

An updated version of the following case study will be available July 1, 2002 as a printed supplement, free when shrink-wrapped to any Longman text.

AMERICA'S WAR ON TERRORISM A CASE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

At 8:45 Tuesday morning, September 11, 2001, a sudden, totally unexpected terror exploded over New York City and in Washington, D.C. In chilling and stunned disbelief, witnesses observed a hijacked commercial airliner plunge high up into one of the twin towers of the majestic World Trade Center. Within a short time a second hijacked plane repeated the attack all over again on the second tower. With both towers now engulfed in gigantic flames and foreboding plumes of dark smoke, onlookers saw bodies on fire plummet from the upper floors. It was not long after these horrifying events when, already paralyzed by what had just happened, people near ground zero heard an ear-splitting noise as the first giant tower imploded and came thundering down—soon followed by the second. More than one person present on the scene of devastation and death believed it to be something akin to the invasion of Pearl Harbor, where 3,000 Americans were killed. They were incorrect. The death toll in New York on September 11, 2001, would exceed Pearl Harbor by well more than 1,000.

Meanwhile, in Washington, D.C., an hour after the first attack on the World Trade Center—in a clearly well planned, orchestrated and executed assault on the U.S.—a third hijacked Boeing 757 slammed into the Pentagon, killing scores of individuals and wounding many others. It was the first time the U.S. military's headquarters had suffered a terrorist attack. These attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C.—when coupled with a fourth terrorist hijacked jet aircraft that crashed before it reached its presumed

target in Washington, D.C.—drove the U.S. government underground, closed Congress for the day, and left almost everyone in the country totally shaken and dazed. The day's catastrophic events led to broad scale heightened security alert across the country, stopped all airline traffic for a period of time, shut down the financial markets temporarily, and launched days of grief and mourning for those who had tragically lost their lives. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and Red Cross, medical disaster teams, fire fighters in New York City and Washington, search-and-rescue workers, engineers and trained dogs performed heroic deeds trying to save as many lives as possible. Over 200 firemen lost their lives trying to put out the first fires when the twin towers collapsed.

About two weeks later, in Boca Raton, Florida, a photo editor working at the main offices of the National Enquirer, a popular US weekly, was hospitalized with a diagnosed case of Anthrax and died shortly thereafter. Since that time, several others have died from Anthrax infection, and many more have been infected with the subcutaneous less fatal form of the disease. Anthrax spores found in the congressional office buildings in Washington caused the shutdown of the Congress for five days. Spores were found in the New York City office of New York State Governor George Pataki, and as we go to press, news has come in of Anthrax dust found in a remote mail sorting station that sorts mail for the White House. While public officials have urged Americans to remain calm, public anxiety has understandably increased sharply. Cities, towns and local community officials across the country are going to Washington to get more information on how to combat the Anthrax threat and to develop a common plan drawing on both federal and state resources to handle the rapidly evolving situation.

With this background in mind, the case study on America's War Against Terrorism examines key questions:

1. **What was the reaction from around the world?**
2. **How did the United Nations react?**
3. **How has America responded in its foreign policy?**
4. **What are the major geopolitical aspects of America's War on Terrorism?**
5. **How do the War on Terrorism and Cold War compare?**
6. **Will the U.S.-led coalition(s) in the War Against Terrorism hold together—given the challenges they face?**
7. **Will the coalitions be able to forge an effective new political leadership for post-Taliban Afghanistan?**
8. **What policy will shape Afghanistan's post-Taliban economy in trying to stabilize this Shatterbelt region?**

WHAT WAS THE REACTION FROM AROUND THE WORLD?

Reaction from around the world was swift. **Russian President** Vladimir Putin was the first foreign head of state to call President Bush to offer support and Russia's condolences to the American people. The **European** foreign ministers scheduled a rare emergency meeting, and on the day after the attack invoked a mutual defense clause in the founding treaty of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Article 5, the cornerstone of the alliance, proclaims that an “armed attack” against any of the allies in Europe or North America “shall be considered an attack against them all.” Article 5 commits NATO members to take all necessary measures, including the use of force, to restore security. Invoking Article 5 represented a powerful expression of European solidarity—coming the wake of increased strains in trans-Atlantic relations over the President George W. Bush's policies, among others on missile defense and the environment.

