly emphasizes intelligence operations during both wartime and peacetime. Diplomatic maneuvers carried out in peacetime are determined through intelligence, enabling the effective allocation of resources in line with the Grand Strategy. Among the most important tools of the Grand Strategy during both war and peace are intelligence and propaganda (NDISC, 2022). For instance, during the Cold War, the spread of communism in Latin American countries posed a threat to U.S. hegemony in the region. The United States' policies to combat communism were sometimes implemented at the intelligence level. Following a military intervention in Bolivia in 1947, approximately 30,000

individuals, mostly miners and agricultural workers, organized various actions, while U.S. support for the Bolivian junta increased American dominance over Bolivia. Notably, the operational activities of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) led to the capture of Che Guevara in 1967, after which he was executed by the junta-controlled Bolivian army (Langguth, 1978, pp. 285-286). John Perkins states, “*There are many ways to eliminate a leader who threatens U.S. hegemony... (Bolivia) It’s no surprise that the CIA was involved in the coup. Coups and counter-coups were never absent from Bolivia throughout the seventies.*” This expression highlights the role of American intelligence in military coups when U.S. hegemony is under threat (Perkins, 2009, pp. 10-56).

The role of intelligence has been significant in the United States’ established Grand Strategy. While the U.S. views regimes that may contradict its liberal ideals as security threats, it has carried out numerous covert operations in various countries to expand its hegemony. Former CIA agent John Perkins explains this situation as follows:

*“The U.S. maintains the world’s most sophisticated military. Although the empire is economically based (with the involvement of economic hitmen), world leaders know that when other sanctions are insufficient (as in Iraq), the military will be deployed”* (Perkins, 2009, pp. 10-11).

The previous explanations suggest that while the role of intelligence in America’s Grand Strategy appears to be operational, this perspective is incomplete. According to an article published by the Central Intelligence Agency titled “Strategic Intelligence Situation,” the key approach to intelligence within the Grand Strategy is strategic intelligence. Strategic intelligence not only shapes the Grand Strategy but is also described as the logic that directs the execution of the formulated strategy, rather than merely being an implementation plan (Heidenrich, 2007, pp. 2-4).

The United States’ strategy for maintaining its hegemony includes economic liberalization as a core component of its Grand Strategy. One of the reasons the U.S. perceives communism as a threat is its resistance to liberal policies. Following the end of the Cold War, the most significant impact on the international system was the rapid liberalization of the global economic system, alongside the emergence of regional conflicts and newly independent states. This situation has provided a breeding ground for weak states to harbor terrorist organizations. Consequently, the uncontrolled management of Middle Eastern energy resources by terrorists and weak states poses a threat to the U.S. from both economic and security standpoints. A clear example of this is the presence of Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, a weak state, which culminated in the attacks on September 11, 2001 (Ellis, 2009, pp. 362-366).

The United States’ “Grand Power Strategy” fundamentally consists of four interrelated parameters. The first is the enhancement of military power in both qualitative and quantitative terms, with emphasizing on supporting allies—most

notably, the previously mentioned support for Israel. Additionally, it aims to integrate states into the global economic order organized by the United States and prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this process, the support of a multifaceted intelligence field, ranging from economic intelligence to nuclear intelligence, is undeniably significant. The emergence of the People's Republic of China as a notable actor in the international system, along with the rise of regional actors, negatively affects American hegemony. While Patrick Porter notes in his article "Why America's Grand Strategy Has Not Changed" that the global economic crisis has negatively impacted American hegemony, he also argues that the United States' institutionalized state structure and the interactive assessment of National Power Elements do not present a pessimistic outlook regarding American hegemony (Porter, 2018, pp. 10-11).

It is noted that while the United States dollar holds a significant position in the international economy, the increasing presence of the People's Republic of China in the global system directly negatively affects American hegemony rather than merely impacting the U.S. economy. Alongside America's geopolitical superiority, the hegemony of the dollar, particularly in the context of the United States' trillion-dollar budget deficit, constitutes a crucial prerequisite for the U.S. in terms of its global security commitments and the distribution of power within the international system (Stokes, 2013, pp. 1070-1075). The United States' increasing vulnerability to dollar hegemony in the face of the People's Republic of China implies a need to strengthen economic intelligence rather than just focusing on strategic or operational intelligence. Although American senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan emphasized that the Central Intelligence Agency failed in economic and technological espionage, particularly during the Cold War, advocating for the passive treatment of these intelligence domains, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, economic intelligence has become an essential requirement within the framework of American Grand Strategy, just like strategic and operational intelligence (Foley, 1994, p. 136).

In a report published by the RAND Corporation in 2021, it was emphasized that military power should not be used as a tool in American Grand Strategy; instead, diplomacy should take precedence. Accordingly, in the expansion of diplomatic relations, strategic and intelligence diplomacy are highlighted over operational intelligence (NDISC, 2022).

