

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ARMENIA

THE THREAT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

AND

THE NEW TRENDS IN THE USA FOREIGN POLICY

A MASTER'S ESSAY SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
FOR FULLFILMENT OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

BY

AVAG MANUKYAN

YEREVAN, ARMENIA

November 2005

SIGNATURE PAGE

Faculty Advisor

Date

Dean

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I want to express my gratefulness to my faculty advisor, Dr. Ashot Galoyan for providing me with pieces of advice, direction, and support in the process of writing this essay. I am thankful to Dr. Ashot Galoyan, for his encouragement while writing my Master's Essay.

I am very grateful to the Political Science Office, and of course to all members of the faculty of Political Science and International Affairs for the years of study in the American University of Armenia, for providing me with the appropriate knowledge and skills to this study.

Special thanks to my classmates for their encouragement throughout the period of study in the University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	5
Abstract.....	6
Part 1	7
INTRODUCTION	7
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY	10
Part 2.....	11
THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE USA AFTER SEPTEMBER 11 ...	11
INTRODUCTION OF THE NSS	11
AMERICA’S INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY	13
Champion aspirations for human dignity.....	14
Strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against USA and their friends	16
Work with others to defuse regional conflicts	19
Prevent the USA’s enemies from threatening its allies and friends, with WMD	22
Ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade	26
Expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy	29
Develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power	31
Transform USA’s national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century.....	35
CONCLUSION OF THE NSS	36
Part 3.....	37
AFGHANISTAN	37
USA – AFGHANISTAN NEGOTIATIONS.....	37
MILITARY OPERATIONS	38
THE USA HUMANITARIAN AID TO AFGHAN	41
AFGHANISTAN: SITUATION TODAY	42
IRAQ.....	43
2003 INVASION OF IRAQ	44
Part 4.....	47
CONCLUSION.....	47
REFERENCES.....	53

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CRF	Constitutional Rights Foundation
EU	European Union
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
NSS	The National Security Strategy
NATO	The North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OAS	Organization of American States
SU	Soviet Union
UN	United Nation
US/USA	The United States of America
USAID	U. S. Agency for International Development
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction

Abstract

The situation in the world has been changed after the September 11 attacks. These attacks made the USA to pay serious attention on its security. The result was the “National Security Strategy” plan, which was brought forward by the president George W. Bush to prevent terrorists and dangerous regimes from developing, acquiring, or using weapons of mass destruction. But immediately after appearance of the new strategy, which also is called “the Bush Doctrine”, in the world appeared controversial views concerning USA’s National Security Strategy.

The purpose of this Master’s Essay is to analyze the strategy, which the USA adopted after the September 11 events and identify the main directions towards which the USA foreign policy is moving. It is also aiming to observe and analyse the situation in Afghanistan and Iraq, which were the main targets of the USA, and also to identify the possible outcomes of USA – Afghanistan, and USA – Iraq conflicts.

Part 1

INTRODUCTION

The great struggles of the twentieth century between liberty and totalitarianism ended with a decisive victory for the forces of freedom. In the twenty-first century, only nations that share a commitment to protecting basic human rights and guaranteeing political and economic freedom are able to unleash the potential of their people and assure their future prosperity. White House (2002) notes that these values of freedom are right and true for every person, in every society.

America's foreign policy has been changed over time reflecting the change in its national interest. As a new nation after the Revolutionary War, America's prime national interest was to maintain its independence from more powerful European countries. Protected by the Atlantic Ocean, its major foreign policy, as typified by the Monroe Doctrine, was to limit European attempts of further colonization of the Western Hemisphere (CRF, 2005).

Central to America's foreign policy in the post-war period was the containment of the Soviet Union and communism. During the Cold War, the United States and its allies competed with the SU and its allies militarily, economically, and ideologically. Both sides created massive military forces and huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Although the two superpowers never went to war, the policy of containment led the United States into the bloody Korean and Vietnam wars. However, The Cold War ended when the Soviet Union, economically exhausted from competing with the West, disintegrated. This left the United States the only remaining superpower in a world no longer ruled by the logic of containing the Soviet Union (CRF, 2005).

But winning the struggle against totalitarianism, against Soviet Union, did not mean that the fight for freedom is ended. Yet there is much work to do. One threat disappeared, appeared another one.

Today the USA is facing another struggle, which is more difficult. According to White House (2002) Defending their Nation against its enemies is the first and fundamental commitment of the Federal Government. Today, that task has changed dramatically. Enemies in the past needed great armies and great industrial capabilities to endanger America. Now, shadowy networks of individuals can bring great chaos and suffering to America's shores for less than it costs to purchase a single tank. Terrorists are organized to penetrate open societies and to turn the power of modern technologies against the world.

According to Rahman (2005) Terrorism through an evolutionary process has become the greatest threat to the security not only for the USA, but also for all nations, and if terrorists groups get hold of weapons of mass destruction, it would spell disaster beyond calculation. Terrorism is a universally accepted term, but in contrast to it there is no one good definition of terrorism. In fact, it might be impossible to define because it is intangible and fluctuates according to historical and geographical contexts. Although some forms of it are indistinguishable from crime, revolution, and war, but the September 11, 2001, attacks can be for sure called "Terrorism". The "Black Tuesday"¹, which entered in the books as the day of the bloodiest terrorist attack in human history continues to cause grief today. It has also brought new changes in the USA foreign policy (Criminal Justice, 2005).

According to Gordon (2001) September 11 seemed fated to deeper radically and permanently the degree to which, and the way in which, the United States engaged with the rest of the world. First of all, the vulnerability of the USA made the government to think about the homeland defense — better protection of ports, airports and national borders, development of rapid-reaction emergency response teams, more research on vaccines against biological weapons, expanded intelligence capabilities.

¹ September 11, 2001, entered in the history as "Black Tuesday"

Changes were also made in the America's foreign policy. On September 14, 2001, in the National Cathedral, President Bush announced: "Just three days removed from these events, Americans do not yet have the distance of history. But our responsibility to history is already clear: to answer these attacks and rid the world of evil. War has been waged against us by stealth and deceit and murder. This nation is peaceful, but fierce when stirred to anger. The conflict was begun on the timing and terms of others. It will end in a way, and at an hour, of our choosing" (White House, 2002). In response to 9/11, on September 20th the President Bush announced a War on Terrorism in front of Congress (Criminal Justice, 2005).

The fronts on which this war is waged are still not clear or identifiable... One can hardly predict what will happen next, but it is quite obvious that the fuse of a new great war already burned.

The war against terrorists of global reach is a global enterprise of uncertain duration. And White House (2002) announces that America will help nations that need their assistance in combating terror. "The United States and countries cooperating with them must not allow the terrorists to develop new home bases. Together, we must seek to deny them sanctuary at every turn" (White House, 2002).

Finally, according to White House (2002) the United States will use this moment of opportunity to extend the benefits of freedom across the globe. It must actively work to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world. The events of September 11, 2001, taught the USA that weak states, like Afghanistan, can pose as great a danger to its national interests as strong states. Poverty does not make poor people into terrorists and murderers. Yet poverty, weak institutions, and corruption can make weak states vulnerable to terrorist networks and drug cartels within their borders.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

So as this Master's Essay is analyzing the "National Security Strategy" of the USA after the September 11 events, and also it is aiming to identify the possible outcomes of the USA confrontation with Afghanistan and Iraq, the major research questions of the Essay are the following:

1. What are the main objectives of "The National Security Strategy" of the USA?
2. How is the USA achieving these goals?
3. How does the USA combat with global Terrorism?
4. What were the justification of the USA for invading Afghanistan and Iraq? What are the main outcomes of those conflicts?

To answer to the above mentioned Research questions the following method has been employed: secondary analysis of different sources.

Part 2

THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE USA AFTER SEPTEMBER 11

INTRODUCTION OF THE NSS

The Cold War ended with the break-up of the Soviet Union in 1991. During the 1990s, the rapid spread of democracy and capitalism in the world seemed to bring a new era of peace and stability. The United States emerged as the most powerful nation in the world. Its economy is far stronger than any other country's. It almost spends more on its military than all the other nations of the world combined. The attacks on September 11, 2001, however, proved that even powerful nations like the United States were vulnerable to terrorist acts (CRF, 2005).

