

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC
RESEARCH
MENTOURI UNIVERSITY OF CONSTANTINE
FACULTY OF LETTERS AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

The Bush doctrine and legitimate war

Dissertation submitted in partial of
fulfillment of the requirement for the master
degree in British and American studies

Submitted by :

• **KECITA Basma.**

Supervised by :

• **Dr. N.MEGHERBI**

June 2010

DEDICATION

TO THE MEMORY OF MY DEAR GRAND FATHER.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. MEGHRBI, whose expertise, understanding and patience added considerably to my experience. I appreciate his vast knowledge and skills in many areas.

I would also like to thank all the English Department teachers for their constant guidance and help when in need.

A special thank goes to my beautiful family for the continuous support they provided me through my entire life and particularly I must acknowledge my sister KENZA, without whose love, encouragement and assistance, I would not finish this thesis and for sharing this experience, listening to my complaints and frustration.

And all my friends, Djamila & Zahra for being incredibly understanding, supportive and believed in me when I doubted myself

ABSTRACT

After September 11 attacks, terrorism is generally recognized as in the world community as both illegal and immoral .It is considered as an attack on the moral and legal fabric of civilization, an attack on decent political, social and cultural life.

President Bush declared in his second inaugural dress “It is the policy of the united states to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.”

The American administration under president G W Bush, has the responsibility of its domestic security and more than that the international security. The question here is that the bush doctrine of preemption resulting war in Afghanistan contains any legitimacy? In other words is the war on terror (war on Afghanistan) a legitimate one?

SUMMARY

International terrorism is a crime against humanity, more than violating national independence of countries, it also violates the right of individuals to security. However the use of force or intervention must be unjustified.

There are special circumstances that justified or at least morally demand it. Thus starting from that point, the decision to engage in military intervention is a fundamentally one moral one. The legitimate war tradition provides moral criteria, for determining whether such action is morally justifiable.

The question here is could the bush doctrine of preemption as a mean of security against terrorism be considered as a legitimate reaction? In other words does the Bush Doctrine in fighting terrorism in its preemptive form contains any legitimacy?

Through my work process I try to answer this question, starting with an over view of terrorism in USA, then giving definitions to terrorism and Al-Qaida, and also the world response to the war on terror declared by president Bush under his doctrine of preemption.

Also I explain the misuse of the term preemption in order to achieve American goal. In addition to that the criteria that should met to say that a war is a legitimate one.

Finally, my study case is going to be Afghanistan and what USA really wants to achieve there. Before this, there is a background of Afghanistan and its history, then there is an analysis of the American strategy including its ends, means and ways.

Résumé:

Le terrorisme international est un crime contre l'humanité, et un viole de l'indépendance nationale des pays, il viole également le droit des individus à la sécurité. Toutefois, l'utilisation de la force ou l'intervention doit être justifiée.

Il ya des circonstances particulières qui justifient, ou en moins la morale le demande. Donc à partir de ce point, la décision de s'engager dans l'intervention militaire est fondamentalement une morale. La légitime guerre traditionnelle prévoit des critères moraux, pour déterminer si une telle action est moralement justifiable.

La question qui se pose ici est ; peut-on considérer la doctrine de Bush -considérant la préemption comme un moyen de sécurité contre le terrorisme- comme une légitime réaction? En d'autres termes, est ce que la doctrine de Bush dans sa forme préemptive dans la guerre contre le terrorisme contienne la moindre légitimité ?

A travers mon processus de travail, j'essaie de répondre à cette question, à commencer par donner une vue globale du terrorisme aux Etats-Unis, puis en donnant des définitions du terrorisme et d'Al-Qaeda, et aussi la réaction mondiale à la guerre contre le terrorisme déclarée par le président Bush dans sa doctrine de préemption.

Aussi expliquer la male utilisation du terme préemption en vue d'atteindre l'objectif américain. En plus de ça, les critères qui devraient être réunis pour dire que c'est une guerre légitime.

Enfin, mon cas d'étude va être l'Afghanistan et ce que les États-Unis veulent vraiment réaliser là-bas. Avant cela, il y a un aperçu de l'Afghanistan et de son histoire, alors il ya une analyse de la stratégie américaine, y compris ses extrémités, voies et moyens.

ملخص:

الإرهاب الدولي هو جريمة ضد الإنسانية، وأكثر من ذلك هو انتهاك للاستقلال الوطني للبلدان ، كما أنه ينتهك حق الأفراد في الأمن. ومع ذلك يجب أن يكون هناك مبرر للتدخل أو لاستخدام القوة.

هناك ظروف خاصة تبرر ذلك أو على الأقل تتطلبه الأخلاق. بدءا من تلك النقطة وبالتالي، فإن قرار المشاركة في التدخل العسكري هو في الأساس مسألة أخلاقية. إن تقاليد الحرب المشروعة تتطلب معايير أخلاقية معينة، لتحديد ما إذا كان مثل هذا العمل له ما يبرره أخلاقيا.

والسؤال المطروح هنا هو هل يمكن اعتبار عقيدة بوش الاستباقية كوسيلة أمن لمكافحة الإرهاب رد فعل شرعي؟. وبعبارة أخرى هل مبدأ بوش في محاربة الإرهاب في شكله الوقائي يتضمن أي شرعية؟

من خلال عملي حاولت الإجابة على هذا السؤال ، بدءا من عرض نظرة عامة عن الإرهاب في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية ، ثم إعطاء تعريف للإرهاب وتنظيم القاعدة، وكذلك رد فعل العالم على الحرب على الإرهاب التي أعلنها الرئيس بوش في إطار عقيدته الوقائية.

كما شرحت سوء استخدام مصطلح الحرب الاستباقية من أجل تحقيق الأهداف الأمريكية. بالإضافة إلى المعايير التي يجب أن تتوفر للقول عن حرب ما أنها شرعية.

وأخيرا، مثال الدراسة في هذه الأطروحة سيكون أفغانستان و ما كانت الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية تحاول الوصول إليه هناك. قبل هذا ، قدمت نظرة عن أفغانستان وتاريخها ، ثم تحليل الإستراتيجية الأمريكية بما في ذلك أهدافها، الوسائل والطرق.

Table of Content:

Introduction.

Chapter 01 :

- Introduction.
 - 1- Background.
 - Resulting war on terror.
 - 2- September and after math.
 - 3- A new phenomenon.
 - 3-1 Definition of terrorism.
 - 3-2 Al-Qaida.
 - 4- The world after September 11th.
 - 4-1 International response to the war on terror.
- Conclusion.

Chapter 02:

- Introduction.
 - 1- Bush Doctrine.
 - 1-1Principles.
 - 1-2The consequences from the misuse of preemption and prevention.
 - 2- Bush Doctrine and legitimate action.
 - 2-1 just cause.

2-2Right authority.

2-3Reasonable hope of success.

2-4Last resort.

- Conclusion.

Chapter 03:

- Introduction.

1- Background to recent developments in Afghanistan.

2- Analysis of the war in Afghanistan.

2.1 National strategy for the war in Afghanistan.

3- The ends of U.S in Afghanistan.

4- The ways of U.S in Afghanistan.

5- The means of U.S in Afghanistan.

- Conclusion.

Conclusion.

Introduction:

The world is at the crossroads of the most serious crisis in the modern history. In the largest display of military might since the second world war. The U.S has embarked upon a military adventure, which threatens the future of humanity.

An understanding of the underlying historical background is crucial, this war agenda is not the product of a distinct neo-conservative project .from the outset of the cold war era, there is a consistent threat, a continuing U.S military doctrine, from the Truman doctrine to bush's war on terrorism.

From the outset of the cold war, the objective was to undermine and ultimately destroy Soviet Union. Washington was also intent upon waking United Nations as a genuine international body, and objective that has largely been achieved under the bush administration.

The war in Afghanistan is a part of a military road map, confirmed by a military documents, the U.S war agenda, not only targets Iran, Syria and North Korea, but also its former cold war enemies: Russia and china.

We are dealing with a global military agenda characterized by various forms of intervention. The latter include covert military and intelligence operations in support of domestic paramilitary groups and so called liberation armies, these operations are largely devised with view of creating social, ethnic and political divisions with national societies, ultimately contributing of entire countries.

After September 11 2001, a ruthless, tragic, terrible event, burned into minds and hearts the U.S had alternatives. The bush administration could have, as it had done in so other many cases of terrorism pursued the criminals through the system of law enforcement. This would have meant slower process, a process that would have been less emotional and less political, and would have required international police and intelligence cooperation.

The people of us and the world endured a heinous act of terrorism, that act has lead to the war on terrorism, and the redefinition of American foreign policy and its national security strategy.

In this work, I'm going to explain how do the September attacks shape bush policy resulting preemption war in Afghanistan and does this new strategy constitute a legitimacy that is justifiable response to terrorism.

On September 20,2001bush delivered an ultimatum to the Taliban government of Afghanistan to turn over Ben Laden and al-Qaida leaders. Operating in the country or face attack. The Taliban demanded evidences of Ben Laden's link to the September attacks and if such evidence warranted a trial, they offered to handle such a trial in an Islamic court, the U.S refused to provide any evidence. Us as the world as the only super power is less vulnerable to military defeat .but it is more vulnerable to animosity of other countries it is taken an enormous leap of imagination to understand what is terrorism are about, what they really do want to kill people and destroy civilization as it is known. The bush administration, has never ad equality explained the theology and ideology behind terrorism or convinced us of its ruthless fanaticism .the first rule of war is to know your enemy and most Americans do not know theirs.

In my work, I started by a back ground of the American history with terrorism, and if really the American policy as the greatest power on the universal level makes it a main target for terrorist attacks. Then I present some definitions of terrorism, and also definitions of al-Qaida and its relationship with U.S. Next I speak about how the September attacks effected the nation' s policies around the world, and of course the American policy under the presidency of George w bush. In other words, I want to explain their responses to the September attacks ,and I try to present the world after September events and its response to these attacks and also to the war on terror (Afghanistan) .