Britain's Prime Minister, Tony Blair, placed British security forces across the world on high alert and stated that Britain would stand closely beside the U.S. in the battle against terrorism. As time moved on, Prime Minister Blair became Europe's foremost vocal supporter of U.S. military and political policies directed against terrorism in general, Afghanistan's Taliban [which means "students of religion"] and Osama bin Laden in particular. In *Germany* Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder concluded that the attacks constituted "a declaration of war against the civilized world."¹ He closed all major skyscrapers in Frankfurt, Germany's financial center, and canceled the public opening of the new Jewish museum in Berlin. *Russia's* President Vladimir V. Putin placed his troops on alert, held an emergency meeting of security officials, and indicated that he supported a tough response to terrorism.

Russia. The Russian people went out of their way to show their sympathy for the Americans who had lost loved ones. The entrances to the US Embassy in Moscow and the US Consulate in St. Petersburg were covered with flowers. Hundreds of candles were lit and thousands of Russians came to stand in front of the two buildings in silence. After his first call to President Bush, President Putin publicly offered both tactical and intelligence assistance to President Bush and his security officials, and won the assurance of the leaders of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan that former Russian military bases there would be available for use by US troops.

As the Bush Administration came to focus on Osama bin Laden as the chief architect of the attacks on America, Russian assistance became increasingly important. Bin Laden was suspected of hiding out in Afghanistan, under the protection of the ruling Islamic fundamentalist regime, known as the Taliban. Because of its geographic proximity to Afghanistan, Russia has had a long history of involvement in Afghan affairs. The most recent case was in 1979, when what was then the Soviet Union invaded the

country in an attempt to re-establish a pro-Soviet government. The Soviet war in Afghanistan lasted more than ten years and cost the lives of over 60,000 soldiers. The Russian death toll, coupled with the enormous expense of the war, was a major factor contributing to the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union. When the Russians finally withdrew from Afghanistan in 1989, they left an intelligence network in place that today probably has the most current inside knowledge on what is really happening in the war-torn state of any intelligence organization in the world. US access to this intelligence is indispensable for the protracted war the US-led alliance is waging against the Taliban and the terrorist organizations it is protecting.

In *Afghanistan*, Taliban officials denied that Osama bin Laden, the youngest of 90 children of the Saudi Bin Laden family, could be behind the attacks. At first the regime would not state publicly whether Bin Laden was in Afghanistan or not. As the United States stepped up its calls to the Taliban to hand over Bin Laden, the Afghan leaders offered to negotiate his release to a third country, arguing that Afghanistan was a miserable land, not worth bombing back to the stone age since it had been severely bombed by the Russians several years earlier.

In the **Middle East**, many countries excluding Iraq, voiced initial sympathy with the U.S, although positions began to change as the U.S. began pounding Taliban military targets in the first week of October 2001. *Israel* declared a national day of mourning and urged the rest of the world to fight terrorism. Yasir Arafat, the leader of the National Palestinian Authority, offered condolences and assistance in finding the attackers if requested. He was quick to deny involvement in the September 11 attacks, while elsewhere across the West Bank celebratory gunfire could be heard. In the attempt to uphold the Palestinian side of a cease-fire agreement negotiated September 26, Arafat pressed the Palestinian fundamentalist groups to cease their suicide bombing actions in

Israel. While Hamas agreed, the more radical groups did not. Terrorist incidents and Israeli military response continued unabated. In mid-October, Arafat was forced to send his security forces to put down a violent demonstration of Palestinian students, in which several of the students were killed. **Iran**, which had broken ties with the Afghan Taliban, exhibited an ambivalent attitude. It lost no time condemning the “terrorist” attacks of September 11, and then three weeks later, roundly condemned U.S. military action in Afghanistan. Still, Iran agreed to perform search-and-rescue missions for any US pilots who might crash on its territory during the military campaign against Afghanistan. As might be expected in light of its defeat in the 1991 Gulf War and the subsequent imposition of UN sanctions, **Iraq** celebrated the attacks as the “operation of the century” which the U.S. well deserved for its “crimes against humanity.”²

China’s President Jiang Zemin expressed his shock over the attacks and sent condolences to President Bush. China’s Foreign Ministry declared that it “opposed all manner of terrorism.”³ **Japan**, a country that has experienced several terrorist acts in the past decade, voiced its anger over the events of September 11th and quickly put into place extra security at all U.S. military installations.

HOW DID THE UNITED NATIONS REACT?

As students of international politics know, ethnic national groups and territorial states dominate international affairs, but non-state actors have become increasingly important. These include international intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) like the United Nations, which Chapter Five discusses in detail. The Security Council of the UN in particular has played a variety of roles, including among others authorizing the use of military force as a means to resolve conflict—as in the Persian Gulf War—or providing

peacekeeping forces in a variety of locations around the world. One key aim of the UN of course is to promote collective security, an international forum where the world's states cooperate and unite to keep the peace. Toward this end the UN frequently issues a series of resolutions when aggression occurs—as when Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990-1991—to label such action as aggression, to set forth how legitimate collective sanctions may be applied to combat that aggression, and to authorize the use of force by an international coalition.