After the September 11 attacks, President George W. Bush brought forward a new American security strategy to prevent terrorists and dangerous regimes from developing, acquiring, or using weapons of mass destruction. The New National Strategy, which is also called the Bush Doctrine, pushes for the expansion of democracy in Middle East Muslim countries and elsewhere in the world (CRF, 2005).

Today, the United States enjoys a position of unparalleled military strength and great economic and political influence. White House (2002) notes, that in keeping with its heritage and principles, the USA does not use its strength to press for unilateral advantage. Instead the USA seeks to create a balance of power that favors human freedom: conditions in which all nations and all societies can choose for themselves the rewards and challenges of political and economic liberty. In a world that is safe, people will be able to make their own lives better. And the USA is going to defend the peace by fighting terrorists and tyrants. It also will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers and will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent.

According to the NSS the gravest danger the American nation faces lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology. The enemies of USA have openly declared that they are seeking weapons of mass destruction, and evidence indicates that they are doing so with determination. The United States is not going to allow these efforts to succeed. For this purpose it will build defenses against ballistic missiles and other means of delivery and will cooperate with other nations to deny, contain, and curtail their enemies' efforts to acquire dangerous technologies. And, as a matter of common sense and self-defense, the USA will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed. The White House hesitates that they can defend the USA and their friends by hoping for the best. So they are going to be prepared to defeat their enemies' plans, using the best intelligence and proceeding with deliberation. History will judge harshly those who saw this coming danger but failed to act. In the new world they have already entered and the only path to peace and security is the path of action (White House, 2002).

Here Mr. Bush (quoted by White House, 2002) is sure that no nation can build a safer, better world alone. Alliances and multilateral institutions can multiply the strength of freedom-loving nations. The United States is committed to lasting institutions like the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the Organization of American States, and NATO as well as other long-standing alliances. Coalitions of the willing can augment these permanent institutions. In all cases, George Bush is taking international obligations very seriously and not symbolically to rally support for an ideal without furthering its attainment.

The NSS states that the United States will also stand beside any nation determined to build a better future by seeking the rewards of liberty for its people. Free trade and free markets have proven their ability to lift whole societies out of poverty—so the United States will work with individual nations, entire regions, and the entire global trading community to build a world that trades in freedom and therefore grows in prosperity. The United States will

deliver greater development assistance through the New Millennium Challenge Account to nations that govern justly, invest in their people, and encourage economic freedom. The USA will also continue to lead the world in efforts to reduce the terrible toll of HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases (White House, 2002).

AMERICA'S INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY

“Our Nation’s cause has always been larger than our Nation’s defense. We fight, as we always fight, for a just peace—a peace that favors liberty. We will defend the peace against the threats from terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers. And we will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent” (President Bush, quoted by White House, 2002).

Today the United States possesses unprecedented and unequalled strength and influence in the world. Sustained by faith in the principles of liberty, and the value of a free society, this position comes with unparalleled responsibilities, obligations, and opportunity. According to White House (2002) the great strength of this nation must be used to promote a balance of power that favors freedom.

The NSS states that for most of the twentieth century, the world was divided by a great struggle over ideas: destructive totalitarian visions versus freedom and equality. Today, that great struggle is over. The militant visions of class, nation, and race which promised utopia and delivered misery have been defeated and discredited. “the USA is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones. We are menaced less by fleets and armies than by catastrophic technologies in the hands of the embittered few. We must defeat these threats to our Nation, allies, and friends” (The White House, 2002).

The U.S. NSS is based on a distinctly American internationalism that reflects the union of its values and its national interests. According to White House (2002) the aim of this strategy is to help make the world not just safer but better. The goals on the path to progress are clear: political and economic freedom, peaceful relations with other states, and respect for human dignity. And this path is not America's alone. It is open to all.

For achieving these goals according to NSS the USA will:

- Champion aspirations for human dignity
- Strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against us and our friends
- Work with others to defuse regional conflicts
- Prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends, with weapons of mass destruction
- Ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade
- Expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy
- Develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power
- Transform America's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century.

1. Champion aspirations for human dignity

For achieving its goals, the USA's first work is to clarify what it stands for. According to the NSS the United States must defend liberty and justice because these principles are right and true for all people everywhere. And the USA puts a strategy before it to stand firmly for the nonnegotiable demands of human dignity: the rule of law, limits on the absolute power of

the state, free speech, freedom of worship, equal justice, respect for women, religious and ethnic tolerance, and respect for private property. Embodying lessons from its past and using the opportunity US has today, the National Security Strategy of the United States starts from these core beliefs and look outward for possibilities to expand liberty.

These demands can be met also in many ways. According to White House (2002) the USA's constitution has served the country very well. Many other nations, with different histories and cultures, facing different circumstances, have successfully incorporated these core principles into their own systems of governance. History has not been kind to those nations, which ignored or flouted the rights and aspirations of their people. And here the USA's experience as a great multi-ethnic democracy affirms its conviction that people of many heritages and faiths can live and prosper in peace. Its own history is a long struggle to live up to its ideals. But as NSS notes even in USA's worst moments, the principles enshrined in the Declaration of Independence were there to guide them. As a result, the USA is not just a stronger, but is a freer and more just society.

The USA's principles will guide the government's decisions about international cooperation, the character of their foreign assistance, and the allocation of resources. They will also guide its actions and words in international bodies.

For this purpose the USA will speak out honestly about violations of the nonnegotiable demands of human dignity using its voice and vote in international institutions to advance freedom. The USA will use also its foreign aid to promote freedom and support those who struggle non-violently for it, ensuring that nations moving toward democracy are rewarded for the steps they take. It also will make freedom and the development of democratic institutions key themes in its bilateral relations, and will take special efforts to promote freedom of religion and conscience and defend it from encroachment by repressive governments (White House, 2002).

So, the USA is going to champion the cause of human dignity and oppose those who resist it.

2. Strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against USA and their friends

Today the United States of America is fighting a war against terrorists of global reach. The enemy, according to White House (2002) is not a single political regime or person or religion or ideology. The enemy is terrorism— premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against innocents.

No cause justifies terror. And in this scope White House (2002) concludes, that the United States will make no concessions to terrorist demands and strike no deals with them. It makes no distinction between terrorists and those who knowingly harbor or provide aid to them.

The struggle against global terrorism is different from any other war in the US history. It will be fought on many fronts against a particularly elusive enemy over an extended period of time. White House (2002) is sure that progress will come through the persistent accumulation of successes—some seen, some unseen.

Today the terrorists have already seen the results of what civilized nations can and will do against regimes that harbor, support, and use terrorism to achieve their political goals. Afghanistan has been liberated; coalition forces continue to hunt down the Taliban and al-Qaida. But White House (2002) is sure that it is not only this battlefield on which they will engage terrorists. Thousands of trained terrorists remain at large with cells in North America, South America, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and across Asia. And here the USA's priority will be first to disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations of global reach and attack their leadership; command, control, and communications; material support; and finances.

This will have a disabling effect upon the terrorists' ability to plan and operate (White House, 2002).

America is going to continue to encourage its regional partners to take up a coordinated effort that isolates the terrorists. Once the regional campaign localizes the threat to a particular state, the US will help ensure the state has the military, law enforcement, political, and financial tools necessary to finish the task. The United States will continue to work with its allies to disrupt the financing of terrorism. They will identify and block the sources of funding for terrorism, freeze the assets of terrorists and those who support them, deny terrorists access to the international financial system, protect legitimate charities from being abused by terrorists, and prevent the movement of terrorists' assets through alternative financial networks. However, this campaign need not be sequential to be effective, the cumulative effect across all regions will help achieve the results they seek (White House 2002).

According to White House (2002) the USA will disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations by :

- Direct and continuous action using all the elements of national and international power. Their immediate focus will be those terrorist organizations of global reach and any terrorist or state sponsor of terrorism which attempts to gain or use WMD or their precursors;
- Defend the United States, the American people, and their interests at home and abroad by identifying and destroying the threat before it reaches the USA's borders. While the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, the USA will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise its right of self defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against its people and country;

- Deny further sponsorship, support, and sanctuary to terrorists by convincing or compelling states to accept their sovereign responsibilities. The USA will also wage a war of ideas to win the battle against international terrorism.