In my second chapter, I speak about the bush doctrine and its principles and the new preemption policy, also the results from the misunderstanding and the misuse of the two concepts of preemption and prevention.

The administration designates this policy as"preemptive", a word refers to actions designed to head off a pending or imminent threat attack that has already taken definitive form. In addition to that I want to discuss the legitimacy of the

bush doctrine according to series of principles concluding just cause, right intention and authority, reasonable hope for success and last resort.

In my last chapter, I start by a historical overview of Afghanistan, concluding its historical and political background, and its recent developments from the conflict with Soviet Union and communism; to the relations with U.S. Next I introduce an analysis to the war in Afghanistan. This analysis containing the ends, and the means and the ways that U.S followed to achieve its goals in Afghanistan.

This work is an analysis of the American administration under President George W. Bush, it presents the other side of the bush doctrine and the American policy in Afghanistan, and whether the war in Afghanistan is a legitimate one.

Introduction

International terrorism has long been recognized as foreign and domestic security threat. The tragic events of September 11th in New York, the Washington DC area, and Pennsylvania have dramatically re-energized the nation's focus and resolve on terrorism. This issue brief examines international terrorist action and threats, and the US policy response. Available policy options range from diplomacy international cooperation and constructive engagement to economic sanctions, covert actions, physical security enhancement, and military force.

The September 11th terrorist incidents in US, the subsequent anthrax attacks, as well as bombings of the USS Cole, Oklahoma city, world trade centre in 1993, and of the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, have brought the issue of terrorism to the fore front of American public interest¹.

Terrorists activities supported by sophisticated planning and logistics as well as possible access to unconventional weaponry raise a host of new issues. Some analysts long held belief that a comprehensive review of US counter terrorism policy, organizational structure, and intelligence capabilities is needed has now become a mainstream view.

The terrorism threat to America takes many forms, has many places to hide, and is often invisible. The war on terrorism cannot be pinpointed in time and place because both are of the terrorist's choosing.

Yet the post 9/11 conventional wisdom that "everything has changed" and "the world will never be the same" requires qualification. The 9/11 attacks ushered in a new age of American vulnerability and exposed the dark side of globalization.

¹ Raphael perl, *Terrorism, the future, and US foreign policy*(springerverlag.2005).p2.

“In the post 9/11, world, America remains the indispensable super power. But global terrorism no longer permits it to be a reluctant cherrif”¹. That chapter, will represents an overview of September 11th events, starting by the background of terrorism especially in US, and why US, in particular is considered as a main target for international terrorism, in other words : does these attacks consider as a result of US foreign policy ?

Also the chapter provides us a reflection on the world since the attacks, “since September 11th the world has indeed changed and now where more than in the area of countering terrorist financing¹, in other words the new world system after September 11th and how the nations around the globe deal with the attacks, and response to it.

In fact the result of September 11th is an unprecedented strengthening of US. Hegemony, in all its aspects. But this represents just one usual element of a broader American foreign policy that otherwise adhered strongly to established norms.

1- Background

Until last decade, terrorism has been primarily viewed as an international and foreign policy issue. US policies, citizens, and interest are main targets for international terrorism, for example “in 2001, approximately 63 % of all terrorist incidents worldwide were committed against US citizens or property compared to 23 % in 1995, according to the US department of state, and the vast majority of those acts have taken place on foreign soil. State department data indicate that between 1991 and 2001, 100 American nationals were killed in terrorist attacks abroad”². It is clear that the event of September 2001 really had changed the US public perception of terrorism as an overseas issue.

According to US policy international terrorism is recognized as a threat to US foreign policy and domestic security. Both timing and target selection by terrorist can

¹ R slitwak The Imperial republic after 9/11 .(<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/af31e344-0499-11df-8603-00144feabdc0.html>).p7

² R perl, Terrorism, the future and US foreign policy(springerverlag.2005).p2

affect US interests in different areas: from preservation of commerce to the Middle East peace process.

The fact that the September 11th attacks struck New York and Washington, the two capitals of globalization explains not only why Americans were so deeply shocked and moved but also why the rest of the world was to such a degree. For a new generation of Americans, terrorism had been brought in to their borders, and “not since the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 did Americans feel anything as a threat to their homeland as this”¹.

-Resulting war on terror

The terrible events of September 11th saw the considerable quieting of what was until then growing domestic and international criticism of the Bush administration. The September 11th attacks resulted in a war on terror which saw support for Bush and his popularity soar at the time. Up to September 11th 2001, Bush administration was been criticized around the world for its stances on various issues domestically and internationally. Even European and other allies were very critical of positions on numerous global issues.

But even before the Bush administration, throughout the world, many nations and groups of people had expressed their frustrations at how US foreign policy had affected them on all sorts of issues, ranging from economic, globalization issues that have deepened poverty and inequality for most people around the world, arms, missile, defense, environmental problems and so on. Protests either directly or indirectly at US policies have accrued all around the world.

Yet that cannot be an excuse for the atrocity of September 11th as it killed many innocent people. People have correctly pointed out that when other regions around the world have faced similar terrorist attacks, the outpouring of concern has not been as much. However, behind the unity of the American people in the shock of September 11th, a heightened sense of security has resulted with concerns reverberating throughout the world, which of course affects all citizens. Many are concerned about the crackdown of freedoms and civil liberties in other nations. That

¹ M zaborwsky, Friends again ? EU US relations after the crisis, (paris institute for security study.2006) p102.

has resulted because of this. Many are concerned that various countries can also use this “war on terror” as an excuse to pursue more aggressive options or other policies that affect the rights of citizens¹.

Shortly after September 11th attacks in the name of fighting terrorism, government have rushed to introduce draconian new majors that threaten the human rights of the own citizens and immigrants. Governments have responsibility to ensure the safety of their citizens, but majors taken must not undermine fundamental human rights standards.

2- September 11th and after math

On September 11th 2001, in an apparently well financed, coordinated attack hijackers, rammed jetliners into each of the New York world trade center’s towers and ultimately collapsed down. A third hijacked airliner plowed into the pentagon, and the forth hijacked airliner crashed near Pittsburgh, raising speculation that related mission had failed.

In the absence of a final death toll from New York city, the US state department’s patterns of global terrorism 2001 estimate that approximately 3 000 persons died in the attacks, including nationals of 78 different countries in the destruction of the world trade center alone. Study by the New York City partnership and chamber of commerce (November 2001, revised February 2002) calculates the direct and indirect economic costs of the destruction of the world trade center at \$83 billion in 2001².

The administration’s response to the September 11th events, was decisive and swift administration officials attributed responsibility for the attack to Osama Ben Laden and his organization Al Qaeda. The doors were opened for USA : a full scale complain was lunched using all elements of national and international power, to go after Al Qaeda and support structures. The complain involved rallying the international community, especially law enforcement and intelligence component, to shutdown Al Qaeda cells and financial networks.

¹ Anup Shah, War in terror, (http://www.globalissues.org/issue/245/war_on_terror).

² Raphael perl, Terrorism, the future and US foreign policy,(springerverlag.2005) , p1.

3- A new historical phenomenon

Is terrorist activity linked with Islam? Terrorism is actually a worldwide scourge that has reared its head under diverse countries as dissimilar as Germany, Japan, Italy, Argentina and Greece. Before it assumed its recent Islamic form, it was successively or simultaneously Palestinian, Israeli, Egyptian and Yemeni it was also endemic, occasional, individual nationalist or governmental in nature, and it primarily targeted local population.

Al Qaeda (brand of terrorism) is an entirely new historical phenomenal quiet different in its makeup. Targeting US interest almost exclusively. Al Qaeda operate on a worldwide scale, in more than fifty countries according to US state department, and makes use practices and technology made possible by globalization.

Often influenced by western culture, al Qaeda members are recruited among the middle classes and work in small cells when inspired by directives from the center. This organization is not the direct tool of any state, for financial and logistical support, it relies on private collaborators and wealthy backers. Unlike the previous generation of other organizations, who acted all behalf of organizations that also engaged in non-violent political activities. Ben laden's disciples apparently do not have any structured popular support. They are in some ways marginalized, yet they claim to speak and act on behave of some Muslims of all religious persuasions.

3-1 Definition:

International terrorism has no universally accepted definition, the famous one that US government used defines international terrorism as terrorism involving the citizens or property of more than one country. Terrorism is broadly defined as politically motivated violence perpetrated against innocent targets by sub national groups or clandestine members. A terrorist group is a group which practices terrorism¹. This traditional definition focuses on groups and excludes individuals.

Another definition of terrorism is the premeditated use of threat of use violence by groups or individuals to obtain political or social objectivities through intimidation of a large public beyond that of the immediate innocent victims. In other

¹Raphael pearl Terrorism, the future and US foreign policy,(springerverlag,2005) , p4.

words terrorist try to achieve their political goals through violence on a public who may than pressure government to concede to the terrorists¹.

Also terrorism can be defined as a form of asymmetric conflict where terrorists are unable to engage in direct struggle, that why terrorists act strategically using violence against non-combatants in order to arrive to their goals, whether political, ideological, or religious ones².

So in the most general sense, the systematic use of terror especially as a mean of coercion. Now the international community has been unable to formulate universally agreed, legally binding, criminal law definition of terrorism³.

Common definitions of terrorism refer only to those violent acts which are intended to create fear (terror), are perpetrated for an ideological goal (as opposed to alone attack) and deliberately target or disregard the safety of civilians.

Some definitions also include acts of unlawful violence and war. The history of terrorism suggest that they do not select terrorism for it political effectiveness. Individuals tend to be motivated more by a desire for social solidarity with other members of their organization that political platforms as strategic objectivities⁴.

The word terrorism is politically and economically charged and this greatly compounds the difficulty of providing a precise definition⁵. Terrorism has been practiced by a broad array of political organization of furthering their objectives, it has been practiced by nationalistic groups, religious groups, revolutionaries, and ruling governments.