In the case of the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and Pentagon on September 11, 2001, the UN Security Council went immediately into action. On September 12, the day after the attack, the Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1368, which called on all states to bring the perpetrators of this crime against humanity to justice. Resolution 1368 held that any act of terrorism constituted a threat to international peace and security—and called on the international community to redouble its efforts to prevent and suppress terrorist acts. It then unanimously passed Security Council Resolution 1373 on September 28, 2001—a wide-ranging anti-terrorism statement that called for all states to suppress the financing of terrorism, assist each other in criminal investigations or criminal proceeding relating to financing or support of terrorist acts, and prevent movement of terrorist across borders. On October 15, 2001, it unanimously adopted another Resolution that called for the Taliban to turn over Osama bin Laden without further delay.

HOW HAS AMERICA RESPONDED IN ITS FOREIGN POLICY?

Two days after the attack on America, President Bush, as Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. armed forces, declared the U.S. to be “at war” with international terrorism. It would

be a war not only against Osama bin Laden and the Taliban leaders in Afghanistan who gave him shelter—but also against the widely-dispersed terrorist network over which he controlled as well as many other terrorist groups at work across the world that had gone underground and were hard to identify. After consultations with his Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of State, Colin Powell, and National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice, the President set in motion a train of events that within three weeks led to a closely orchestrated new foreign policy.

Elements of America’s New Foreign Policy

New elements of America’s foreign policy included the following:

- The call up of U.S. Military Reserves and launching of **Operation Enduring Freedom**, striking military targets in Afghanistan combined with humanitarian food air.
- A U.S. Congressional Resolution giving the president power to “use all necessary and appropriate force” against any individual, organization or country that played any role in the attacks.
- A Congressional appropriation of \$20 billion for that purpose, in addition to the \$20 billion designated for rescue and clean-up operations at home.
- The identification of Osama bin Laden as the mastermind behind the September 11 attacks and his al-Qaeda terrorist organization as the main vehicle for launching the attacks.
- A US public opinion overwhelmingly in support of military action against terrorists, including the Taliban military forces in Afghanistan.
- The building of a broadly based coalition in support of military action. This alliance brought together the **NATO countries, including Turkey; Russia, the Gulf states** including a somewhat reluctant **Saudi Arabia;**

Egypt, Indonesia, Japan, and the key states on Afghanistan's borders: volatile and fragile **Pakistan**, where Taliban followers were trained and where considerable support for the Taliban existed, **Uzbekistan**, a country that had Uzbek relatives in Afghanistan fighting in the Taliban opposition known as the Northern Alliance; and **Tajikistan** that also had Tajik relatives fighting against the Taliban in Afghanistan.

- A U.S. Congressional Resolution giving the president power to “use all necessary and appropriate force” against any individual, organization or country that played any role in the attacks.
- A Congressional appropriation of \$20 billion for that purpose, in addition to the \$20 billion designated for rescue and clean-up operations at home.
- The identification of Osama bin Laden as the mastermind behind the September 22 attacks and his al-Qaeda terrorist organization as the main vehicle for launching the attacks.
- A US public opinion overwhelmingly in support of military action against terrorists, including the Taliban military forces in Afghanistan.
- Movement to speed payment of the U.S. long standing debt to the United Nations, in order to gain a stronger position there for its war on terrorism.
- Condemnations by the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly of the terrorist attacks against the U.S.
- Visits to the US to confer with President Bush by many of the new alliance's heads of state, particularly Britain's Tony Blair and French President Jacques Chirac.
- The emergence of Tony Blair as the global spokesman and defender of the US-led war against terrorism.

- The coordination of financial control of terrorist group monetary resources through the freezing of assets of suspected terrorists, the sharing of intelligence information across a broad spectrum of countries, including Russia, an international police investigation, and diplomatic pressure.
- A national appeal for tolerance for Muslims within the United States and a strong show of support for the war against terrorism by US minority groups, including Asians, Muslim African-Americans and Hispanics.
- Strong US pressure for new peace talks between Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization, and a public statement by President Bush committing the US to the establishment of a Palestinian state.
- A carefully calculated US and British bombing campaign in Afghanistan intended to distinguish between an innocent population and the terrorist enclaves and Taliban forces supporting them
- Collaboration with the Afghan rebel group, the Northern Alliance, who had been fighting the Taliban for five years.