According to White House (2002) for achieving these goals the US will use the full influence of the United States, and work closely with allies and friends, to make clear that all acts of terrorism are illegitimate so that terrorism will be viewed in the same light as slavery, piracy, or genocide: behavior that no respectable government can condone or support and all must oppose. It will also support moderate and modern government, especially in the Muslim world, to ensure that the conditions and ideologies that promote terrorism do not find fertile ground in any nation; will diminish the underlying conditions that spawn terrorism by enlisting the international community to focus its efforts and resources on areas most at risk; will also use effective public diplomacy to promote the free flow of information and ideas to kindle the hopes and aspirations of freedom of those in societies ruled by the sponsors of global terrorism.

This Administration has proposed the largest government reorganization since the Truman Administration created the National Security Council and the Department of Defense. Centered on a new Department of Homeland Security and including a new unified military command and a fundamental reordering of the FBI, its comprehensive plan to secure the homeland encompasses every level of government and the cooperation of the public and the private sector (White House 2002).

According to White House (2002) this strategy will turn adversity into opportunity. For example, emergency management systems will be better able to cope not just with terrorism but with all hazards. Its medical system will be strengthened to manage not just 6 National Security Strategy bioterror, but all infectious diseases and mass-casualty dangers. Its border controls will not just stop terrorists, but improve the efficient movement of legitimate traffic.

While the government's focus is protecting America, it also knows that to defeat terrorism in today's globalized world the USA needs support from its allies and friends.

Wherever possible, the United States will rely on regional organizations and state powers to meet their obligations to fight terrorism. Where governments find the fight against terrorism beyond their capacities, the US will match their willpower and their resources with whatever help it and its allies can provide. As the US pursue the terrorists in Afghanistan, it will continue to work with international organizations such as the United Nations, as well as non-governmental organizations, and other countries to provide the humanitarian, political, economic, and security assistance necessary to rebuild Afghanistan so that it will never again abuse its people, threaten its neighbors, and provide a haven for terrorists (White House, 2002).

In the war against global terrorism, the US will never forget that it is ultimately fighting for its democratic values and way of life. Freedom and fear are at war, and there will be no quick or easy end to this conflict. In leading the campaign against terrorism, the country is forging new, productive international relationships and redefining existing ones in ways that meet the challenges of the twenty-first century (White House 2002).

3. Work with others to defuse regional conflicts

The USA gives also big importance in solving regional conflicts which emerge over the world. The White House (2002) says that "Concerned nations must remain actively engaged in critical regional disputes to avoid explosive escalation and minimize human suffering. In an increasingly interconnected world, regional crisis can strain our alliances, rekindle rivalries among the major powers, and create horrifying affronts to human dignity. When violence erupts and states falter, the United States will work with friends and partners to alleviate suffering and restore stability".

The NSS puts a strategy before the United States to invest time and resources into building international relationships and institutions that can help manage local crises when they emerge, and to be realistic about its ability to help those who are unwilling or unready to help themselves. Where and when people are ready to do their part, the US will be willing to move decisively.

As it comes to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the White House (2002) finds it critical because of the toll of human suffering, because of America's close relationship with the state of Israel and key Arab states, and because of that region's importance to other global priorities of the United States. The White House concludes that there can be no peace for either side without freedom for both sides. America stands committed to an independent and democratic Palestine, living beside Israel in peace and security. Like all other people, Palestinians deserve a government that serves their interests and listens to their voices. The United States will continue to encourage all parties to step up to their responsibilities as the USA seeks a just and comprehensive settlement to the conflict. Also the United States continues to challenge Israeli leaders to take concrete steps to support the emergence of a viable, credible Palestinian state, and as there is progress towards security, Israel forces need to withdraw fully from occupied positions (White House, 2002).

In South Asia, the United States has also emphasized the need for India and Pakistan to resolve their disputes. This Administration invested time and resources building strong bilateral relations with India and Pakistan. These strong relations then gave the USA leverage to play a constructive role when tensions in the region became acute. With Pakistan, the USA's bilateral relations have been bolstered by Pakistan's choice to join the war against terror and move toward building a more open and tolerant society. The Administration sees India's potential to become one of the great democratic powers of the twenty first century and has worked hard to transform their relationship accordingly. According to NSS the USA's

involvement in this regional dispute, building on earlier investments in bilateral relations, looks first to concrete steps by India and Pakistan that can help defuse military confrontation (White House, 2002).

In the Western Hemisphere the USA has formed flexible coalitions with countries that share the USA's priorities, particularly Mexico, Brazil, Canada, Chile, and Colombia. NSS says that together they can promote a truly democratic hemisphere where their integration advances security, prosperity, opportunity, and hope. The USA will work with regional institutions, such as the Summit of the Americas process, the OAS, and the Defense Ministerial of the Americas for the benefit of the entire hemisphere.

In Africa, promise and opportunity sit side by side with disease, war, and desperate poverty. This threatens both a core value of the United States—preserving human dignity—and their strategic priority—combating global terror. The USA's interests and principles, therefore, lead in the same direction: they will work with others for an African continent that lives in liberty, peace, and growing prosperity. Together with their European allies, the USA can help strengthen Africa's fragile states, help build indigenous capability to secure porous borders, and help build up the law enforcement and intelligence infrastructure to deny havens for terrorists (White House, 2002).

According to NSS Africa's great size and diversity requires a security strategy that focuses on bilateral engagement and builds coalitions of the willing. The USA Administration will focus on three interlocking strategies for the region:

- Countries with major impact on their neighborhood such as South Africa, Nigeria, Kenya, and Ethiopia are anchors for regional engagement and require focused attention;
- Coordination with European allies and international institutions is essential for constructive conflict mediation and successful peace operations; and

- Africa's capable reforming states and sub-regional organizations must be strengthened as the primary means to address transnational threats on a sustained basis.

Ultimately the path of political and economic freedom presents the surest route to progress in sub-Saharan Africa, where most wars are conflicts over material resources and political access often tragically waged on the basis of ethnic and religious difference. The transition to the African Union with its stated commitment to good governance and a common responsibility for democratic political systems offers opportunities to strengthen democracy on the continent (White House, 2002).

4. Prevent the USA's enemies from threatening its allies and friends, with WMD

“The gravest danger to freedom lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology. When the spread of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons, along with ballistic missile technology—when that occurs, even weak states and small groups could attain a catastrophic power to strike great nations. Our enemies have declared this very intention, and have been caught seeking these terrible weapons. They want the capability to blackmail us, or to harm us, or to harm our friends—and we will oppose them with all our power” (Bush, quoted by White House, 2002).

Having moved from confrontation to cooperation as the hallmark of the USA's relationship with Russia, the dividends are evident: an end to the balance of terror that divided them; an historic reduction in the nuclear arsenals on both sides; and cooperation in areas such as counter terrorism and missile defense that until recently were inconceivable. But new deadly challenges have emerged from rogue states and terrorists. None of these contemporary threats rival the sheer destructive power that was arrayed against the USA by the Soviet Union. However, the nature and motivations of these new adversaries, their

determination to obtain destructive powers hitherto available only to the world's strongest states, and the greater likelihood that they will use weapons of mass destruction against the USA, make today's security environment more complex and dangerous (White House, 2002).

In the 1990s the world witnessed the emergence of a small number of rogue states that, while different in important ways, share a number of attributes. These states:

- brutalize their own people and squander their national resources for the personal gain of the rulers
- display no regard for international law, threaten their neighbors, and callously violate international treaties to which they are party
- are determined to acquire WMD, along with other advanced military technology, to be used as threats or offensively to achieve the aggressive designs of these regimes
- sponsor terrorism around the globe
- reject basic human values and hate the United States and everything for which it stands.

According to White House (2002) the USA must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States and its allies and friends. Here it brings example of Iraq, which action at the time of the Gulf War, was not limited to the chemical weapons it had used against Iran and its own people, but also extended to the acquisition of nuclear weapons and biological agents. And in this scope the USA's response must take full advantage of strengthened alliances, the establishment of new partnerships with former adversaries, innovation in the use of military forces, modern technologies, including the development of an effective missile defense system, and increased emphasis on intelligence collection and analysis.