The American heritage definition defines terrorism as the unlawful use of threatened use of force or violence by a person or an organized group against people or property, with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies or governments often for ideological or political reasons⁶.

This definition indicates that terrorism is a tactic employed as a mean to an end, in other words: to declare war against a tactic may expediently yield some short-

¹ Todd Sandler, Collective versus unilateral response to terrorism, (Combridge university press.2003), p76.

² Daniel G.Arce and Todd Sandler Strategic analysis of terrorism, (Borgo Press.2003) p333.

³ Thalif Politics U.N member states, struggle to define terrorism, (Inter press service.2005) p25.

⁴ Abrahms Max, what terrorists really want : motives and counter terrorism strategy : international security, (Combridge ma. kit press.2004) p86-89.

⁵ Hoffman Bruce, inside terrorism, p32.

⁶ <http://www.britannica.com>, (Columbia press.1998),p3.

term benefits, however denying the enemy his primary tactic arguably does not address the long-term root causes of the problem.

3-2 Al Qaeda :

« The base », is an islamist group founded sometime between August 1988 and the late 1989. it operates as a network comprising both a multinational, stateless arm, and a fundamentalist Sunni movement calling for jihad¹.

Characteristics techniques include suicide attacks and simultaneous bombings of different targets. Activities ascribed to it may involve members of the movement, who have taken a pledge of loyalty to Osama Ben Laden, or the much more numerous “Al Qaeda linked” individuals who have undergone training in one of its camps in Afghanistan, but not taken any pledge².

Al Qaeda ideologues envision a complete break from the foreign influences in Muslims countries, and the creation of a new Islamic caliphate. Reported beliefs include that a Christian – Jewish alliance is conspiring to destroy Islam³, which is largely embodied in the U.S Israel alliance, and that the killing of bystanders and civilians in religious justified in jihad.

Al Qaeda’s management philosophy has been described as “Centralization of decision and decentralization of execution”⁴. Many terrorism experts don’t believe that the global jihadist movement is driven at every level by Osama Ben Laden and his followers.

Although Osama Ben Laden still has a huge ideological sway over some Muslim extremists, experts argue that Al Qaeda has fragmented over the years into a variety of disconnected regional movements that have little connection with each other.

¹ Bergen Al-Qaeda2006, (New York monthly Review Press,2006.)p75.

² Wright, September 2001. (Inter press service,USA,2006), p270

³ Fuad Husayn Alzarqawi, the 2nd generation of Al Qaeda, (Al Quds Al Arabi, july 13 2005). p14.

⁴ Al Hammadi Khalid, the inside story of Al Qaeda, (Al Quds Al Arabi, March 22,2005). part 4.

Marc Sageman, a psychiatrist and former CIA officer said that Al Qaeda would now just be a “loose label for a movement that seems to target the west”. There is no umbrella organization, it seems as the world likes to create a mythical entity called “Al Qaeda” in its mind but that is not the reality the world is dealing with¹.

Others, however, see Al Qaeda as an integrate network that is strongly led from the Pakistani tribal areas, and has a powerful strategic purpose.

Bruce Holfman, a terrorism expert at Georgetown university, said “it amazes that people don’t think there is a clear adversary out there, and that our adversary does not have a strategic approach”.

Notes of a meeting of Ben Laden others on August 20, 1988. Indicate Al Qaeda was a formal group by that time: ”basically an organized Islamic faction, its goals is to lift the word of god, to make his religion victorious”².

Al Qaeda was formed at an August 11, 1988, meeting between “Several senior leaders” of Egyptian Islamic jihad; Abdullah Azzam” and Ben Laden, where it was agreed to join Ben Laden’s money with the expertise of the Islamic jihad organization and take up the jihadist cause elsewhere after the soviets withdrew from Afghanistan³ but before, in 1979, the largest covert operation in history of the CIA was launched in Afghanistan, with the active encouragement of CIA and Pakistan’s ISI (Inter Services Intelligence), who turned the Afghan jihad into a global war waged by all Muslim states against the Soviet Union. This project of the US, was entrusted in challenging covert military aid to the Islamic bridges and financing US support to the mujahedeen was presented to the world, as a necessary response: to the 1979 soviet invasion of Afghanistan in support of the procommunist government⁴.

¹ Blit Z.James, January, *A threat transformed.*(routlegde.2005). p75.

² <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/af31e344-0499-11df-8603-00144feabdc0.html>.

³ Wright, *September 2001.* (Inter press service,USA,2006), p133-134.

⁴ Ibid, p260.

4- The world after September 11th

In fact talking about changes that happened at universal level, after September 11th attacks in US referring to the impact of significant changes that occurred in US foreign policy and defense policies on other part of the globe it would not have had such tremendous impacts worldwide.

Many countries are pushed to adjust their foreign and defense policy according to US global agenda since it is the global power.

The world finds itself in a new strategic system marked by a minimum of eight main characteristics:

First, September 11th events have reinforced the borderless world thesis, but also reaffirmed the dominant meaning of the state. In other words territorial boundaries seem to be irrelevant, at the same time however, civilians believed that the state is the only security provider.

Second, the US reaction have created a new world system with more complicated relationship among countries. When president Bush declared: “either you are with us or you are with the terrorist”. He created a black and white world, in other words a struggle between good and bad. A division like that had put many countries in a very difficult position, and many nations could not accept why war on terror has to be fought under American leadership, and on American values. Other nations are more concerned about their home problems (poverty, ethnic struggles, and economic recovery) rather than terrorism.

Third, September 11th attacks have changed the major power relations. Russia and China, for example found a new kind of relationship with US, speaking about coalition more than competition, by their support to American military invention.

Forth, September 11th changed completely the concept of the enemy, and also changed the traditional security issues in international relations. The attack on world trade center and pentagon clearly demonstrated that a threat to state do not necessarily come from other state. The threats could come from anywhere, against anyone, and by anyone. This what makes terrible situations, and even the use of military forces in such case do not and the conflict or find final and real solution. Non-traditional security threat can only be faced through a coordinated universal effort at multilateral level to deal with the origins of the issue.

Fifth, September 11th shows that US depends on new values in judging the other states, and that it more worried about terrorism rather than democracy and human rights, especially when US has forging an anti-terrorism alliance with the Pakistani president Pervez Musharraf, despite that he came to power through a military coup. In short between the enemy and friend the commitment to fight terrorism will become a more important indicator for US rather than democracy and human rights, especially that terrorism posed a direct threats to American interests.

Sixth, war on terrorism carried out by the US has opened up an opportunity for many national regimes to manipulate the issue for their own domestic purposes, for example : what Russia did in Chechnya and also what Israel did in Palestine using war on terrorism Israel has brutally destroyed Palestine and massacred Palestinians.

The seventh impact of September 11th attacks on US has been the dramatic change in the calculus of American foreign policy priorities and interest. The doctrine of pre-emption gives US the right to undertake a pre-emptive strike, to destroy what it believes as a threat to its interests, both at home and abroad.

Finally, September 11th tragedy has created a new world where Islam has become the center of attention and suspicion. Some see the September 11th attacks have the evidence for the clash of civilizations between Islam and the west¹.

4-1 International response to the war on Afghanistan:

On 16th September 2001, at Camp David, president George Bush mentioned the war on terror when he said: “this crusade, this war on terrorism is going to take a while [...] and the American people should be patient. I’m going to be patient, but I can assure the American people I’m determined”². During a televised address to a joint session of congress. President Bush launched the war on terror when he said :”our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there, it will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated”.

On September 20th, 2001 Bush delivered an ultimatum to the Taliban government of Afghanistan to turn over Ben Laden and Al Qaeda leaders. Operating

¹ Rizal Sukma War on terror, islam and the imperative democracy: (springer-verlag.2004). p86.

² Kenneth R.Bazinet, A fight vs Evil, bush and cabinet tell US, (Borgo press.2004).p105.

in the country or face attack. The Taliban demanded evidence of Ben Laden's link to September 11th attacks, and if such evidence warranted a trial, they offered to handle such a trial in an Islamic court the US refused to provide any evidence.

Subsequently, in October 2001, US with some coalition allies invaded Afghanistan to oust the Taliban regime which had control of the country, on October 7th, 2001, the official invasion began with British and American forces conducting airstrike campaigns.

The attacks were denounced by mass media and governments worldwide. Across the globe nations offered US support and solidarity. Leaders in most Middle Eastern countries and Afghanistan condemned the attacks. Iraq was a notable exception, with an immediate official statement that "the American cowboys are reaping the fruits of their crimes against humanity"¹.

Tens of thousands of people attempted to flee Afghanistan. Following the attacks fearing response by US. Pakistan already home to many afghan refugees from previous afghan conflict, closed its border with Afghanistan. On September 17th approximately one month after the attacks, US led a broad coalition of international forces in the removal of the Taliban regime for the harboring Al Qaeda, Pakistan moved to align themselves with the US in a war against Al Qaeda, that's why it provided US a member of military airports and bases for its attack on the Taliban regime and arrested over 600 suspected Al Qaeda members, whom it handed over US².

Some countries: Canada, China, United Kingdom, France, Russia, Germany, India and Pakistan introduced anti-terrorism legislation and froze the bank account of businesses, and individuals they suspected of having Al Qaeda ties. Law enforcement and intelligence agencies in number of countries such as: Malaysia, Italy, Indonesia and the Philippines arrested people they labeled terrorist suspect for the state purpose of breaking up militant cells around the world³.

¹ Hertz Berg Bendrik, September 11th 2001, lost love, (the New Yorker, http://www.newyorker.com/archives/2006/9/11/06.0911ta_talkhertzberg).

² Terrorism – Wikipedia, (the free encyclopedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/terrorism>).

³ September 11 attacks - Wikipedia, (the free encyclopedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/September_11_attacks).