U.S. Foreign Policy Goals

To sum up, America's foreign policy response—including the military campaign against Taliban forces in Afghanistan—was successful in bringing together an extraordinary coalition of different countries, including Moslem states, that one could not have imagined coming together on September 10, 2001.⁴ Shifting to a brand new and unfamiliar operating mode, US foreign policy was forced to focus on a terrorist enemy who knew no borders, operated through an unknown quantity of clandestine networks

and cells, and was peopled with individuals from many different countries harboring what they perceived to be serious grievances against the status quo. In its initial stages, then, the US response was aimed at a country with a desolate “Road Warrior” landscape that had inherited a centuries-old legacy of ceaseless bloody wars among local tribes and against outside intruders.

This first war of the 21st century is a new kind of war. It is the first to require the combination of human intelligence (HUMINT) as much—or more than sheer military power, the organization of US homeland national security on a war footing that matched U.S. interests abroad, including close relations with Congress, the maintenance of smooth ties with coalition partners, the waging of a financial and psychological war aimed not only at the terrorists but also to win over the hearts and minds of the population of the entire world and last but not least, humanitarian aid to balance military action. In confronting an illusive non-state, the U.S.-led War on Terrorism truly opened a new chapter in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. Even more importantly it turned a new page in the global conduct of inter-state and international relations. War is no longer assumed to be the exclusive domain of states. It is now also waged by international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

WHAT ARE THE MAJOR GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS OF AMERICA’S WAR ON TERRORISM?

From what you have read so far, you know that the US-led war on terrorism is not taking place in a vacuum. On the contrary, a host of geopolitical forces are driving the conflict. Geopolitics mixes with an enemy who uses weapons of the most sinister kind to obtain his own ideological ends. We shall take the most important of these forces in turn.

Afghanistan

Central Asia, where much of the war on terrorism is focused is a highly volatile region of the world with strong competing geopolitical interests driving foreign policies and domestic rule. **Afghanistan** is a land-locked country of 253,000 square miles of foreboding terrain that borders on Iran, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and China.

Afghanistan is composed of seven main tribes that historically have fought each other for dominance in the region. In the north towards the border with Tajikistan are the Tajiks, comprising about 25 percent of the population. Grouped around the border with Uzbekistan are the Uzbeks (6 percent). These two tribes form the core of the Taliban opposition, the Northern Alliance. In the North West on the border with Turkmenistan are the nomadic Turkmens (4 percent). In the South West are the Aimaq and Baluchi (8 percent). In the center are the Hazara (19 percent). The largest tribe is the Pushtun (known also as Pathans) as it is variously called (40 percent). The Taliban leaders and the majority of their supporters belong to this tribe.

All of these tribes speak different languages and have kindred across the Afghan border: the Turkmens, Uzbeks and Tajiks with the newly independent states of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan. The Baluchi and Hazara have relatives in Iran and Pakistan, while some of the Baluchi and a large part of the Pushtu tribe live in neighboring Pakistan. So numerous are the Pathan, or Pushtu, as they are called in Pakistan, in that country that in 1947, when Pakistan was forming, the Afghan government pushed for Pakistan's North West Frontier Province to be made the independent sovereign state of Pushtunistan.

This proposal soured Afghanistan's relations with Pakistan, and the division of the Pathan tribe has been a source of friction ever since. With the influx of some 2 million Afghan refugees into Pakistan, the Pushtu tribe has become a sizable force in Pakistani politics. Their political strength is probably the main reason why the Pakistani government until just recently chose to support the training of Taliban mujahidin in Pakistan and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. Keep in mind that none of these ethnic groups have an “Afghan” national identity. Their loyalty is not to “Afghanistan” as in the case of Serbs to Serbia, Croats to Croatia or Bosnians to Bosnia; loyalty flows to ethnic group, tribe, or clan rather than to the state or central authority.⁵

Only a few times in its history was the country able to unite around one leader. The most notable instance was in the eighteenth century when Ahmed Shah established a unified state in most of present day Afghanistan, under the Durani dynasty that lasted until 1826. Most of the country's turbulent history, however, consists of foreign invasions and occupations, including the Persians, Alexander the Great, Moslem Arab armies, Genghis Khan's Mongol hordes, and Great Britain, Imperial Russia, and the Soviet Union. The 1979 invasion by the Soviet Union ended in its being forced out by anti-Soviet mujahidin guerillas, loosely organized under tribal leaders who were backed by Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and the U.S. When the Soviets departed, internal fighting erupted among the groups—a situation many observers fear will happen again if a viable security establishment and political leadership is not forged when the Taliban are removed from power.