According to the NSS the USA's comprehensive strategy to combat WMD includes:

- *Proactive counter proliferation efforts:* The USA must deter and defend against the threat before it is unleashed. They must ensure that key capabilities—detection, active and passive defenses, and counterforce capabilities—are integrated into the USA's defense transformation and homeland security systems. Counter proliferation must also be integrated into the doctrine, training, and equipping of its forces and those of their allies to ensure that they can prevail in any conflict with WMD-armed adversaries.
- *Strengthened nonproliferation efforts to prevent rogue states and terrorists from acquiring the materials, technologies, and expertise necessary for weapons of mass destruction:* The USA will enhance diplomacy, arms control, multilateral export controls, and threat reduction assistance that impede states and terrorists seeking WMD, and when necessary, interdict enabling technologies and materials. The USA will continue to build coalitions to support these efforts, encouraging their increased political and financial support for nonproliferation and threat reduction programs. The recent G-8 agreement to commit up to \$20 billion to a global partnership against proliferation marks a major step forward.
- *Effective consequence management to respond to the effects of WMD use, whether by terrorists or hostile states:* Minimizing the effects of WMD use against the USA's people will help deter those who possess such weapons and dissuade those who seek to acquire them by persuading enemies that they cannot attain their desired ends. The United States must also be prepared to respond to the effects of WMD use against its forces abroad, and to help friends and allies if they are attacked.

For centuries, 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. However, according to NSS the USA must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today’s adversaries. Rogue states and terrorists do not seek to attack the USA using conventional means. They know such attacks would fail. Instead, they rely on acts of terror and, potentially, the use of weapons of mass destruction—weapons that can be easily concealed, delivered covertly, and used without warning (White House, 2002).

The United States has long maintained the option of preemptive actions to counter a sufficient threat to its national security. The greater the threat, the greater is the risk of inaction— and the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend themselves, even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemy’s attack.

To forestall or prevent hostile acts by its adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively. However, as White House (2002) concludes, the United States will not use force in all cases to preempt emerging threats, nor should nations use preemption as a pretext for aggression. Yet in an age where the enemies of civilization openly and actively seek the world’s most destructive technologies, the United States cannot remain idle while dangers gather. The USA will always proceed deliberately, weighing the consequences of its actions. To support preemptive options, the USA will:

- build better, more integrated intelligence capabilities to provide timely, accurate information on threats, wherever they may emerge
- coordinate closely with allies to form a common assessment of the most dangerous threats

- continue to transform its military forces to ensure its ability to conduct rapid and precise operations to achieve decisive results.

So, according to White House (2002) the purpose of the USA's actions will always be to eliminate a specific threat to the United States or its allies and friends. The reasons for its actions will be clear, the force measured, and the cause just.

5. Ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade

Talking about free market and free trade in Monterrey on March 22, 2002, President Bush expressed the following idea (quoted by White House, 2002)"When nations close their markets and opportunity is hoarded by a privileged few, no amount of development aid is ever enough. When nations respect their people, open markets, invest in better health and education, every dollar of aid, every dollar of trade revenue and domestic capital is used more effectively."

A strong world economy enhances the USA's national security by advancing prosperity and freedom in the rest of the world. It is also true that economic growth supported by free trade and free markets creates new jobs and higher incomes. It allows people to lift their lives out of poverty, spurs economic and legal reform, and the fight against corruption, and it reinforces the habits of liberty. In this scope the USA puts goal to promote economic growth and economic freedom beyond America's shores. All governments are responsible for creating their own economic policies and responding to their own economic challenges. The USA will use its economic engagement with other countries to underscore the benefits of policies that generate higher productivity and sustained economic growth (White House, 2002). This includes:

- pro-growth legal and regulatory policies to encourage business investment, innovation, and entrepreneurial activity

- tax policies—particularly lower marginal tax rates—that improve incentives for work and investment
- rule of law and intolerance of corruption so that people are confident that they will be able to enjoy the fruits of their economic endeavors
- strong financial systems that allow capital to be put to its most efficient use
- sound fiscal policies to support business activity
- investments in health and education that improve the well-being and skills of the labor force and population as a whole
- free trade that provides new avenues for growth and fosters the diffusion of technologies and ideas that increase productivity and opportunity.

According to the NSS the lessons of history teach the world that market economies, not command-and-control economies with the heavy hand of government, are the best way to promote prosperity and reduce poverty. Policies that further strengthen market incentives and market institutions are relevant for all economies—industrialized countries, emerging markets, and the developing world.

A return to strong economic growth in Europe and Japan is vital to U.S. national security interests. According to White House (2002) the USA wants its allies to have strong economies for their own sake, for the sake of the global economy, and for the sake of global security. European efforts to remove structural barriers in their economies are particularly important in this regard, as are Japan's efforts to end deflation and address the problems of non-performing loans in the Japanese banking system. The USA is going to continue to use its regular consultations with Japan and its European partners—including through the Group of Seven (G-7)—to discuss policies they are adopting to promote growth in their economies and support higher global economic growth.

Improving stability in emerging markets is key to global economic growth. International flows of investment capital are needed to expand the productive potential of these economies. These flows allow emerging markets and developing countries to make the investments that raise living standards and reduce poverty. According to White House (2002) the USA's long-term objective should be a world in which all countries have investment-grade credit ratings that allow them access to international capital markets and to invest in their future.

The best way to deal with financial crises is to prevent them from occurring, and the USA according to White House (2002) has encouraged the IMF to improve its efforts doing so. It is going to continue to work with the IMF to streamline the policy conditions for its lending and to focus its lending strategy on achieving economic growth through sound fiscal and monetary policy, exchange rate policy, and financial sector policy.

However, to promote free trade, the United States has developed a comprehensive strategy, which is the following:

- Seize the global initiative
- Press regional initiatives
- Move ahead with bilateral free trade agreements
- Renew the executive-congressional partnership
- Promote the connection between trade and development
- Enforce trade agreements and laws against unfair practices
- Help domestic industries and workers adjust
- Protect the environment and workers
- Enhance energy security

And here NSS states that economic growth should be accompanied by global efforts to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations associated with this growth, containing them at a level that prevents dangerous human interference with the global climate. The USA's overall objective is to reduce America's greenhouse gas emissions relative to the size of its economy, cutting such emissions per unit of economic activity by 18 percent over the next 10 years, by the year 2012. The USA's strategies for attaining this goal will be to:

- remain committed to the basic U.N. Framework Convention for international cooperation
- obtain agreements with key industries to cut emissions of some of the most potent greenhouse gases and give transferable credits to companies that can show real cuts
- develop improved standards for measuring and registering emission reductions
- promote renewable energy production and clean coal technology, as well as nuclear power—which produces no greenhouse gas emissions, while also improving fuel economy for U.S. cars and trucks
- increase spending on research and new conservation technologies, to a total of \$4.5 billion—the largest sum being spent on climate change by any country in the world and a \$700 million increase over last year's budget
- assist developing countries, especially the major greenhouse gas emitters such as China and India, so that they will have the tools and resources to join this effort and be able to grow along a cleaner and better path.

6. Expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy

A world where some live in comfort and plenty, while half of the human race lives on less than \$2 a day, is neither just nor stable. Including all of the world's poor in an expanding

circle of development—and opportunity—is a moral imperative and one of the top priorities of U.S. international policy. Decades of massive development assistance have failed to spur economic growth in the poorest countries. Worse, development aid has often served to prop up failed policies, relieving the pressure for reform and perpetuating misery. Results of aid are typically measured in dollars spent by donors, not in the rates of growth and poverty reduction achieved by recipients. These are the indicators of a failed strategy (White House, 2002).

Working with other nations, the United States is confronting this failure. It forged a new consensus at the U.N. Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey that the objectives of assistance—and the strategies to achieve those objectives—must change. This Administration’s goal is to help unleash the productive potential of individuals in all nations. Sustained growth and poverty reduction is impossible without the right national policies. Where governments have implemented real policy changes, the USA will provide significant new levels of assistance. According to NSS the United States and other developed countries should set an ambitious and specific target: to double the size of the world’s poorest economies within a decade (White House, 2002).

The United States Government will pursue these major strategies to achieve this goal:

- Provide resources to aid countries that have met the challenge of national reform
- Improve the effectiveness of the World Bank and other development banks in raising living standards
- Insist upon measurable results to ensure that development assistance is actually making a difference in the lives of the world’s poor
- Increase the amount of development assistance that is provided in the form of grants instead of loans

- Open societies to commerce and investment
- Secure public health
- Emphasize education
- Continue to aid agricultural development

7. Develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power

White House (2002) notes that the USA will implement its strategies by organizing coalitions of states able and willing to promote a balance of power that favors freedom. Effective coalition leadership requires clear priorities, an appreciation of others' interests, and consistent consultations among partners with a spirit of humility.