Conclusion:

Although the US were facing up to a new role as first time 21st century domestic victims in the wake of 9/11, the country's response to the attacks was, in fact, strikingly familiar. Far from resulting in a radical new foreign policy agenda, G Bush's post 9/11 programme was shaped by his predecessors, not least his own father, the "famous presidential reference to the 'axis of evil' made by the younger president Bush in early 2002, rhetorically lumped together the separate challenges posed by North Korea to the stability of Northeast Asia, by Iran's longer-range ambitions in the Persian Gulf region, and by the unfinished legacy of the 1991 campaign against Iraq's Saddam Hussein"¹.

Bush himself had immediately placed the events of September 11th, in a broader historical contest "the Pearl Harbour of the 21st century took place today"².

Equally, bush has compared the post 9/11 international political climate to that of the cold war, he made a speech to congress less than 02 weeks after 9/11, on September 20, 2001 in which he remarked that "these terrorists.....are the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th centurythey follow the path of fascism, and Nazism and totalitarianism"³.

Bush's "axis of evil" speech appeared to signal a shift from the measured, restrained, and coalition focused language and behaviour shown by his administration in the first days after 9-11 to a new brand of head strong American unilateralism⁴.

¹ Zbignien Brzezinski, the choice: global domination or global leadership, (New York : basic book, 2004), p27.

² Timothy garton Ash, free world : why a crisis of the west reveals, the opportunity of our time, (London, Penguin, 2005), p117.

³ Gilbert Achcar, translated by Peter Drucker, the clash of barbarism, September 11th and the making of the New World disorder, (New York, monthly review press, 2002), p48.

⁴ Peterson & Mark A.pollak, Europe, America, Bush, transatlantic relations in the twenty first century, (studies.2004),p8.

As he came into office, bush favoured a militant form of “Unilateralism”, promising strong and decisive American military weight, and 9/11 offered Bush the chance to manifest this.

The terrorist attacks on 9-11 were immediately, within a matter of hours, conceived by the Bush administration as an act of war, an alternative conception would have been to understand the action as an international crime against humanity. The former understanding logically lead to a response conceived a war – a war on terrorism.

President Bush declared: “the deliberate and deadly attacks which were carried out yesterday our country were more than acts of terror, they were acts of war”¹.

In the new security strategy of the US it is stated “the United states of America is fighting a war against terrorists of global reach. The enemy is not a single political regime or person, or religion or ideology, the enemy is terrorism premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against innocents².

Bush’s foreign policy especially his doctrine of pre-emptive war and his emphasis on the spread of democracy, is that represent a radical break with the American past.

¹ G.B, remarks by the president in photo opportunity with the national security team,(the white house, September 12, 2001),<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/9/20010912-4.html>

² National Security Council,(the national security strategy of the US),
<http://whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html>.

Introduction

The current U.S national security strategy for fighting the war against terrorism is under attack as a policy that is unsustainable ,unilateral and a marked departure from past U.S principles ,it calls for an open-ended war against terrorism that continues to be costly the United States in both blood and treasure . Although the Bush doctrine calls for human rights , and the American mission of spreading democracy around the world ,it is perceived as being largely words with no action, and when action is called for ,it is force . to win the fight against terrorism an alternative strategy is needed , this strategy should be sustainable and can be supported at home and abroad . The Bush doctrine in reality reflects something else. The current U.S strategy for fighting terrorism is documented in the national strategy for combating terrorism, the national security strategy , and speeches by president G.W Bush .the strategy has been uniquely different in principle than any previous administration 's strategy , and is often referred to as the 'Bush doctrine' . The U.S strategy to combat terrorism was first published in February 2003.under the title 'national strategy for combating terrorism'. The strategy's top priority was explained as securing the home land from future attacks .it indicated that the fight against terrorism would use all available means :diplomatic ,economic ,law enforcement, financial ,information ,intelligence ,and even military. The strategy stated that "the U.S will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community in this fight against a common foe. If necessary, however ,we will not hesitate to act alone , to exercise our right to self- defense , including acting preemptively against terrorists to prevent them from doing harm to our people and our countries "¹.

The strategy's goal for defeating terrorism is listed as a 4 D strategy: defeat ,deny ,diminish ,and defend.

This chapter will present a definition of the Bush doctrine , including its main principles ,then, there is an evaluation to it ,in other words is it the

¹ Lora. S Aggour, the strategy of containment in fighting terrorism.(Master dissertation. Indonesia university.2007). p33.

right choice for the American administration to follow such policy, and if so, is that doctrine of preemption contains any legitimacy?

1-Bush Doctrine

When he was elected to the American presidency in 2000, George W. Bush gave every indication that he, like his father before him, was a conventional “realist” in foreign affairs, committed to a grand strategy of selective engagement.

In many speeches, Bush stressed foreign policy retrenchment and military “transformation” in preparation for the emergence of a future large peer competitor in the vein of the Soviet Union during the cold war.

Personally, neither Bush, nor his advisers spoke of spreading democracy throughout the world.

Then came 9/11 to the surprise of almost everyone, the president abandoned his realism and embraced an approach to foreign affairs that seemed to be a revolution in U.S and the globe. For the first time, the “Bush Doctrine” was enunciated in a speech he delivered on September 20th, 2001, only nine days after the attacks and then refined and elaborated in three more speeches over the next nine months.

G.W. Bush’s foreign policy meaning his doctrine of preemptive war and his emphasis on the spread of democracy. Is that it represents a radical break with the American post. U.S foreign policy was originally based on the principle of nonintervention.

The Bush doctrine is in fact well with the main stream of U.S foreign policy and very much in keeping with the vision of America’s founding generation, in other words, the Bush doctrine is only the latest manifestation of the fact that U.S national interest has always been concerned with more than simple security, it has always had both a commercial and ideological component.

1-1Principles:

The most concise statement of the Bush doctrine can be observed in G. Bush's second inaugural address: "it is the policy of the united state to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world¹.

While this statement captures the essence of the Bush doctrine unapologetically asserts the need for and the possibility of moral judgment in international affairs, the Bush doctrine holds that liberal democratic regimes are superior to tyrannies².

The second principle of the Bush doctrine is the repudiation of the "social work" theory of terrorism, which means that economic factors such as: poverty and hunger are the root causes of the phenomenon. The Bush doctrine is founded on the contention that the terrorism that spawned 9/11 and its precursors, both against the united states and Israel, is a murderous ideology aimed at the destruction of western liberalism, according, this ideology is a dangerous as fascism, Nazism and communism, according to the bush doctrine, the origins of 9/11 and similar aggression is "the culture of tyranny in the middle east, which spawns fanatical, aggressive, secular, antireligious despotisms". The remedy for this democratic regime change.

The final principle of the bush doctrine is the recognition that after 9/11, the traditional approaches to threats, deterrence's and containment are inadequate when dealing with terrorists and rogue regimes seeking to acquire weapons of mass destruction, thus, under the Bush doctrine, the U.S reserves the right to undertake preventive war. While international law and norms have always acknowledged the right of a state to launch a preemptive strike against another when a attack by the latter is imminent, it has rejected any right of preventive war. President Bush argued that in an age of globalization, catastrophic terrorism, and weapons of mass

¹ George Bush, Second inaugural address, (January 20, 2005.
http://www.voicesofdemocracy.umd.edu/documents/parry_giles_bush.pdf).

² Robert G. Kaufman, in defense of Bush doctrine, (proceedings.2002)pp 87-99.

destruction, this distinction had become meaningless. If an attack is imminent, it is now too late to preempt it.

As a policy or grand strategic approach to international relations, the Bush doctrine is a species of primary, based on the intersection of hegemonic stability theory and the theory of the democratic peace.

Hegemonic stability theory holds that a liberal world order: does not arise spontaneously as the result of some global “invisible hand”¹.

Instead, such system requires a great hegemonic power, plus a very strong willing to provide the globe with the economic stability and international security, in other words for a better world.

The U.S took up the role of hegemony not out of altruism but because it is in its national interest to do so.

1-2The consequences from the misuse of preemption and prevention:

Bush has brought the concept of prevention, preemption and anticipatory action to the FOE. Although each word has its semantic meaning reflected in general-purpose dictionaries, the discussion of new national security strategy uses them. More or less, in the changeably. For example, this chapter intended to define and outline the concept of preemption, use the verb prevent in its heading to summaries the chapter’s contents by using both terms.

The prevention and preemption are rooted in Latin verbs *praevenire* (to forestall) and *praemare* (to buy before others).according to the verb prevent, relevant to this discussion, are ‘to deprive of power or hope of acting or succeeding’ and ‘to keep from happening or existing’². This definition is more than academic exercise. In strategic debate, a number of practical consequences result from the use and misuse of prevention and preemption. First an essential distinction in current international

¹ Robert Gilpin, the political economy of the international relations,(San Bernardo Press, California.USA) pp 72-80 and pp 85-92.

² www.merriamwebster.com

law is blurred. If the bush doctrine strictly boiled down to preemption in term, tied to the concept of imminent threat, then the new U.S national security strategy would not necessarily involve upsetting basic principles governing the use of force in international relations¹. Conversely, preemption is used interchangeably with prevention and Bush are subject to wide interpretation, the legitimization of the use of force may be revolutionalized.

Second, the other consequence of misusing the two terms is to confuse the public debate in the international arena, inviting a confluence of strategy –worst case –analysis and political anti U.S sentiment by both U.S allies and adversaries , such confusion can undermine mutual confidence and trust among U.S allies and partners while also increasing the domestic and international margin for political maneuvering by U.S adversaries when contemplating radical countermeasures, thus easing the way for all states with which the U.S interacts to make dangerous and destabilizing decisions at the political and strategic level, the bush doctrine’s loose language may hinder a convergence between the new U.S national security strategy and those of U.S allies which are being redefined at varying rates in the wake of September 11 combined with questionable characterization of the security landscape (example the alliance splitting ‘axis of evil’ formula), such ambiguous language could accelerate, for better or worse, a reshuffling of the U.S partner network, as old allies such as Germany keep their distance while new partners such as Russia fill the void, forming a would be ‘axis of good’. Similarly, unfixed terminology forces U.S adversaries to make potentially flawed assumptions about the actual scope of the new policy².