Afghanistan is an extremely poor and landlocked country where twenty-five million people struggle to survive. One out of every four children dies before the age of five. Life expectancy is about 43 years of age. Only 12 percent of the population has access to fresh drinking water, and barely 30 percent of the men and 15 percent of the

women can read or write. The geography of Afghanistan is harsh and forbidding, where arable land often runs only a few feet from riverbeds. Expanding desertification and environmental degradation exacerbate the terrible poverty and crumbling infrastructure. In addition the whole population lives with the omnipresent danger of being blown up by anti-personnel mines, the enduring gift of the retreating Soviet army. All these problems underscore the scope of the Afghans' problem in finding the national unity, security, and sound economic base the country needs.

The place is made for guerrilla war—high mountains, deep valleys, wide plains, where land mines proliferate and knowledge of the terrain lies in the hands of local inhabitants. Craggy cliffs and long tunnels hidden deep in the limestone rock offer unique hiding places. Unpaved roads and steep mountain trails make vehicular traffic difficult at best, while steeply rising mountainsides frustrate troop movement. Taliban bases are difficult for the untrained eye to discern, and civilians and combatants dress and look alike. The land is perfect for tribal warfare, lawlessness, and defense against foreign invaders, including U.S. combatants. From a military perspective, the place is hardly a picnic—ignorance of this land of high mountains, narrow river valleys and hidden tunnels is a serious danger to foreign invaders.

Historically caught up in fighting among hill tribes, warlords, and diverse ethnic groups, Afghanistan might well be described as a **failing state**. Certainly it was an **outlaw** or **pariah state** in that before the September 11th events. Up to that time, only three countries recognized the Taliban as the legitimate government of Afghanistan—Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and the United Arab Emirate (UAE). After the attack, Saudi Arabia and the UAE withdrew diplomatic recognition, and Pakistan withdrew its diplomatic representatives.

Afghanistan's Border States

The Economist magazine calls this part of Central Asia, “the perpetual vortex,” a place where the Taliban have caused lots of trouble with Central Asia since they came to power in the mid-1990s, and now Central Asia is taking its revenge.⁶ Despite the fact that five of the border states are Moslem, and the sixth China has a large population of Moslems in its western provinces, not one has come to the defense of the Taliban since the U.S. launched its military strikes against Afghanistan. On the contrary, Pakistan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan have each offered assistance to the U.S. and its allies. The leaders of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan have looked on anxiously as the Taliban trained and armed dissidents to cause disruption and terror in their still young and fragile countries and none of them has supported or abetted Afghan militants. The most populous of the three states, Uzbekistan, has been a primary target of Taliban activity, with two assassination attempts on the Uzbek head of state, Karimov. It is worth remembering that Afghanistan's landlocked status makes it dependent on neighboring states for trade and transit, while its porous borders make smuggling drugs and guns easy.

Pakistan, ironically, shares much of the responsibility for the rise of the Taliban in the first place. During the Afghan/Soviet war, the government allowed groups of militant Islamic students to study in Pakistan, in the hope of training enough guerillas to deter the Soviet invasion. With the same goal in mind, Saudi Arabia gave considerable amounts of money to start up and keep these schools going. In addition, it sent its rebellious fundamentalist youth to train at these schools and then go to fight in Afghanistan. From these small beginnings there arose in Pakistan a network of pro-Taliban *madrassas*, Islamic religious schools where poor and hungry boys were fed, lodged and educated to militant Islam under the influence of anti-American and anti-West religious leaders. Pakistan, multiethnic in its origins, has become increasingly fragile since September 11

with its over two million Afghan refugees since the Taliban took over in Afghanistan, and scores more since the U.S. launched air strikes. In siding with the U.S., Pakistan is on an ethnically frayed tightrope. Its biggest problem is its old 1947 bone of contention with Afghanistan, the North-West Frontier Province, where the Pushtun/Afghani are in the majority. The largest and most violent anti-U.S. protests have broken out here. It is here as well that Pakistan's largest religious party, Jamaat-e-Islami, has warned that "millions" will take to the streets if U.S. attacks on Afghanistan continue⁷.