Here the USA accepts, that there is little of lasting consequence that it can accomplish in the world without the sustained cooperation of its allies and friends in Canada and Europe. Europe is also the seat of two of the strongest and most able international institutions in the world: NATO, which has, since its inception, been the fulcrum of transatlantic and inter-European security, and the European Union (EU), which is USA's partner in opening world trade (White House, 2002).

The alliance must be able to act wherever the USA's interests are threatened, creating coalitions under NATO's own mandate, as well as contributing to mission-based coalitions. To achieve this, according to the NSS the USA must:

- expand NATO's membership to those democratic nations willing and able to share the burden of defending and advancing their common interests
- ensure that the military forces of NATO nations have appropriate combat contributions to make in coalition warfare

- develop planning processes to enable those contributions to become effective multinational fighting forces
- take advantage of the technological opportunities and economies of scale in the uSA's defense spending to transform NATO military forces so that they dominate potential aggressors and diminish USA's vulnerabilities
- streamline and increase the flexibility of command structures to meet new operational demands and the associated requirements of training, integrating, and experimenting with new force configurations; and
- maintain the ability to work and fight together as allies even as they take the necessary steps to transform and modernize their forces.

Here White House (2002) notes that if NATO succeeds in enacting these changes, the rewards will be a partnership as central to the security and interests of its member states as was the case during the Cold War. They will sustain a common perspective on the threats to their societies and improve their ability to take common action in defense of their nations and their interests. At the same time, the USA welcomes its European allies' efforts to forge a greater foreign policy and defense identity with the EU, and commit themselves to close consultations to ensure that these developments work with NATO. The USA cannot afford to lose this opportunity to better prepare the family of transatlantic democracies for the challenges to come (White House, 2002).

According to White House (2002) the war against terrorism has proven that America's alliances in Asia not only underpin regional peace and stability, but are flexible and ready to deal with new challenges. For enhancing Asian alliances and friendships, the US will: look to Japan to continue forging a leading role in regional and global affairs based on their common interests, values, and close defense and diplomatic cooperation; work with South Korea to maintain vigilance towards the North while preparing their alliance to make contributions to

the broader stability of the region over the longer term; and also maintain forces in the region that reflect US's commitments to its allies, their requirements, technological advances, and the strategic environment.

The USA is also attentive to the possible renewal of old patterns of great power competition. Several potential great powers are now in the midst of internal transition—most importantly Russia, India, and China. However, in all three cases, recent developments have encouraged the USA's hope that a truly global consensus about basic principles is slowly taking shape (White House, 2002).

With Russia, the USA is already building a new strategic relationship based on a central reality of the twenty-first century: the United States and Russia are no longer strategic adversaries. According to White House (2002) they both now understand, increasingly, that Cold War approaches do not serve their national interests and that Russian and American strategic interests overlap in many areas.

United States policy seeks to use this turn in Russian thinking to refocus their relationship on emerging and potential common interests and challenges. Now they are broadening their already extensive cooperation in the global war on terrorism. However, at the same time, the US is realistic about the differences that still divide him from Russia and about the time and effort it will take to build an enduring strategic partnership. White House (2002) notes that Russia's uneven commitment to the basic values of free-market democracy and dubious record in combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction remain matters of great concern. That is why Russia's very weakness limits the opportunities for cooperation.

As it comes to India, the United States has undertaken a transformation in its bilateral relationship with India based on a conviction that U.S. interests require a strong relationship with India. India is moving toward greater economic freedom as well. According to White

House (2002) they both have a common interest in the free flow of commerce, including through the vital sea-lanes of the Indian Ocean. Finally, they share an interest in fighting terrorism and in creating a strategically stable Asia.

The United States relationship with China is an important part of the USA's strategy to promote a stable, peaceful, and prosperous Asia-Pacific region. The USA welcomes the emergence of a strong, peaceful, and prosperous China. The democratic development of China is crucial to that future. Yet, a quarter century after beginning the process of shedding the worst features of the Communist legacy, China's leaders have not yet made the next series of fundamental choices about the character of their state. In pursuing advanced military capabilities that can threaten its neighbors in the Asia-Pacific region, China is following an outdated path that, in the end, will hamper its own pursuit of national greatness. In time, White House (2002) is sure that China will find that social and political freedom is the only source of that greatness.

The United States also seeks a constructive relationship with a changing China. However, they already cooperate well where their interests overlap, including the current war on terrorism and in promoting stability on the Korean peninsula. Likewise, they have coordinated on the future of Afghanistan and have initiated a comprehensive dialogue on counter terrorism and similar transitional concerns (White House, 2002).

White House (2002) says that the events of September 11, 2001, fundamentally changed the context for relations between the United States and other main centers of global power, and opened vast, new opportunities. With their long-standing allies in Europe and Asia, and with leaders in Russia, India, and China, the US must develop active agendas of cooperation.

8. Transform USA's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century.

The USA agrees that the major institutions of American national security were designed in a different era to meet different requirements. Now all of them must be transformed. White House (2002) sees that it is time to reaffirm the essential role of the USA military strength. The US must build and maintain its defenses beyond the challenges. Its military's highest priority is to defend the United States. To do so effectively, its military must: assure their allies and friends; do not continue future military competition; deter threats against U.S. interests, allies, and friends; and decisively defeat any adversary if deterrence fails.

White House (2002) also notes that the USA must strengthen intelligence warning and analysis to provide integrated threat assessments for national and homeland security. Since the threats inspired by foreign governments and groups may be conducted inside the United States, the US must also ensure the proper fusion of information between intelligence and law enforcement.

According to the NSS the initiatives in this area will include:

- strengthening the authority of the Director of Central Intelligence to lead the development and actions of the Nation's foreign intelligence capabilities
- establishing a new framework for intelligence warning that provides seamless and integrated warning across the spectrum of threats facing the nation and its allies
- continuing to develop new methods of collecting information to sustain its intelligence advantage
- investing in future capabilities while working to protect them through a more vigorous effort to prevent the compromise of intelligence capabilities

- collecting intelligence against the terrorist danger across the government with all source analysis.

As the United States Government relies on the armed forces to defend USA's interests, it must rely also on diplomacy to interact with other nations. Its diplomats serve at the front line of complex negotiations, civil wars, and other humanitarian catastrophes. As humanitarian relief requirements are better understood, the US must also be able to help build police forces, court systems, and legal codes, local and provincial government institutions, and electoral systems (White House, 2002).

In exercising its leadership, the USA will respect the values, judgment, and interests of its friends and partners. They still will be prepared to act apart when the USA's interests and unique responsibilities require. When USA disagrees on particulars, it will explain forthrightly the grounds for its concerns and strive to forge viable alternatives. According to NSS the USA will not allow such disagreements to obscure its determination to secure together, with its allies and friends, its shared fundamental interests and values (White House, 2002).

“Ultimately, the foundation of American strength is at home. It is in the skills of our people, the dynamism of our economy, and the resilience of our institutions. A diverse, modern society has inherent, ambitious, entrepreneurial energy. Our strength comes from what we do with that energy. That is where our national security begins” (White House, 2002).

CONCLUSION OF THE NSS

Above we are talking about the USA strategic plans which the country put before it after September 11 and started to implement. In this plans, we see real goals towards safer and democratic world, where the terrorist groups will be isolated and destroyed, where everyone will enjoy his/her freedom, where the economies will flourish. And for achieving

these goals USA relies not only on its abilities, but it also tries to cooperate with other developed nations, and together to achieve what they want to have. The strategy the USA chose is also warning for other nations: nations, which are totalitarian and which can give basis for terrorist groups to exist; where human rights are not protected and people live in fear. It is warning for such kind of totalitarian countries to stop the way they are treating their nation, otherwise....

Part 3

AFGHANISTAN

USA – AFGHANISTAN NEGOTIATIONS

Since approximately 1996, Osama bin Laden had been resident in Afghanistan along with other members of al-Qaeda, which were recognized to be the people who prepared September 11. According to Wikipedia (2005) in the weeks prior to the military action in Afghanistan, US President George W. Bush delivered an ultimatum to the Taliban, which was the following:

- deliver Al-Qaeda leaders located in Afghanistan to the United States
- release all imprisoned foreign nationals, including American citizens
- protect foreign journalists, diplomats and aid workers in Afghanistan
- close terrorist training camps in Afghanistan and "hand over every terrorist and every person and their support structure to appropriate authorities".
- give the US full access to terrorist training camps to verify their closure

President Bush further stated that the demands were not open to negotiation or discussion. The Taliban refused to directly speak to Bush, stating this would be an insult to Islam, but made statements through their Pakistan embassy. Their initial response was to demand evidence of bin Laden's culpability in the September 11th attacks and to offer to try him in an Islamic court. Later, as military action became more obvious, they offered to

extradite bin Laden to a neutral nation. President Bush rejected these offers made by the Taliban as insincere (Wikipedia, 2005).