Given today’s complex and unstable strategic reality, the becomes, will uncertainty lead to worst –case- conclusion ;and if it does will such conclusions prove stabilizing or destabilizing in practice, particularly as others are considering the acquisition or the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD)? The current ambiguity of the U.S national security does, however, have at least the saving grace of keeping options open. Semantic confusion leaves room for strategic convergence on military and security implications, particularly since prevention has also, as

¹ François, A work in progress : the bush doctrine and its consequences, (USA.2002)P75.

² Ibid, P75.

previously discussed, been invoked to address root causes in a nonmilitary manner and to stop crises from developing.

2-The bush doctrine and just war theory

In the history of foreign policy and war fare relations between states have been often defined by the presupposition of international “anarchy”. The world becomes a war of all against all, it is “anarchical” for universal sovereign power to enforce morality and law is absent.

In such situation law and morality are nonexistent there elevating fear and power to a position of dominance, the international system exists in continual state of war, in the sense that war is always imminent.

If the interstate arena is a state of nature constituted by a war of all against all, then there is no terrorism, as a moral and legal concept, so terror is the constitutive element of the system from that point, all the necessary means including attacking innocent people, in order to achieve political goals is valid, for there are no legitimate moral or legal principles that define that act as immoral and illegal.

To assert that international terrorism is immoral and illegal is to make a claim about the nature of the international system, it possesses an international moral and legal fabric, which has historical roots in the just war tradition.

Central to this code is the principle of nonintervention or, on aggression. From the perspective of international society, there is inherent equality between states, a state right to, self-determination, and the universal obligation of nonintervention, that’s why international justice is procedural.

It is constituted by a mutual respect for the equal sovereignty of each society. Injustice is therefore defined as the crime of aggression, the violation of nonintervention¹.

¹ The Bush doctrine and just war theory, (http://www.trinstitute.org/ojpcr/6_1snau.pdf).p6.

Terrorism an international crime not only because it violates national sovereignty, but also more fundamentally, it violates the right of individuals to security. But on the other hand the use of force must be unjustified.

There may be special circumstances that justify or at least morally demand it. Thus, from this perspective, the decision to engage in military intervention is a fundamentally moral one. The legitimate war tradition provides moral criteria, a moral calculus, for determining whether such action is morally justifiable. These criteria comprise what is traditionally referred to as jus ad bellum. Historically jus ad bellum criteria have included following principles: just cause, right authority, right intention, proportionality, reasonable hope of success, and last resort¹.

According to the tradition, all of the criteria must be met in order of the use of force to be morally justifiable.

2-1 Just cause:

The essence of just cause means to protect innocent life, to preserve conditions necessary for decent human existence and to secure basic human rights. Self-Defense is the protection of the innocent, and protection against threats to international peace is understood to constitute just cause. Just cause is defined in terms of a response to the crime of terrorism, the unlawful violation of the principle of nonintervention. If aggression “terrorism” is a crime according to international law, then states have a right to respond to terrorism with force, especially knowing that there is no world government or police force to uphold international law.

Under these conditions self-defense and the protection of others is a legitimate form of self-help.

My question here is: could the Bush doctrine of preemption as a mean of security against terrorism be considered as a legitimate reaction?

¹ The Bush doctrine and just war theory, (http://www.trinstitute.org/ojpcr/6_1snau.pdf).p7.

As we have seen before, terrorism is generally recognized in the world community as both illegal and immoral. It is an attack on the moral and legal fabric of civilization, an attack on decent political and social life.

The wide spread recognition of the criminality of a strategy of terror inflicted within and across national boundaries by a governments and nongovernmental organization indicates a fundamental belief in existence of a global moral and legal order.

Discrimination designed to provide civilians, the intentional killing of innocents for military or political strategy is never justifiable. The intentional killing of innocents for military or political gain is the very definition of terrorism.

Just war theory prohibits terrorism or war of terror in absolute terms, the intentional killing of civilians is considered as a war crime. Such a military strategy is never justified, because it violate the rights of civilians in order to achieve special goals either political goals or military ones, which cannot justify the means of terror. In other words, we can say that the use of force in self-defense against terrorism is not acceptable, even if we acknowledge the immoral and illegal nature of terrorism.

This response may well fall under the custom of preemptive action, the U.S national security strategy does accurately this notion.

For countries, international law recognized that nations need not suffer an attack before they can lawfully take action to defend themselves against forces that present an imminent danger of attack, legal scholars and international jurists often conditioned the legitimacy of preemption on the existence of an imminent threat, most often a visible mobilization of armies, navies, and air forces preparing to attack.

The Bush doctrine of “preemption” is really preemptive. In such cases there is a potential threat rather than an imminent one, and this is the distinguishing factor between “preemption” (potential threat). The Bush administration argues that the nature of the terrorist threat is such that it is never clear and present, and thus the danger must be adjusted in an age of terrorism. Just war theory may need to adjust to account for this shift in the nature of danger. In other words, terrorism is a tactic

linked to political aims; the threat cannot be resolved military. Any long term response to terrorism must resolve the political conflict that is its ultimate cause.¹

However, the linkage between terrorists and states significantly complicates the justifiability of the Bush doctrine, the doctrine asserts the principle that terrorists and those who harbor them are equivalent. This implies violations of the principle of non intervention and thus must be morally justified. There are two issues here, first: how closely related are the terrorists with the state? And second how extensive is the support given the terrorists by the state? Are they so closely related that the terrorist is indistinguishable from the state, therefore rendering the terrorist actions an act of state and thus of war? The legitimacy for intervening in the affairs of such states would have to be based on substantial, clear, conclusive evidence of their support for terrorists, which is very difficult to produce (the case of Iraq: where there is a lack of evidence of the existence of weapons of mass destruction, and Iraq's support for terrorism. Preventive regime change is highly problematic, for it assumes much and sets a dangerous precedent.

Intention is however difficult to determine the credibility of one's claim for the justification of the use of force is contingent upon one's committed to peace in principle, then one's claim of justification cannot be credible. The credibility of the claim of just war by any state or official is contingent upon the history of state's abiding commitment to peace.²

To sum up, the historical practice of states is an objective criterion for determining right intention.

For a state to invoke just war principles to justify its actions when the part it has acted in violation of those principles calls into questions the state's intentions.

2-2Right authority:

¹ Council, National security strategy of the white house, (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html>).

² Council, National security strategy of the white house, (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html>).

The legitimate authorization of the used force lies exclusively with an official agent of a sovereign political entity. The decision to use force is thus limited to a political sovereign. Right authority also needs an official declaration of war, which should include a bill of particulars that clearly articulates the moral justification and aims of the war. According to United Nation charter, must be authorized by a sovereign state and the united nations security council, and that what brings legal and political legitimacy to the use of force, and also to guarantee is used for just ends.

The claim of the legitimacy of unilateralism at the core of the Bush doctrine violates the principle of right authority. In our days, it is clear that there is a great opposition to the foreign invasion of any state, and thus gives no legitimacy to the use of force by President Bush and his administration.

2-3 Reasonable hope of success: here it is as a calculation of the probability if the use of force will restore a just peace. This stipulation constitutes an attempt to protect the citizens, military and non military alike, from the imprudence and unethical ambitions of their leaders.

A claim to unilateral preemption with a system of global hegemony resulted a struggle in the security dilemma. It is logic that every nation has the right to arm itself in self-defense.

The result is an escalation of arms, leading to an increasing probability of the outbreak of struggle. This struggle is called: security dilemma.

In short: the preparation of self defense is an increasing of the probability of conflict.

The world now is suffering from an imbalance in military power, because it is clear, that the only means of deterring intervention is through the arms, especially the development of nuclear weapons, more than that, terrorist attacks are happened when conventional military action is not possible.

Since the fear generated from the perceived predatory nature of the Bush Doctrine, it will exacerbate rather than reduce international terrorism, to conclude Bush doctrine will reinforce the anarchical nature of the international system, leading to more, not less insecurity and instability.

2-4last resort: the armed forces should be the last resort, that sufficient nonviolent attempts to resolve the conflict have been made and have failed. We can say that the criterion of last resort is met when all attempts at nonviolent conflict resolution have been reasonably made, and the threat persists. “Reasonable” here means that the judgment that last resort can never be known with absolute certainty.¹

The most important points here are: first the effort must be made to resolve the conflict diplomatically, and second, the threat must be imminent.

The principle of last resort places a strong restraint on war and is consistent with the noble goal of a just peace. It encodes the presumption against aggression and also giving force to the legitimacy of the just cause².

CONCLUSION

Although, the bush administration has presented preemption doctrine as a general principal of U.S. policy, the main function of the doctrine appears to have been to justify U.S military actions around the world.

On balance, the negative aspects of the administration’s policy of preemptive attack on weapons of mass destruction proliferators and terrorism appear considerably to outweigh its potential security gains. Preventive attack is the wrong method to deal with a new security problem. The possibility of weapons of mass destruction attack on U.S.A by a rogue state or terrorist group .

The claim of self-defense through preemptive attack can be abused and can become a cover for aggression this is even more the case with preventive attack.

Hitler justified his world war ‘2’ invasion of Belgium ,Norway and the Soviet Union with the claim that the Germany attacks ware needed to foil pending attacks on Germany by these other countries ,these are historical examples .one area of damage from U.S adoption of preemption strategy is the

¹ Council, National security strategy of the white house,(<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html>).

² Council, National security strategy of the white house,(<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html>).

encouragement this precedent may give to further states to adopt preemption arguments today as a justification for military actions against others .