In the studies mentioned above, we emphasized that the United States' perception of threats is integrated with military power. However, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the new threat perception of the United States has been defined as a state by realist theorists, who have indicated that states can also engage in economic warfare. The rapid shift of East Asian and Latin American countries toward heavy industry, along with their participation in the global search for raw materials, poses a threat to the American economy. This also jeopardizes the hegemony established by the United States. Under these conditions, Lieutenant Robert A. Rowe, who has served in the U.S. Navy, has stated that economic intelligence needs to be developed (Rowe, 1948, p. 546).

## Conclusion

The importance of military policies became apparent with the onset of the decline of colonization movements during the American War of Independence. Under the leadership of George Washington, the American independence movement was realized alongside an intelligence approach that had yet to achieve institutionalization. The success of intelligence activities during the American War of Independence remains a subject of debate. This is primarily because 19<sup>th</sup> century American intelligence was limited to military intelligence and propaganda efforts, which did not extend beyond these realms. However, American intelligence underwent a significant evolution following World War I.

The devastating effects of World War I had a profound impact on the entire world, leading to shifts in the political perspectives of many nations, including the United States. The changes in economic policies, particularly those resulting from economic successes, also prompted alterations in state policies. Woodrow Wilson's liberal economic philosophy and the political and diplomatic understanding rooted in Wilsonian principles influenced global dynamics significantly. Although it could not prevent the outbreak of World War II, it fundamentally transformed the United States' political, security, and diplomatic approaches.

With the Cold War, the United States' understanding of security emphasized the need to evaluate national power elements, as articulated by Hans Morgenthau, rather than relying solely on classical military policies. While intelligence remained a subsidiary aspect of military policy during this period it operated with a multidisciplinary approach.

The end of the Cold War marked the dollar's emergence as a significant tool in the global economy, establishing a foundational step for America's hegemony. Consequently, the United States' grand strategy adopted a more rational role, facilitating the support and strengthening of American hegemony. However, no strategy, policy, or diplomatic maneuver can be successfully implemented without prior knowledge. Strong strategies necessitate robust intelligence, which is an indispensable requirement. In this context, the success or failure of America's grand strategy will be more realistically determined by the effectiveness of intelligence operations rather than military presence.

While not the focus of this study, America's attempts to expand its hegemony to Vietnam, and its use of military force to overthrow Saddam in Iraq, illustrates this point. In Vietnam, the U.S. suffered a loss, and its success in Iraq remains debatable. However, the operational intelligence conducted against the Taliban has drawn international attention due to its lower budget and effective execution.

The maximization of America's interests and the continuation of its hegemony are contingent upon the strength of the dollar in the international economy and the effectiveness of the People's Republic of China's policies within the international

system. In this context, the United States requires a dynamic intelligence policy to maintain and protect its hegemony. This necessity extends beyond military intelligence to encompass strategic and economic intelligence efforts as well.

In conclusion, the role of intelligence in the United States' Grand Strategy has evolved significantly over time, adapting to shifting geopolitical landscapes and emerging threats. From its early reliance on rudimentary intelligence practices during the American Revolution to the sophisticated economic and strategic intelligence operations of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the U.S. has continuously sought to maintain its hegemony and address challenges posed by rival powers, particularly in the context of globalization and regional conflicts.

During the United States' independence process, intelligence was closely associated with military operations. Notably, America's perception of intelligence has influenced a wide range of topics, from foreign policy formulation to its grand strategy, especially after the Cold War. As a result, the United States has diversified the scope of intelligence, expanding it beyond purely military intelligence to include areas such as nuclear, operational, health, and economic intelligence et al. In our study, it has been determined that the most significant intelligence issues affecting America's grand strategy are operational and economic intelligence.