Later the UN Security Council also issued a resolution on September 18, 2001 directed towards the Taliban demanding that they hand over the terrorist Osama bin Laden and close all terrorist training camps immediately and unconditionally. The council also referred to a resolution it adopted in December 2000 demanding that the Taliban turn over bin Laden to the United States or a third country for trial in the deadly bombings of two U.S. embassies in Africa in August 1998 (Wikipedia, 2005).

MILITARY OPERATIONS

On Sunday October 7, 2001, US and British forces began an aerial bombing campaign targeting Taliban forces and Al-Qaida. Strikes were reported in the capital, Kabul (where electricity supplies were severed), at the airport and military nerve-centre of Kandahar (home of the Taliban's Supreme Leader Mullah Omar), and also in the city of Jalalabad (military/terrorist training camps). The US government justified these attacks as a response to the September 11, 2001 attacks and the failure of the Taliban to meet any US demands. The Taliban condemned these attacks and called them an "attack on Islam." This was a way that bin Laden and other members of the Al-Qaida were trying to make that war called for a war of Muslims, a Jihad, against the entire non-Muslim world (Wikipedia, 2005).

According to Wikipedia (2005) within a few days, most al-Qaeda training sites had been severely damaged and the Taliban's air defenses had been destroyed. The campaign then focused on communications and "command and control". The Taliban began losing the ability to coordinate, and their morale began to sink. But the line facing the Northern Alliance held, and no tangible battlefield successes had yet occurred. By November 2, Taliban frontal positions were decimated, and a Northern Alliance march on Kabul seemed possible for the

first time. Many Afghan Taliban troops had terrible morale, and were regarded as untrustworthy. Foreign fighters from al-Qaeda took over security in the Afghan cities, demonstrating how unstable the regime had become. Meanwhile, the Northern Alliance and their CIA/Special Forces advisors planned the offensive.

Finally, on the night of November 12, Taliban forces fled from the city of Kabul, sneaking away under cover of darkness in a massive retreat. By the time Northern Alliance forces arrived in the afternoon of November 13, only bomb craters, burned foliage, and the burnt out shells of Taliban gun emplacements and positions were there to greet them.

The fall of Kabul marked the beginning of a collapse of Taliban positions across the map. But the war was still continuing in the other regions of the Afghanistan. Though by the summer of 2002 most Taliban forces were destroyed but the war was still continuing, and there was still big threat of the Taliban. Now they are concentrated up on the mountains and continuing to fight against coalition forces (Wikipedia, 2005).

However, after managing to evade U.S. forces throughout the summer of 2002, the remnants of the Taliban gradually began to regain their confidence and started to begin preparations to launch the “Holly” war against the Afghan government and the US lead coalition forces. As Wikipedia (2005) notes Small mobile training camps were established along the border with Pakistan by al-Qaeda and Taliban fugitives to train new recruits in guerilla warfare and terrorist tactics. The Taliban gradually reorganized and reconstituted their forces over the winter, preparing for a summer offensive. They established a new mode of operation: gather into groups of around 50 to launch attacks on isolated outposts and convoys of Afghan soldiers, police, or militia and then breaking up into groups of 5-10 men to evade subsequent offensives.

As the summer continued, the attacks gradually increased in frequency in the "Taliban heartland." Dozens of Afghan government soldiers, non-governmental organization and

humanitarian workers, and several U.S. soldiers died in the raids, ambushes, and rocket attacks. Over 220 people, including several dozen Afghan police, were killed in August of 2003 as Taliban fighters gained strength (Wikipedia, 2005).

As Dr Kapila (2003) notes the United States did a commendable job in liberating Afghanistan from the brutal and oppressive regime of the Islamic Jehadi protigis of Pakistan, namely the Taliban. Here he gives very big importance to America's role in the liberation of Afghanistan and notes that the Afghanistan could be liberated by the United States only with the support of the Northern Alliance. Unlike in Iraq, except Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and China, no country in the world, opposed the United States military intervention for a regime change in Afghanistan. And the reasons according to Kapila (2003) for this was: The Taliban regime in Afghanistan under Pakistan's tutelage and dictates had turned Afghanistan into the Mecca of Islamic Jihad and global terrorism.

The global community recognized that other than by a United States military intervention and its ultimatums to Pakistan's military ruler, General Musharraf, to submit to the American line, the liberation of Afghanistan was not possible. The United States, was successful also in bringing-in the willing participation of NATO's member's military forces for peace-making operations in Afghanistan (Kapila 2003).

the USA succeeded in this Afghan war, and the only failure in this war was that it could not capture Osama bin-Laden.

An American sponsored interim government under President Karzai, Pashtun, was installed in Kabul to initiate the reconstruction of Afghanistan and its move to democracy and human rights and liberal advancement.

THE USA HUMANITARIAN AID TO AFGHAN

After the establishment of diplomatic relations in 1934, the U.S. policy of helping developing nations raise their standard of living was an important factor in maintaining and improving U.S.-Afghan ties. From 1950 to 1979, U.S. foreign assistance provided Afghanistan with more than \$500 million in loans, grants, and surplus agricultural commodities to develop transportation facilities, increase agricultural production, expand the educational system, stimulate industry, and improve government administration and for many other things (NetCent Communications, 2005).

In the 1950s, the U.S. declined Afghanistan's request for defense cooperation but, instead, extended an economic assistance program focused on the development of Afghanistan's physical infrastructure--roads, dams, and power plants. Later, U.S. aid shifted from infrastructure projects to technical assistance programs to help develop the skills needed to build a modern economy. The Peace Corps was active in Afghanistan between 1962 and 1979.

After the April 1978 relations deteriorated. In February 1979, U.S. Ambassador Adolph "Spike" Dubs was murdered in Kabul after Afghan security forces burst in on his kidnapers. The U.S. then reduced bilateral assistance and terminated a small military training program. All remaining assistance agreements were ended after the December 1979 Soviet invasion (NetCent Communications, 2005).

Following the Soviet invasion, the United States supported diplomatic efforts to achieve a Soviet Union's withdrawal. In addition, generous U.S. contributions to the refugee program in Pakistan played a major part in efforts to assist Afghans in need. U.S. efforts also included helping Afghans living inside Afghanistan. This cross-border humanitarian assistance program aimed at increasing Afghan self-sufficiency and helping Afghans resist Soviet Union's attempts to drive civilians out of the rebel-dominated countryside. During the

period of Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, the U.S. provided about \$3 billion in military and economic assistance to Afghans and the resistance movement (NetCent Communications, 2005).

AFGHANISTAN: SITUATION TODAY

The situation in Afghanistan today should be a matter of concern, primarily for the United States and all other countries interested in a peaceful South Asia and South-West Asia. And also It is in the vital strategic interests of the United States that Afghanistan emerges as a politically stable, moderate, democratic and viable nation-state entity capable of defending its sovereignty against the Taliban forces, which till today exist and present threat towards the safer and independent Afghanistan, towards the peacefull life of its civilians.

The U.S. Embassy in Kabul was closed in January 1989 for security reasons, but officially reopened as an embassy on January 17, 2002. Throughout Afghanistan's difficult and turbulent 23 years of conflict, the U.S. supported the peaceful emergence of a broad-based government representative of all Afghans and actively encouraged a UN role in the national reconciliation process in Afghanistan (NetCent Communications, 2005).

Today, the U.S. is assisting the Afghan people as they rebuild their country and establish a representative government that contributes to regional stability, is market friendly, and respects human rights. The U.S. and Afghanistan are also working together to ensure that Afghanistan never again becomes a haven for terrorists. The U.S. provides financial aid for mine-clearing, reconstruction, and humanitarian assistance through international organizations (NetCent Communications, 2005).

IRAQ

In July 1979, after the resignation of Bakr, Saddam Hussein assumed the offices of both President and Chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council of Iraq. He was the de facto ruler of Iraq for some years before he formally came to power. However, after gaining the power he started the war with Iran (1980-1988), which was mainly about the territorial dispute. The war left Iraq with the largest military establishment in the Persian Gulf region but with huge debts and an ongoing rebellion by Kurdish elements in the northern mountains (Wikipedia, 2005).