In October 2002 .Russia declared a policy of preemption against Chechen terrorists. In December ,2002, after the bombing of a night club in Bali ,Australian prime minister declared a policy of preemption against terrorists.

However, this threat must be taken seriously. Better ways must be found short of preventive military actions to implement the international treaty prohibitions of W.M.D. These ways should include more effective, comprehensive inspection methods.¹

The united Nations security council is the real operating authority for the anti –W.M.D. treaties ,and the council must become more effective in this arena. for this to happen ,the U.S must seek a much closer political understanding with the other permanent members of the council :Russia, China, France, and United Kingdom on the dangers from further . Proliferations both to them and to world peace. Military actions against possible proliferates ,including preventive action must be a last resort, with decisions taken multilaterally.

¹ Council, National security strategy of the white house,(<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html>).

Introduction:

Afghanistan is a fragile state attempting, with substantial U.S. help, to stabilize after more than 22 years of warfare, including a U.S.-led war that brought the current government to power. Before the U.S. military campaign against the Taliban began on October 7, 2001, Afghanistan had been mired in conflict since the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. The Taliban ruled most of Afghanistan from 1996 until its collapse in December 2001 at the hands of the U.S.-led military campaign.

The defeat of the Taliban enabled the United States and its coalition partners to send forces throughout Afghanistan to search for Taliban and Al Qaeda fighters and leaders that remain at large, including Al Qaeda founder Osama bin Laden. Since the fall of the Taliban, Afghan citizens are enjoying new personal freedoms that were forbidden under the Taliban, about 2 million Afghan refugees have returned, and women have returned to schools, the workforce, and participation in politics. At the same time, there is a lack of security in many parts of Afghanistan, particularly the southeast, which was the power base of the Taliban. Security concerns are widely believed to be slowing the pace of reconstruction.

On May 1, the United States and the Afghan government declared major U.S.-led combat to have ended and that U.S.-led forces would henceforth concentrate on stabilization. U.S. stabilization measures include extending the writ of the central government, which has been widely viewed as weak and unable to control the many regional leaders. The United States is trying to strengthen Kabul by building a new Afghan national army, supporting an international security force (ISAF), and setting up regional enclaves to create secure conditions for reconstruction. To help foster development, the United Nations and the Bush Administration have lifted most sanctions imposed on Afghanistan since the Soviet occupation. The United States gave Afghanistan a total of over \$815 million in aid during FY2002, but aid will rise for FY2003 to about \$1.8 billion after factoring in a new additional (\$1 billion) aid package reported in July 2003.

Although with some difficulty, political reconstruction is following the route laid out by major Afghan factions and the international community during the U.S.-led war. On December 5, 2001, major Afghan factions, meeting under U.N. auspices in Bonn, signed an agreement to form an interim government that ran Afghanistan until a traditional national assembly ("loya jirga") was held on June 11-19, 2002. The loya jirga delegates selected a new government to run Afghanistan for the next two years and approved Hamid Karzai, a Pashtun, to continue as leader for that time. Preparations are proceeding for a loya jirga to approve a new constitution (October 2003) and then national elections for the leadership and a parliament in June 2004¹.

1-Back ground to recent developments

Afghanistan became unstable in the 1970s, as both its communist party and its Islamic movement grew in strength and became increasingly bitter opponents of each other². The instability shattered the relative peace and progress that characterized the rule of king Mohammad Zahir Salah, who reigned during 1933-1973, he was the last king in the Afghanistan monarchy. Afghanistan did not exist as a distinct political entity, but was a territory inhabited by tribes and tribal confederations often linked to neighboring nations. Later King Amanullah khan lunched attacks on British forces in Afghanistan shortly after taking power and won complete independence from Britain in 1919.

Then the soviets occupied Afghanistan, the U.S backed mujahedin fought them effectively, and soviet occupation forces were never able to pacify all areas of the country; the soviets held major cities, but the outlying mountainous regions remained largely under mujahedin control. The mujahedin benefited from us weapons and assistance, provided through the central intelligence agency, working closely with Pakistan's underserved intelligence directorate.

¹ Kenneth Hatzman, Afghanistan current issues and U.S policy, (New York press.2004)P2.

² Richard Cromin, Afghanistan : Challenges and options for reconstructing a stable and moderate state . (osprey great britain.2006), 24.

The Islamic guerrillas also hid and stored weaponry in large network of natural and man-made tunnels and caves throughout Afghanistan.

On April 14, 1988; the Soviet Union, led by reformist leader: Mikhail Gorbachev, agreed to a United Nations brokered accord (the Geneva accords) requiring it to withdraw. The Soviet Union completed the withdrawal on February 15, 1989 leaving in place a weak communist government facing a determined U.S backed mujahidin. A warming union to try for a political settlement to the internal conflict. From late 1989 the U.S pressed the Soviet Union to agree to a mutual cutoff of military aid to the combatants, then Moscow agreed with Washington on 1991, to a joint cutoff of military aid to the Afghan combatants¹.

The State Department has claimed that a total of about 3 billion in economic and covert military assistance was provided by the U.S to the Afghan mujahedin from 1980 until the end of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in 1989. The Soviet withdrawal had decreased the strategic and political value of Afghanistan and made the administration less forthcoming with funding².

2- Analysis of the war in Afghanistan

The formulation of national strategy is critically important. In essence, the process of strategic decision making defines how a nation will direct and coordinate the elements of national power to achieve its aims. In time of struggle, strategy determines the nation's approach to conflict and defines the ends, ways, and means used to prosecute war. Ultimately, it determines success or failure in war³.

Following the terrorist attacks of September 2001, the United States found itself at war with Al-Qaida, and its leader Ussama Ben Laden. In response to the terrorist attacks, President George W. Bush's administration formulated a national strategy for the war in Afghanistan. What, then, was the U.S strategy for this war?

¹ Kenneth Hatzman, Afghanistan current issues and U.S policy, (New York press.2004), P2.

² Country fact sheet : Afghanistan in U.S department of state, (Dispatch Volume 05 N23, 1994) P 377.

³ Earl H. Tiford. J R "operation allied force and the role of air power", (parameters, volume 24, winter 199-2000), P 37.

and ,more importantly, did it represent an effective national strategy that will enable the U.S to achieve its goals?

What follows is a strategy analysis of the war in Afghanistan¹.this chapter's intent, first, and foremost ,is to articulate the strategic objectives of the war ,the approach taken to achieve those objectives ,and the resources employed in each approach .in other words its primary purpose is to identify the ends ,ways, and means of American strategy .after describing what the U.S has been trying to accomplish in Afghanistan and how it has pursued those objectives ,this chapter will provide an assessment of U.S strategy by focusing primarily on whether or not the U.S has achieved its strategic objectives .it will conclude the analysis by discussing implication for the future.

2-1National strategy for the war in Afghanistan

Following the terrorist attacks on september11, 2001, the bush administration established a new and different national strategy to guide America's response to the attacks. In essence, its policy was to find those responsible and bring them to justice².in doing so, the U.S would disable the terrorist organization in Afghanistan and prevent the terrorists from mounting further attacks against the U.S.A.

In his first televised speech following the attacks, president Bush, expanded the policy to include not only the terrorist perpetrators, but those nations the support them, as well, in essence ,his policy made elimination of terrorist sanctuaries and support systems as important as elimination of terrorists themselves.

The bush administration elected focus initial efforts on fighting Al-Qaida in Afghanistan. Al-Qaida as we have said before, is an organization with global reach included cells in nations around the world.

However, its net work thrived in Afghanistan, where it enjoyed the support of the Taliban –in addition ,many key leaders of Al-Qaida network not only lived in Afghanistan ,but had directed attacks against U.S from locations inside that country

¹ Dan Balz and Bob Woodward: 10 days in September, the Washington Post eight part series from Washingtonpost (New York Press.2002), p63.

² Ibid, p66.

.although other terrorist organizations represented a threat to the U.S. the bush administration decided to pursue those organizations later ,in a broader war on terrorism.

For the president and his national security advisors, the first order of business was Al-Qaida a network in Afghanistan, as a result, in the days and weeks immediately following the events of September 11, the administration focused on formulating a strategy for the new war against Al-Qaida and its Taliban supporters.

3-The ENDS OF USA IN AFGHANISTAN

The bush administration developed six strategic objectives for operations in Afghanistan. the primary objectives was to disrupt, and if possible destroy Al-Qaida in that country.

Following the attacks on September 11, the administration designed military operation that would inflict real pain on the terrorists and destroy Al-Qaida network ,at least in Afghanistan¹.

The U.S. also sought to convince, and if necessary compel the Taliban to cease support for terrorist organization.

In referring to the September 11 attacks, the president declared "we will deal with those who harbor them and feed them and house them"². Statements from administration officials made it clear that they saw little distinction between Al-Qaida who had planned and executed the attacks, and the Taliban, who supported the terrorists activities³. Ultimately the objective of the bush administration was to deny Al-Qaida the sanctuary and support it enjoyed in Afghanistan.

¹ Bob Woodward : Bush at war:(New York Press, 2002), p223.

² William R. Hawkins : terrorism, missile, defense and decisive warfare, (Army Press, November 2001), p12.

³ Bob Woodward : Bush at war:(New York Press, 2002), p30.

In addition ,the bush administration demonstrate that the U.S was not at war with the Afghanistan people or the Islamic religion .the American administration sought to define the conflict carefully in terms of terrorism ,and narrow the scope of the conflict to Al-Qaida and its supporters. in doing so, it hoped to avoid implications that the U.S had embarked on a crusade against Islam or was engaging in a fight against innocent afghans¹.