Kashmir

Kashmir was the northernmost province of old British India. In 1948, when Pakistan and India were separating into independent states along religious lines, the Hindu ruler of the largely Moslem province asked to join India. A Moslem revolt broke out. Pathan/Pushtu tribesmen from Pakistan invaded the province. The Hindu ruler asked India for help. In 1949, the UN was able to secure a cease-fire line that left northwest Kashmir in Moslem/Pakistani hands. For over fifty years, Pakistan and India have been caught in conflict over the status of the province, and India's presence in the disputed Kashmir territory has been a source of deep frustration to Pakistanis. Recognizing the need for a friendly neighbor to its west, when the Taliban came to power, the Pakistani government enthusiastically backed them, seeing in them religious zealots who could promote the Pakistani cause in Kashmir. In addition, the Pakistanis found Afghanistan a splendid place to train guerrillas to combat India in Kashmir. Small wonder then that Pakistan until recently has backed the Taliban. The problem now is that Taliban fundamentalists, while useful to Pakistan in the Kashmir conflict, have grown in such numbers and intensity that they threaten Pakistan's very stability—and at the same time raise eyebrows in India as the U.S. courts Pakistan in its war against the Taliban. Indian's leaders may

well ask what will be Pakistan's relationship with the Islamic fundamentalists and Taliban in post-Taliban Afghanistan? India likely will seek to weaken U.S. ties to Pakistan by stepping up fighting in Kashmir as it did on October 15th, 2001, just before U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell arrived in Pakistan on a state visit.

The Arab Countries

It might well be argued that much of the radical Islamic opposition to the U.S. and the west is caused as much by Arab countries as by U.S. or Western actions or non-actions. Saudi Arabia and Egypt are cases in point. In failing to promote economic and political modernization, their non-democratic leaders face radical Islamic opposition from those who suffer under stagnant economies and non-inclusive political cultures. Poor young men increasingly have turned to radical fundamentalism that pledges salvation by way of jihad, or implacable struggle, with the West.

While the rise of radicalism is feared by most Muslim governments—including conservative ones like Saudi Arabia—it is worth keeping in mind is that the Saudi government has tried to bolster its weakening legitimacy by funding a religious revival elsewhere in the Arab world—backing mosques, preachers and schools that tout militant Islam and opposition to modernity.⁸ Egypt, the Arab's world most populous state, more and more looks like a police state, repressing political dissent and rising extreme opposition. Egypt is no stranger to terrorism. In 1981, terrorists now known to have been associated with the al-Qaeda group, murdered Egyptian leader, Anwar Sadat, because he had the courage to make peace with Israel. While the U.S. treats these countries as trusted allies, their leaders have treaded very lightly in support of the U.S. fearing to offend even more their highly vocal internal Islamic radicals. One positive result of the participation of Egypt and Saudi Arabia in the anti-terrorist coalition could

be a new promotion of Islam by these states, not as a weapon against the modern world, but as a vehicle of modernization and incorporation into the global community. The future of the two countries in large part hinges on an "Islamic renaissance," similar to the Christian renaissance in Europe in early modern times.

The Muslim World

Islam predominates in more than 35 countries, stretching in a band across northern Africa to Central Asia, northwestern China, and the northern part of the Indian subcontinent.

Still more to the east, Indonesia has the largest Muslim population of any country in the world. While the largest absolute number of Muslims lives in Asia, Africa has the largest proportion of Muslims among its population—over 42 percent. Islam has approximately 1.25 billion followers, which means that one in every five people on the planet is a Muslim. Islam (which means “commitment”) is the fastest growing religion in the world, and in the United States as well. There are now over 8 million Muslim Americans.

“Arab” and “Muslim” are not synonymous. A Muslim is a person who follows the precepts of Islam, whereas “Arab” refers to ethnicity—a person whose origins originate from the Arabian Peninsula. Arabic is a language spoken throughout the world, although not every speaker of Arabic is an Arab, in the same way that every English speaker is not from Great Britain or North America. Muslims come from every ethnicity on the globe—from sub-Saharan Africans to Europeans in Germany, Bosnia and France, to Portuguese-speaking Brazilians. Over 50 million Muslims live in China and over 150 million in Indonesia. The world of Islam includes Sunni Muslims, Shiite Muslims and other smaller branches and sects.

Those countries with predominately Muslim people belong to the Islamic Conference, a religious international intergovernmental organization (IGO). At the end of the first month after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on America, the Islamic

Conference met in Doha, Qatar, and denounced those attacks on New York and Washington, D.C. At the same time, however, it called on the U.S. to justify its bombing campaign against Afghanistan—a clear indicator of less than full support for America’s war on terrorism. While the large majority of Muslims are peace-loving and have life goals for their family similar to most of the world's population, there is continuing ambivalence in many believers' minds as to the true meaning of jihad or Holy War. Most Moslems argue that Osama bin Laden and his followers are no more representative of Islamic jihad than is the Ku Klux Klan of American democratic principles. But the fact remains that jihad appeals to the young, educated and uneducated, rebellious and lonely.