Near the end of the Cold War, Iraq (led by dictator Saddam Hussein) invaded its oil-rich neighbor Kuwait. Iraq accused Kuwait for violating the Iraqi border to secure oil resources, and demanded that its debt repayments should be waived. The United Nations Security Council and the Arab League immediately condemned the Iraqi invasion. Four days later (August 6, 1990), the Security Council imposed an economic embargo on Iraq that prohibited nearly all trade with Iraq. Iraq responded to the sanctions by annexing Kuwait as the "19th Province" of Iraq on 8 August, and this action called for stronger international response (Wikipedia, 2005).

For this occasion the New York Times wrote: “While the world waited Saddam Hussein systematically raped, pillaged and plundered a tiny nation – no threat to his own... And while the world waited, while the world talked peace and withdrawal Saddam Hussein dug in and moved massive forces into Kuwait. While the world waited, while Saddam stalled, more damage was being done to the fragile economies of the Third World, the emerging democracies of the Eastern Europe, to the entire world...” (quoted by Hartmann, 1994, p.14).

The UN passed different resolutions on Iraq, but all these had no affect. In November 1990, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 678, permitting member states to use all

necessary means, authorising military action against the Iraqi forces occupying Kuwait, and demanded a complete withdrawal by January 15, 1991.

When Saddam Hussein failed to comply with this demands, he left no other chance for US and others than to start the war. The Persian Gulf War (Operation "Desert Storm") started on the 17th of January 1991, with allied troops of 28 countries, led by the US launching an aerial bombardment on Baghdad. The war, which proved disastrous for Iraq, lasted only six weeks. Probably as many as 100,000 Iraqi soldiers and tens of thousands of civilians were killed (Wikipedia, 2005).

A cease-fire was announced by the US on 28 February 1991. UN Secretary-General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar met with Saddam Hussein to discuss the Security Council timetable for the withdraw of troops from Kuwait. Iraq agreed to UN terms for a permanent cease-fire in April 1991, and strict conditions were imposed, demanding the disclosure and destruction of all stockpiles of weapons.

After the war Iraq was allowed under the UN Oil-for-Food program (Resolution 986) to export \$5.2 billion (USD) of oil every 6 months with which to purchase these items to sustain the civilian population. According to UN estimates, a million children died during trade embargo, due to malnutrition or lack of medical supplies. 30% of the proceeds were redirected to a war reparations account (Wikipedia, 2005).

2003 INVASION OF IRAQ

The weakening of the internal position of the government occurred at a time when the external opposition forces were as weak as ever, too divided among themselves to take any effective action. At the same time, France and Russia pushed for an easing of sanctions. US determination to keep up the pressure on Iraq prevailed. However, apparent weakening of the government was illusory.

In 1998, Iraq expelled U.N. weapons inspectors. Around this same time, a group of national defense critics in USA began to publicly argue for the forced removal of Saddam Hussein because of his potential use of weapons of mass destruction (CRF, 2005).

However, as Diamond (2002) notes, whether Saddam was involved in the attacks on Sept. 11 (the evidence on that is still unclear) wasn't the central question. Instead, within days after the attacks on New York and Washington one year ago, the president and his top aides turned their sights on Baghdad as the biggest future threat to a nation that suddenly seemed all-too-vulnerable to terrorists and international outlaws.

Bush's presidency had been transformed in reaction to the terrorist attacks on Sept. 11. And here Diamond (2002) thinks that Bush's decision to act against Iraq could rid the world of an erratic dictator who has developed weapons of mass destruction and was seeking more. But it also could set off a chain of unpredictable developments in the Persian Gulf, affect the prospects for peace in the Middle East and redefine long-standing U.S. foreign policy doctrine. Never before has the United States launched a major military campaign on the grounds of pre-empting some future attack (Diamond, 2002).

As the US department of state (2002) notes Iraq remained a state sponsor of terrorism, continuing its long – standing policy of providing training, political support and sanctuary for a variety of terrorist organizations.

In an address to the UN on September 12, 2002, President Bush said: “The history, the logic, and the facts lead to only one conclusion: Saddam Husein's regime is a grave and gathering evidence. To assume this regime's good faith is to bet the lives of millions and the peace of the world in a reckless gamble. And this is risk we must not take” (quoted by US department of state, 2002, p.2).

Another major reason for the attack on Iraq was WMD. Saddam's pursuit of weapons of mass destruction culminated in the '70s with "Osirak", the French built nuclear reactor in

Iraq. In 1981, the reactor was destroyed by Israeli Air-Force jets. Saddam reacted by executing Iraqi generals in charge of defense. Israel claimed it acted to protect itself from threat of mass murder, but the action was internationally condemned as aggressive. However, in hind sight, following the Persian Gulf War this action might be viewed a prescient intervention, to prevent Iraq from developing a nuclear military capability - a capability which would have most likely deterred the US intervention in defence of Kuwait (Wikipedia, 2005).

In 2003 Bush said that Saddam has repeatedly violated 16 UN Security Council resolutions, which include a call for Iraq to "disarm its chemical, biological and nuclear weapons programs". Iraqi officials rejected Bush's assertions (that were based on flawed intelligency reports, as it later emerged), and a team of U.N. inspectors lead by Swedish diplomat Hans Blix was admitted into the country. The team's final report stated that Iraqis capability in producing "weapons of mass destruction" was not significantly different from 1992, when the country dismantled the bulk of their remaining arsenals under terms of the ceasefire agreement with U.N. forces (Wikipedia, 2005).

However, the United States and the United Kingdom opposed the team's requests for more time to further investigate the matter; the U.N. Security Council hence refused to issue a resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq. And in March 2003 the United States and the United Kingdom, with some aid from other nations, invaded Iraq.

On 23 May 2003, the UN Security Council unanimously approved a resolution lifting all economic sanctions against Iraq, largely due to the fact that Saddam Hussein's government, which the sanctions had targeted, no longer ruled the country. Saddam Hussein, who vanished in April as the U.S. military took control of the capital, was captured on 13 December 2003.

The political future is uncertain and detailed plans remain to be developed. Rampant looting and crime, coupled with infrastructural problems continue to plague the country at the moment. And from other side the terrorism emerged as a threat to Iraq's people not long after the invasion of 2003. Al Qaeda now has a presence in the country, in the form of several terrorist groups. Many foreign fighters and former Baath Party officials have also joined the insurgency, which is mainly aimed at attacking American forces and Iraqis who work with them. The most dangerous insurgent area is the Sunni Triangle, a mostly Sunni-Muslim area just north of Baghdad (Wikipedia, 2005).

Part 4

CONCLUSION

The September 11 attack has a very big influence on the US foreign policy. After the attacks, President George W. Bush brought forward a new American security strategy to prevent terrorists and dangerous regimes from developing, acquiring, or using weapons of mass destruction.

In this NSS plan a big part is devoted to terrorism: to the fight against this disease, which is a big fear for the whole world. However, the President Bush has been realistic in saying that the war against terror will not be quickly completed. In 2002, speaking to a joint session of Congress, he said: "...We will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice. And ... we must prevent the terrorists and regimes that seek chemical, Biological, or nuclear weapons for threatening the United States and the world..." (quoted by The U.S. Department of State 2002, p.7).

Though many people today think that Bush's administration policy is mainly about the fight against terrorism, but the National Security Strategy, which otherwise is also called Bush Doctrine, is much more than fight against terrorism. It today covers a wide range of

functions and issues. It includes establishing and maintaining diplomatic relations with other countries and international organizations. It includes peacekeeping functions such as working with allies to assure regional and international security and arms-control efforts. It covers a range of international economic issues including trade, travel, and business. It involves foreign aid and disaster relief. As a superpower, the United States has also taken a leadership role in peacemaking around the globe by trying to negotiate treaties and agreements to end regional conflicts. Also, as a world leader, the United States has a longstanding role in trying to address international economic and environmental problems.

However, several elements are crucial and consist the main meaning of the doctrine.

The first is the sense of urgency, which is very vital in Bush's words "...Yet time is not on our side. I will not wait the events while dangers gather...".