The administration also sought to demonstrate American resolve in this war on terrorism. Bush and his top national security advisors believed the Clinton administration's response to Ben Laden and international terrorism had been "so weak as to be provocative, a virtual invitation to hit the United States again"². The objective now was to convey, as forcefully as possible, the nation's commitment

In addition, many in the bush administration felt that a perceived aversion to casualties had emboldened terrorists to attack the U.S or its interests around the world. To overcome that perception, the administration intended to demonstrate total commitment to the fight, to include a willingness to accept the risk of casualties. The strategy also include the objective of building international support for the war in Afghanistan, the bush administration believed it would need broad international support for the war³. Support from other nations would provide an added degree of legitimacy and could lessen the burden of war on the U.S. Accordingly, the administration sought to involve as many nations as possible. The final objective was to stabilize Afghanistan following the fighting .the intent was to avoid creating a vacuum in a notoriously turbulent, unstable nation. When the fighting was over, the administration wanted to establish conditions the world foster security and stability .moreover, it aimed at eliminating the conditions that had promoted terrorism and support for terrorism.

¹ Bob Woodward : Bush at war:(New York Press, 2002),, p94.

² G.K Herring : national security strategy challenges for the 21th century, (Parameters 2003), p163.

³ Ibid, p 163.

Finally, we can say the strategic intent was to prevent the reemergence of Al-Qaida in Afghanistan and the use of that country as a sanctuary for terrorist organization.

4-The ways:

The U.S adopted a variety of approaches to accomplish its strategic. it sought ,first, and foremost ,to disrupt or destroy Al-Qaida network in Afghanistan .to do so it mounted an effort to kill or capture key terrorist leaders. In essence, the president wanted to "take out Ben Laden and his top lieutenants".

In addition, the U.S sought to kill or capture Al-Qaida fighters and destroy the terrorist in fray-structure in Afghanistan, such as training camps, safe houses, and meeting places for Al-Qaida operative.

The U.S also sought to freeze the financial assets of the terror network to deny the terrorists the resources they needed to finance their activities, and, while conducting operation against Al-Qaida, the U.S sought to gain intelligence on the terrorist network .intelligence gleaned from searches and interrogation would provide important leads in the fight against Al-Qaida. As the war unfolded, some in the administration feared that key terrorist leaders would flee Afghanistan and escape to Iran, Pakistan, or Somalia, where they would be much harder to catch. As a result, the U.S also sought to prevent the escape of Al-Qaida leaders.

The U.S Adopted a variety of approaches to convince or compel the Taliban to cease supporting Al-Qaida.

Initially, it demands that the Taliban hand over terrorist leaders and cease other support for Al-Qaida.

President Bush issued an ultimatum demanding that the Taliban turn over Ben laden and his associates or suffer the consequences of a U.S attacks .the

immediate goal of the administration was not to destroy Taliban but the president and his advisors were willing to do so. If the Taliban failed to cooperate¹.

When it became evident the Taliban would not agree to support us objectives, the effort shifted toward destruction of Al-Qaida. Accordingly, U.S strategy included effort to kill, or capture key Taliban and Leaders. The us also sought to destroy the regime's hardcore, committed Taliban fighters, who kept the regime in power. Ultimately U.S. Policy makers sought to replace the regime with one more supportive of their objectives in the war on terrorism.

The administration found a variety of ways to demonstrate support for the Afghan people. It conducted humanitarian assistance operations to provide the Afghans with food, clothing, medical assistance, and other basic necessities.

In addition, the U.S assisted private organizations in their efforts to help the Afghans. Military forces also endeavored to minimize collateral damage².

Coalition forces hoped to avoid alienating the Afghans by limiting civilians casualties and damage to the civilian infrastructure. In addition the U.S. Initiated an extensive demining program to eliminate the threat that mines posed to Afghans, as well as coalition forces and finally, its agents attempted to address the plight of women and children in Afghanistan by improving their living conditions, educational opportunities, and status in society. As a critical component of religious sensibility to avoid the impression that it was engaged in a war on Islam.

Specifically, it avoided damaging mosques, openly debated whether or not to conduct military operations during the Ramadan religious holiday, and even changed the name of military operation to avoid alienating Muslims.

¹ Dan Balz and Bob Woodward: 10 days in September, the Washington Post eight part series from Washingtonpost (New York Press.2002), P98.

² Bob Woodward Bush at war; (New York Press, 2002), p 272.

In addition, the U.S sought to gain support from Muslim states for the war in Afghanistan¹.

The administration also adopted several approaches to demonstrate its resolve. First and foremost, it was intent on executing a meaningful military response to the terrorist attacks. The view of many in the administration was that recent terrorist attacks had not elicited a meaningful us response. In 1998, al Qaeda bombing of the U.S embassies in Kenya and Tanzania had killed more than 200 people at that time, the Clinton administration responded by directing the us military to launch a cruise missile attack against terrorist training camps in Afghanistan and a factory in Sudan. While making a political statement, the attacks had minimal impact on Ben Laden and his terrorists» to many in the bush administration, that operation, and its failure to serve as a deterrent, was indicative of the U.S response to terrorist attacks during the eight years of the previous administration. The bush administration, by contrast, was eager to conduct a more meaningful military response, one that would clearly demonstrate U.S resolve in the war against Al-Qaida and its Taliban supporters, and thus deter future attacks².

The administration frequently stressed its commitment to winning the war in Afghanistan. In an address to a joint session of congress and the American people. President Bush promised the U.S would use all of its resources in fighting the war in Afghanistan. He also vowed that "we will be patient, we will be focused, and we will be steady in our determination"³. The administration intended for the themes expressed in public statements also intended to dispel the notion that the U.S was averse to taking risks and unwilling to accept casualties.

The U.S government was also intent on gaining and maintaining international support for the war in Afghanistan to do so it worked with existing international organization to build support. Moreover, it needed access, basing, and over-flight right to conduct military operations in Afghanistan. Support from variety of regional

¹ Alberto Betancourt : coalition team clears land mines, (Soldiers, may 2002), p 8-9.

² G.K Herring, the war in Afghanistan, (Parameters 2003),p 166.

³ Bob Woodward Bush at war; (New York Press, 2002), p45.

nations was essential in that regard. Accordingly, the U.S sought cooperation from nations in southern and central Asia to support U.S efforts in Afghanistan. Coalition nations participated in a variety of ways, from providing ships, air planes, and round combat forces to supporting humanitarian assistance operations.

The U.S adopted a number of approaches to prevent the –re-emergence of Al-Qaida in Afghanistan as a sanctuary for terrorist organizations. To do that, it worked to establish security and stability throughout the war-torn nation.

After the fall of the Taliban, these efforts included establishment of a new afghan government, creation of an afghan police force, and development of an afghan national army. The U.S also began initiatives to support economic development. In addition to that, it initiated an extensive effort to rid Afghanistan of the vast quantities of weapons and munitions strewn throughout the country. This approach primarily aimed at denying remnant Al-Qaida fighters continued access to weapons and munitions .and finally the U.S sought to address the repressive social and religious conditions enforced for years by the ruling Taliban. In essence, the administration initiated a peace-keeping and nation building effort in post-Taliban Afghanistan.

5-The means:

To implement the various approaches in its strategy .the U.S employed all the elements of national power. As president bush explained «this war will be fought on many fronts, including the intelligence side, the financial side, the diplomatic side, as well as the military side»¹.

Accordingly, the U.S employed every traditional element of national power, diplomatic, economic, informational, and military, to fight Al-Qaida and the Taliban, support the Afghan people, demonstrate resolve, build international support, and prevent the reemergence of terrorist organization in Afghanistan.

¹ Bob Woodward Bush at war; (New York Press, 2002), p73.

Diplomatically, U.S worked to obtain support for operations against Al-Qaida from international organizations and states. In this effort, it used diplomatic means to garner support from the United Nations and approval

Of a Security Council resolution. United Nations Security Council resolution 1373 condemned all support for terrorism and called on member states to cooperate in the fight against terrorism.

Moreover, it called on member nations to prevent the financing of terrorist acts freeze the assets of terrorist. U.S also received unprecedented support from the north Atlantic treaty organization (NATO).when it involved article 5,on September ,12,2001,demonstrating that its members viewed the terrorist attack against U.S.A as an attack all member nations.

Initially, the U.S attempted to apply diplomatic pressure on the Taliban to cooperate with us and break off support for Al-Qaida. Following the defeat of the Taliban, it used diplomatic means to gain international support for a new government in Afghanistan. The U.S also engaged a variety of international and private organization to lend their support to the Afghans.

International organization like: the U.N, the world health organization, and the Red Crescent, continued to provide support to the afghan people, the U.S relied on diplomatic means to build and maintain international support. It was especially intent on gaining support for its efforts from Muslim organization, without this support us could not conduct military operations in Afghanistan¹. The U.S worked also with other regional nations such as “Tijikist and Turk Menistan, to close borders and prevent al-Qaida fighters from escaping to prevent the re-emergence of terrorist organizations in Afghanistan, the U.S employed diplomatic power.

It mounted a diplomatic effort to assist in the establishment its new embassy in Kabul and provided diplomatic recognition for the new government.

¹ Bob Woodward Bush at war; (New York Press, 2002), p81.

The U.S used economic means to freeze the financial assets of Al-Qaida and deny its access to other financial resources¹. The treasury department froze the financial assets of front companies, terrorist leaders, and some nonprofit organizations that support terrorist groups. In addition us used economic power to pressure. Foreign banks and financial institutions to cooperate in this effort. Although it could not directly influence foreign banks and institutions, treasury could prohibit them from conducting transactions in the U.S. It used this leverage to gain cooperation of a number of overseas banks and financial institutions².

The U.S employed economic means to support reconstruction and promote economic development in Afghanistan.

The administration used the media to convey support for the new afghan government. It incorporated key themes in public statements to emphasize that the war was directed against Afghans. Statements from the administration highlighted us support for the afghan people during the soviet occupation in the 1980s and emphasized that the U.S had no territorial desires or plans for permanent bases in the region. In addition during the process of establishing of new government administration rhetoric avoided any suggestion that the U.S was trying to determine who would run Afghanistan. Likewise, the us employed information as a mean to demonstrate the war in Afghanistan was not against Islam. It used public statements to counter any suggestion that it was involved in a “crusade” or engaged in a war against Islam. It also conveyed support for Afghanistan by working to improve educational opportunities, addressing human rights issues, and improving access to information in Afghanistan. In short, all of the diplomatic, economic, informational efforts employed to accomplish other objectives also served to demonstrate commitment to the war in Afghanistan.