THE FIVE PILLARS OF ISLAM

1. Declaration—Muslims believe in only one God, and each Muslim declares that Allah is that one god and Muhammad his final prophet. Islam recognizes the prophethood of Jesus, Moses, and Abraham, etc.
2. Prayer—Muslims perform ritual prayer five times per day.
3. Fasting—During the ninth month of the lunar Islamic calendar, Ramadan, Muslims who are old enough and healthy enough fast for 29 or 30 days from sun-up to sun-down.
4. Giving to the Poor—Every Muslim customarily donates a certain portion of his or her earnings to the less fortunate.
5. Pilgrimage—Each Muslim should make a pilgrimage to Mecca (in Saudi Arabia) once in his or her lifetime if he or she has the means to do so.

Note: Contrary to popular belief in the West, *jihad* (struggle) is not one of the five pillars of Islam. Jihad in fact refers to the personal struggle every Muslim engages in to live a peaceful and good life. One of the basic principles of Islam is the equality of all people regardless of race, ability, and gender.

Navigating the shoals of Muslim emotions surrounding Osama bin Laden and his call to “holy war” against America is one of the most serious challenges that confront the U.S and the coalition today. The problem is to convince Muslims around the world that

going after Muslim terrorists is not an attack on the Muslim world or on Islam. In this propaganda war, Bin Laden and his supporters are likely to do everything possible to create that illusion, mining the fault lines of Muslim identity and passions wherever and whenever possible. [See Chapter Six, pp. 274-forward] Both the Arab and non-Arab Muslim world therefore forms a pivotal arena in the geopolitics of the US-led war on terrorism. Indonesia has experienced huge anti-U.S. protests in the wake of U.S. air strikes on Afghanistan. With the instability created by the overthrow of the Suharto dictatorship and the violence attending the independence of East Timor, Indonesia is a very fragile state indeed. Thousands of angry Muslims similarly took to the streets in Kenya, Africa, with the news of U.S. bombing on Afghanistan.

Arab-Israel Conflict

A hugely significant geopolitical arena of this war lies in Israel and the West Bank (For background, see "The Israeli Palestinian Conflict: Which People is Palestine's Rightful Owner", p. 81) In 2000, what seemed like interminable peace talks seemed to many Palestinians to be leading nowhere. In anger, a second Palestinian *intifada* ("insurrection" or "uprising" in Arabic), more violent than its 1978 predecessor, began in the West Bank and Gaza. Palestinian youths fought Israeli tanks for the creation of a Palestinian state. Strapping bombs around their waists, they blew themselves up in market places and other public areas in Israel, killing innocent Israelis in the process. The Israeli army struck back with the force of its modern military equipment. The US-led War on Terrorism gave this bitter conflict into a new perspective in several ways. First, it placed renewed pressure on Palestinian leaders, notably Yasir Arafat, to try to control the mobs that rallied in the thousands in support of Osama bin Laden, lest he lose the sympathy and renewed backing for a Palestinian state by President George Bush. As

a result, Palestinian policemen shot down their own people with live ammunition in clashes in mid-October 2001.⁹ Israeli leaders, for their part, also felt renewed U.S. pressure to negotiate with Arafat, lest they fan the fires of deeper anti-Israeli—and by implication, anti-U.S.—sentiments throughout the Muslim world, giving legitimacy to Osama bin Laden vitriolic attacks on the U.S. for backing Israel.

In both Israel and the Palestinian territories, tensions have been since the War on Terrorism began. Yasir Arafat faces real challenges to his authority from the angry mobs celebrating the bombing of America as well as from militant groups supporting terrorist tactics like Hamas (Islamic Resistance Movement, founded in 1987), Hizbullah (Party of God) and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP). His longevity in power is not guaranteed. Israel's current leader, Ariel Sharon of the rightist Likud party, faces pressure from his rightist supporters who will be dissatisfied with Sharon's compromises as the U.S. pressures Israel to negotiate a Palestinian state. The struggle between Palestinians and Jews inside Israel has been extraordinarily complex and tense in recent months, and the War on Terrorism has served to intensify opinions and emotions.