## References

- Aydın, G. (2019). The ebb and flow in the US trade policy: Does the hegemonic stability theory have explanatory power?, *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 33(4), pp. 1345 – 1366.
- Aydın, M. (1996). Approach, theory and analysis in international relations, *Ankara University Faculty of Social Sciences Journal*, 51(1), pp. 71-114, DOI:https://doi.org/10.1501/SBFder\_0000001917
- Arslan, L., & Yıldız, S. (2023). Amerika Kıtasında Kolonizasyon ve Birleşik Devletlerin Kuruluşu. *Dünya Multidisipliner Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6 (Prof. Dr. Durmuş Ali Aslan Özel Sayısı), 242-260.
- Avcı, Ö. (2018). *İletişim ve Propaganda: Propagandanın Türleri*, In M. Karaca & C. Çakı (Eds.), Konya: Education Publishing House.
- Bağçe, E. (2003). Emperyalizm Kuramları ve Amerikan Kamu Diplomasisi. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*.
- Birdişi, F. (2011). Ulusal Güvenlik Kavramının Tarihsel ve Düşünsel Temelleri. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(31), 149-169.
- Brad, M., & Mensch, J. (2018). *The first conspiracy: The secret plot to kill George Washington*, New York: Flatiron Books.
- Chang, I. F. (2023). *Hegemony & anti-hegemony in US-China relations*, U.S.: Independently published.
- Caldwell, Q. G. (2018). The importance of spies to Washington's success, *NCO Journal, Sergeants Major Course Class 67*.
- Cohen, B. J. (2008). *International political economy*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Ellis, D. C. (2009). U.S. grand strategy following the George W. Bush presidency, *International Studies Perspectives*, 10(1). pp. 361-377.
- Fingar, T. (2012). Intelligence and grand strategy, *ORBIS*, 56(1), pp. 118-134.
- Folley, T. D. (1994). The role of the CIA in economic and technological intelligence. *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, 18(1), pp. 135-145.
- Grizzard, F. E. (2002). *George Washington: A biographical companion*, New York: ABC-CLIO.
- Hartmann, F. (1957). *The Relations of Nations*, New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Heidenrich, J. G. (2007). The state of strategic intelligence, *Studies in Intelligence*, 51(2).
- Hurst, S. (2009). *The United States and Iraq since 1979: Hegemony, oil and war*, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hooker, R. D. (2016). *American grand strategy*, Washington.: National Defence University Press.
- Kaplan, R. (1990). The hidden war: British intelligence operations during the American Revolution, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 47(1), pp.115-138. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/2938043.
- Kılıçaslan, A. (2022). Bir disiplin olarak sosyal çalışmanın doğuşu ve kurumsallaşması: ABD örneği, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Langguth, A. J. (1978). *Hidden Terrors*, New York: Pantheon Books.

- Layne, C. (1998). Rethinking American grand strategy: Hegemony or balance of power in the twenty-first century? *SAGE*, 15(2), pp.8-28.
- Machiavelli. (2002). *The art of war*, (Nazım Güvenç, Trans.), İstanbul: Anahtar Kitapları.
- Manfred, S. B. (2006). *Globalization*, (Abdullah Ersoy, Trans.), Ankara: Dost Kitapevi.
- Martel, W. C. (2015). *Grand strategy in theory and practice: The need for an effective American foreign policy*, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Molzhan, W. (2023). The CIA's In-Q-Tel model and its applicability, *Acquisition Review Quarterly*, Winter 2003.
- Morgenthau, H. (1976). *International politics*, (Baskın Oran & Ünsal Oskay, Trans.). Ankara: Turkish Political Science Association Publications.
- Morgenthau, H. (n.d.). *Scientific man vs. power politics*, Middlesex: Latimer House Limited.
- Navari, C. (2016). Hans Morgenthau and the national interest. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 30(1), pp.47-54. DOI:10.1017/S089267941500060X.
- Özdal, B., & Karaca, K. (2015). *Diplomasi Tarihi I*, Türkiye: Dora Yayınları.
- Perkins, J. (2009). *Confessions of an economic hitman*, (Cihat Taşçioğlu, Trans), İstanbul: APRIL Publishing.
- Porter, P. (2018). Why America's grand strategy has not changed, *International Security*, 42(4), pp. 9-34.
- Prabhakar, R. (2010). Hegemonic stability theory and the 20th century international economy, *E-International Relations*.
- Rose, P. K. (n.d.). The founding fathers of American intelligence, Retrieved July 31, 2024, from [www.cia.gov.tr](http://www.cia.gov.tr).
- Rowe, R. A. (1945). The Need for Strategic Intelligence on Economic War Potential, *Proceedings*, 47(7).
- Sencer, M. (1987). The American Revolution in terms of human rights, *Human Rights Yearbook*, Number.9.
- Stokes, D. (2013). Achilles' deal: Dollar decline and US grand strategy after the crisis, *Review of International Political Economy*, 21(5), pp. 1071-1094 DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2013.779592>
- Trifunovic, D., & Curcic, M. (2021). National interest in security science: A realist perspective, *NSF Journal*, 22(3), pp.73-89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37458/nstf.22.3.3>
- Williams, B. (2021). *Japanese foreign intelligence and grand strategy from the Cold War to the Abe era*, Washington.: Georgetown University Press.
- Tezkan, Y. (2000). *Siyaset, Strateji ve Milli Güvenlik*, Ankara: Ülke Yayınları.

## **Internet Reference**

Crunchbase.com. (n.d.). In-Q-Tel. Retrieved June 6, 2024, from [https://www.crunchbase.com/organization/in-q-tel/recent\\_investments](https://www.crunchbase.com/organization/in-q-tel/recent_investments)

Defense Intelligence Agency. (2014). George Washington: More than a general and a president. DIA Public Affairs. Retrieved August 1, 2024, from <https://www.dia.mil/News-Features/Articles/Article-View/Article/566965/george-washington-more-than-a-general-and-a-president/#:~:text=Not%20only%20was%20George%20Washington,funding%20on%20intelligence%2Drelated%20activities.>

SSA, FDR's Statements on Social Security. Retrieved June 4, 2024, from <https://www.ssa.gov/history/fdrstmts.html>

Notre Dame International Security Center, (2022), Retrieved June 4, 2024, <https://ndisc.nd.edu>