The most visible mean employed by the us involved military power, us military forces conducted both conventional operations and unconventional warfare against Al-Qaida .the us employed air power to attack terrorist targets and destroy them. It relied heavily on special operating forces to conduct direct action against high targets and key leaders, and unconventional warfare to gain the support of

¹ G.K Herring, the war in Afghanistan, (Parameters 2003), p169.

² Ibid, p 169.

opposition forces and the Afghans. U.S conventional ground forces searched for and destroyed Al-Qaida a leaders, and fighters. In addition naval forces conducted leadership interdiction operations in the north Arabian Sea to prevent the escape of Al-Qaida members to safe havens in Yemen or other nations¹. Military forces from coalition partners also played a significant role. The U.S employed air, ground, and .us also used military power to build and maintain international support. A variety of military activities sewed to promote coalition building and support for the war in Afghanistan .the us sought military contribution from nations around the world, integrated coalition troops, ships, and air forces, and employed coalition forces as part of a coordinated military campaign.

Finally, the U.S used military means to help establish a police force and army for the fledgling afghan government.

Conclusion:

Although the U.S has enjoyed considerable success against al-Qaida and the Taliban, it has not realized its strategic objectives. The complain in Afghanistan is still under way and so far the us has not been entirely successful in achieving its strategic ends. In other words, U.S disrupted al-Qaida network to a considerable degree, but has certainly not destroyed it. The administration wanted Ben Laden and other al-Qaida leaders killed or captured, so they would be unable to plan and execute additional terrorist attack. In fact us has been successful in killing or capturing a number of key al-Qaida network in Afghanistan and elsewhere in the world.

However many other leaders remain at large, their places are unknown. Despite claims to the effect that Ben Laden's capture was not a primary goal of the American effort, his ability to elude capture does have significance.

In that sense, U.S has not been successful, and al-Qaida remains a threat and continues to possess the capability to plan and execute attacks against us and its friends around the world.

¹ Captain Phil Wisecup, U.S navy and lieutenant Tom Williams, U.S Navy: enduring freedom: making coalition naval warfare work, (Proceedings), 2000.

Conclusion:

After the September 11 2001 attacks, the world has changed completely, these events could be considered as the breaking point in both the American history and the world history, and we can say that from one vantage point, the American foreign policy in the 20 century can be stated quite simply. The first half of the century marked a steady trend away from insularity, the second half was signified by a global anti-communism.

The 9 11 2001 opened the door to series military activity abroad. The US has been actively engaged in prosecuting the global war on terror (GWOT).since September 2001 and after many years of American effort that has included the less of thousands. The world's countries asks many questions whether the u s strategy is working, and whether the u s really understands how to combat an unknown enemy called terrorism.

In fact, American foreign policy needs to change its tone and attitude open up and reach out, the bush administration's arrogant bunker mentality has been counterproductive at home and abroad. The bush administration will recognize that the U S main fight today does not pit us against the world, but pits the world against the world against the terrorists. At the same time bush declared that his administration will never surrender any of American sovereignty, which is why he was the first presidential candidate to oppose ratification of the law of the sea treaty , which would end anger both on the American national security and economic interests.

The U.S needs to better explain Islamic jihadism to the American people, to avoid linking between Islam and terrorism, if so the ideological war against Islam will stop.

The term terrorism itself has been characterized as unacceptably vague, since there is lack of agreement on a definition of terrorism and that has proven an obstacle to meaningful international countermeasures. It proceeds to declare that some often commented that one state's terrorist is another state freedom fighter.

The Bush Doctrine is considered as the most important response to the September attacks, its main three principles shaped the U.S foreign policy. although these principles seemed great and helped in creating a new peaceful world, but in reality the bush doctrine

caused struggles more than giving solutions to the universal issues, more than that it bring new conflicts resulting from the misuse of words, meaning: preemption and prevention, and the best example here is the war in Iraq the use of military force.

The Bush Doctrine in fact is not really for spreading democracy, free markets, and bringing human rights, it is something else, in other words the bush doctrine is the use of American politics and economy in order to achieve American goals.

Recently, military in the line of Bush Doctrine speaking about calmatives and synergistic effect based operations to combat war fare combat nature in the war in Afghanistan and the axis of evil supporters. From another point it is difficult to imagine the U.S going to war, any war ,that' s of Afghanistan and also the war in Iraq, without the lobbying efforts.

I think that it was the triumph of so-called Neo-conservative ideology, as well as the bush administration arrogance and incompetence that took America into these wars in choice, the Bush administration obviously made a convincing case to the world with limited national security and foreign policy experience who keenly felt the burden of leading the nation in the wake dead list terrorist attack ever in America.

After the terrorist attacks on September 11 2001, the president Bush established a new national strategy in order to achieve America's goals. The first step here is the war in Afghanistan and the fighting against al-Qaida. The U.S could reach some achievements, on the other hand it's is loose is too clear either in budget and soils. To sum up I can say that the war on terrorism is a pretext to protect the American interests and achieve its goals under the bush principles of spreading democracy and defeating terrorism, the best example is the war in Afghanistan, where the us has no right to invade the country, and destroy it, this war is not a legitimate war.

Bibliography:

Books:

1. Abrahms Max, what terrorists really want: motives and counter terrorism strategy : international security. Combridge ma. kit press.2004
2. Al Hammadi Khalid, the inside story of Al Qaeda, part 4, Al Quds Al Arabi, March 22,2005.
3. Alberto Betancourt : coalition team clears land mines, soldiers, may 2002.
4. Bergen D, Al-Qaeda. New York monthly Review Press,2006.
5. Blit Z. James, January, A threat transformed.routlegde.2005
6. Bob Woodward : Bush at war; New York Press, 2002.
7. Captain Phil Wisecup, U.S navy and lieutenant Tom Williams, U.S Navy: enduring freedom: making coalition naval warfare work, proceedings, 2000.
8. Country fact sheet : Afghanistan in U.S department of state, Dispatch Volume 05 N23, 1994.
9. Dan Balz and Bob Woodward: 10 days in September, the Washington Post eight part series from Washington post .New York Press.2002.
10. Daniel G.Arce and Todd Sandler, Strategic analysis of terrorism. Borgo Press.2003.
11. Earl H. Tiford. J R “operation allied force and the role of air power”, parameters, volume 24, winter 1999-2000.
12. François.D, A work in progress: the bush doctrine and its consequences. USA.2002.
13. Fuad Husayn Alzarqawi, the 2nd generation of Al Qaeda, p14, Al Quds Al Arabi, july 13 2005.
14. G.K Herring : national security strategy challenges for the 21th century, parameters.2003.
15. Gilbert Achcar, translated by Peter Drucker, the clash of barbarism, September 11th and the making of the New World disorder, New York, monthly review press, 2002.
16. Hoffman Bruce, inside terrorism, Columbia press.1998

17. Kenneth Hatzman, Afghanistan current issues and U.S Policy. New York press.2004.
18. Kenneth R. Bazinet, A fight vs Evil, bush and cabinet tell us. Borgo press.2004.
19. Lora. S Aggour, the strategy of containment in fighting terrorism. Master dissertation. Indonesia university.2007.
20. Marcin Zaborwski, Friends again ? EU US relations after the crisis. Paris institute for security studies.2006
21. Peterson & Mark A. Pollak, Europe, America, Bush, transatlantic relations in the twenty first century. Paris institute for security studies.2004
22. Raphael Perl Terrorism, the future and US foreign policy.springerverlag.2005
23. Rizal Sukma, War on terror, Islam and the imperative democracy. springer-verlag.2004
24. Robert G. Kaufman, in defense of Bush doctrine.proceedings.2002
25. Robert Gilpin, the political economy of the international relations. San Bernardo Press, California.USA.
26. Richard Cromin, Afghanistan : Challenges and options for reconstructing a stable and moderate state . osprey great britain.2006
27. Todd Sandler Collective versus unilateral response to terrorism. Combridge university press.2003.
28. Thalif Politics U.N member states, struggle to define terrorism. Inter press service.2005.
29. Tinothy Garton Ash, free world : why a crisis of the west reveals, the opportunity of our time, London, Penguin, 2005.
30. Wright B September 2001..Inter press service,USA,2006.
31. William R. Hawkins : terrorism, missile, defense and decisive warfare, Army Press. November 2001.
32. Zbignien Brzeznski, the choice: global domination or global leadership, New York : basic book, 2004.

Internet:

1. War in terror, Anup Shah,
http://www.globalissues.org/issue/245/war_on_terror.
2. <http://www.britannica.com>.
3. Emperial republic R slitwak after 9 11 <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/af31e344-0499-11df-8603-00144feabdc0.html>.
4. Hertz berg Hendrik, September 11th 2001, lost love, the new Yorker,
http://www.newyorker.com/arhive2006/9/11/06.0911ta_talkhertzberg.
5. Terrorism – Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia,
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/terrorism>.
6. September 11 attacks - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia,
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/September_11_attacks.
7. G.B, remarks by the president in photo opportunity with the national security team, the white house, September 12, 2001,
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/9/20010912-4.html>
8. National Security Council, the national security strategy of the US,
<http://whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html>.
9. George Bush, Second inaugural address, January 20, 2005.
http://www.voicesofdemocracy.umd.edu/documents/parry_giles_bush.pdf.
10. <http://www.merriamwebster.com>
11. The Bush doctrine and just war theory, P6.
http://www.trinstitute.org/ojpcr/6_1snau.pdf
12. Council, National security strategy of the white house,
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html>