The second one is that the unique danger created by WMD requires the US to be prepared to take swift, decisive, and preemptive action. Here logic is, that whatever the risks of acting are, the risks of not acting are more dangerous. The term preemption is about the idea that in a world of terrorist organizations, dangerous regimes, and weapons of mass destruction, the United States may need to attack first. "We cannot let our enemies strike first," the National Security Strategy document warns. As CRF (2005) notes the National Security Strategy recognizes that pre-emptive action in the past required "the existence of an imminent threat--most often a visible mobilization of armies, navies, and air forces preparing to attack." It says, however, that terrorists and rogue states will not use conventional armies and navies, but rather terrorism and possibly "weapons of mass destruction--weapons that can be easily concealed, delivered covertly, and used without warning".

But critics of the emerging policy warn that striking first against adversaries has other risks as well. In the absence of clear evidence that these nations intend to attack the U.S. or its citizens, Washington would be setting an example for other nations that it's acceptable to

ignore international norms and act unilaterally. At the same time the policy analysts warn that an attack on Iraq could have another effect. It could alienate allies and can even encourage other states to engage in the kind of rogue behavior the Bush administration wants to preempt (Rowley, 2005).

Another important part in the NSS is the idea to act alone, if necessary. The Bush Doctrine is talking about the methods to achieve his aims such as establishing new military bases in the world, developing defense technology, and expanding intelligence gathering. Diplomacy also has a role to play in this difficult fight. And this doctrine is talking about the action to deal with threats to world peace through cooperation with allies, international institution (UN, EU, NATO...) and so on. But the NSS states that the United States "will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary." Critics argue for this, bringing argument that the USA through this action tries to show its power to all and tries to tell the world, that it will do whatever it wants. But Supporters of the Bush doctrine respond that the administration believes deeply in multilateral action whenever possible. As for Iraq, they point out that this was not a unilateral action: The coalition of the willing had many member nations (CRF, 2005).

However, most interesting and important part of the NSS is the extension of the benefits of freedom across the globe in order to build a balance of power that favors freedom. The security strategy states that the United States should do this by championing "nonnegotiable demands of human dignity." These include such things as the rule of law, freedom of worship, respect for women and many other things. In addition, the strategy calls for the United States to promote world economic growth through capitalist free markets and free trade. Here as CRF (2005) notes that the critics have mostly nothing to do, the only thing, which they can criticize, is the degree of realism. But however Bush administration believes in this and according to the NSS they will do everything for achieving this.

Though in NSS we come across with the word Iraq very rarely, but it is obvious that this plan is also designed against Saddam's regime. On January 29, 2002, President Bush expressed the opinion, which was saying: "...Yet time is not on our side. I will not wait the events while dangers gather. I will not stand by as peril draws closer and closer. The United States of America will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons" (quoted by The U.S. Department of State 2002, p.7). Here the President makes it clear, that certain states, like Iraq, Iran, and North Korea, present greatest threat. Analyzing the NSS very attentively, we come to the conclusion that the problem here is not only the danger of these countries acquiring WMD themselves, but also the risk that they can ultimately make such weapons available to others, especially terrorist groups like al Qaeda.

The international reaction to the Bush doctrine has been more complex, and the differences in the views within the allies and other countries have emerged concerning Iraq, and middle east. Robert Jervis, a professor of international politics at Columbia University and a leading foreign-affairs realist in the academy, calls the document's rhetoric "incredibly ambitious and incredibly activist" (quoted by Gitlin, 2003). However, as The U.S. Department of State (2002) notes much of this dissent remains rhetorical, and despite of these different views extensive cooperation in military and intelligence efforts continues to take place.

Another important part in the Bush doctrine is that the President started to fight against the terrorism by helping poor countries. The USA started to add its development assistance. President Bush launched significant new aid initiatives for the developing world in the months following the attack. As The U.S. Department of State (2002) mentions, that "The United States policy toward development assistance is based on the belief that poverty provides a breeding ground for disease and deprivation, and terrorism" (p.14).

Afghanistan is also one of the main targets of the USA. As The U.S. Department of State (2002) notes Afghanistan presents one of the most difficult humanitarian and development challenges the USAID has ever faced. Approximately half of Afghanistan, 26.8 million people live in absolute poverty: malnutrition is widespread, 50% of people are unemployed, 70% are illiterate. And all these are presenting very effective ground for terrorism to be developed. And that is why Afghanistan was always under the big attention of the USA. Even before September 11 terrorist attacks, Afghanistan was the USA's top recipient of humanitarian aid, receiving \$174 million in fiscal year 2001, and \$300 million in 2002.

In Iraq also the USA is doing great job for helping the country and its people. They are improving the lives of Iraqi citizens by conducting offensive operations to clear out enemy forces and leave Iraqi units behind to prevent the enemy from returning. With the USA help, the Iraqi military is gaining new capabilities and new confidence with every passing month. At the time of the Fallujah operations, there were only a few Iraqi battalions in combat - today there are more than 80. President Bush notes that "the progress is not easy, but it is steady" (quoted by White House, 2005). Today Iraq is also making incredible political progress. In about two and a half years, Iraq has made incredible progress on the path to becoming a democracy.

The road the USA chose is not flat. Many nations and groups stand against the USA, against its international policies. Even some groups inside the USA oppose Bush administration's international policies. But Bush administration drives forward very confidently. They believe that whatever they are doing is right and they are not going to step back. In contrast to opposition of president Bush's international policies, the fruits of that policies we can see today, in such kind of short time. Today Iraqi people are free from the tyrant, they are on their right way towards real democracy. So and Afghanistan. The USA is

doing incredible big job in rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan. Yes, of course, there are still too much to do: the fight against terrorism is not ended; many small nations still have internal and external problems. However, NSS was not designed to solve all the problems immediately. There is big need of time and universal efforts.

REFERENCES

Books

The U.S. Department of State (2002). September 11: One Year Later. Office of International Information Programs.

The U.S. Department of State (2002). Iraq: From Fear to Freedom. Office of International Information Programs.

Frederick Hartmann and Robert Wendzel (1994). America's Foreign Policy in a Changing World. Harper Collins College Publisher.

Internet sources

Constitutional Rights Foundation (2005). America's Foreign Policy: A Brief History.
[On-line] http://www.crf-usa.org/Iraqwar_html/iraqwar_foreignpolicy1.html
(20.10.05).

Constitutional Rights Foundation (2005). The Bush Doctrine.
[On-line] http://www.crf-usa.org/Iraqwar_html/iraqwar_bush_doctrin.html
(20.10.05).

Criminal Justice (2005). The Criminology Of Terrorism: History, Law, Definitions, Typologies. [On-line] <http://faculty.ncwc.edu/toconnor/429/429lect01.htm>
(22.06.05).

Eric Foner (2004). Rethinking American History in a Post-9/11 World.
[On-line] <http://hnn.us/articles/6961.html> (16.09.05).

John Diamond (2002). Iraq course set from tight White House circle. [On-line]
http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2002-09-10-iraq-war_x.html (20.10.05).

NetCent Communications (2005). Backgrounds: Afghanistan US Relations. [On-line]
<http://www.ncbuy.com/reference/country/backgrounds.html?code=af&sec=bac>
kusrelations (23.09.05).

Philip Gordon (2001). September 11 and American Foreign Policy.
[On-line] <http://www.brookings.edu/views/op-ed/gordon/20011101.htm>
(16.09.05).

S. M. Rahman (2005). Culture of Terrorism in USA.
[On-line] <http://www.friends.org.pk/rahman/culture%20of%20terrorism.htm>
(22.06.05).

Storer H. Rowley (2002). Critics Say Bush Doctrine Might Provoke 1st Strike.
[On-line] <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines02/0624-01.htm>
(11.11.05)

- Subhash Kapila (2003). United States Policy Predicaments In Afghanistan. [On-line]
<http://www.saag.org/papers9/paper820.html> (16.09.05).
- The White House (2002). The National Security Strategy of the United States of America.
[On-line] <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article2320.htm>
(20.10.05).
- The White House (2005). United States of America: National Security. [On-line]
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/nationalsecurity/> (02.11.05).
- Todd Gitlin (2003). America's Age of Empire: The Bush Doctrine. [On-line]
http://www.motherjones.com/commentary/columns/2003/01/ma_205_01.html
(17.11.05).
- Wikipedia (2005). U.S. Invasion of Afghanistan. [On-line]
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._invasion_of_Afghanistan (23.09.05).
- Wikipedia (2005). History of Iraq. [On-line]
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Iraq#2003_invasion_of_Iraq
(20.10.05).