Russia's Interests

The geography of Russia, as noted above, gives Russia unique geopolitical leverage when it comes to fighting the Taliban in Afghanistan. An extended war suggests two bases from which to operate—one in highly unstable Pakistan and the other within the three independent republics lining Afghanistan's northern border: Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. While these countries are independent, they nevertheless fall inside Russia's sphere of influence in terms of economic, military and political realities. The heads-of-state are well known to each other. Most if not all of the present government administration in these countries were educated under the Soviet regime and were comrades together in the former Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The leaders of all

the countries have a personal relationship with individuals in the Russian government that despite differences with Russia and a desire to maintain their independence makes these leaders more comfortable with known Russian power than with the still evolving power relationships they are developing with their neighbors to the south.

Russia thus remains the key to opening up its former republics to accept the presence of US military and as we saw earlier, is the intelligence key that assures the security of US activity in the region. Since the onset of intertribal warfare in Afghanistan after Russia's troop withdrawal, Russia has steadfastly backed the anti-Taliban Northern Alliance [See Chapter 3 on Power Influences in Foreign Policy]. In having to rely on Russia for security of its forces in the area, the U.S. undoubtedly will have to alter its position on a number of issues important to Moscow:

1. Less criticism of Russia's war in Chechnya (predominantly Muslim) (Take a fresh look at the case study on Chechnya in Chapter 2.)
2. More support for Russia's domination of the Caucasus region (Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan).
3. Return of more Russian power in Central Asia.
4. Less NATO expansion.
5. An increase in financial assistance.
6. Negotiating a reduction in nuclear weapons in order for Russia to accept US testing of an eventual missile defenses system.

HOW DO THE WAR ON TERRORISM AND COLD WAR COMPARE?

In some ways the war on terrorism shows parallels to the Cold War that emerged in 1947 after World War Two. There is a similar geopolitical construct. The Cold War was

designed to contain Communism in an all-out struggle that included military, diplomatic, economic and ideological components; the New War is a similar all-out struggle designed to defeat terrorism with multiple policy tracks. A moral imperative shaped the Cold War: Communism is evil. In the new war, “terrorism is evil.” The Cold War led to the creation of a National Security State, with emphasis on national security in foreign and domestic policy and new institutions to achieve it, like the Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Council, coupled to high priority for defense spending. The Terrorism War stresses key roles by these same institutions, new emphasis on Homeland Security, and higher defense spending. The Cold War gave us a way to tell friends from enemies; the Terrorism War defines who is with us and who is against us.

Differences between the Cold War and War on Terrorism also are clear. In the Cold War, America knew who was the enemy—the former Soviet Union, a large state located in Eurasia with Communist Party links throughout the world. Terrorists hide within states and live in cells inside states and travel across porous state borders. Communists did not have legions of religious fundamentalists prepared to commit suicide for their cause. Even the most die-hard Communist was hardly prepared to strap on a time bomb and walk into a crowd or hijack a plane and steer it into a tall building or resort to the use of biological weapons like anthrax or smallpox. In the Cold War nuclear deterrence—or Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) was successful in achieving and maintaining relative security. Terrorists have created a world of Assured Insecurity (AI), with few ways to deter that fear and insecurity.

Assured Insecurity is an entirely new situation for most people living on the North American continent. In their need to feel more secure, Canadians and U.S. citizens may urge their governments to pass laws that on the one hand increase surveillance of suspected terrorists, increasing the likelihood that they will be apprehended and on the

other significantly decrease the freedoms set forth in the first amendments of the U.S. constitution that Americans have struggled so long to define and understand. As this case study goes to press, an Anti-Terrorism bill is winding its way through the U.S. Congress that civil libertarians argue will curtail freedoms that Americans may take for granted.

A New Kind of War

This new kind of war, where terrorists mingle with the man-in-the-street, demands a new kind of approach to civil rights and civil liberties that is only just beginning to evolve. How can the West wage a successful war against a terrorist groups and a repressive regime if it does not ensure civil rights at home? Civil rights include all those rights listed in the UN Declaration of Human Rights, including women's rights. In the first days after September 11, when Afghanis were able to express their fear of U.S. air strikes, Afghan women, telling of their unbearable situation and how much more unbearable U.S. strikes would make it, sent out a desperate appeal over the Internet. In this new war, then, the Internet, NGOs (terrorist organizations) and porous state borders have taken on new meaning—and in this kind of war the exercise of raw power has severe limitations. Winning the war means winning the hearts and minds of the planet. To be successful, the U.S. and its allies must emphasize the common values that bind the world together and demonstrate their commitment to making the world a better place for everyone.

WILL THE U.S.-LED COALITION (S) IN THE WAR AGAINST TERRORISM HOLD TOGETHER—GIVEN THE CHALLENGES THEY FACE?

This question remains opened ended as the War on Terrorism—and the Taliban in Afghanistan—entered its second month. It will require that the U.S. maintains

international support for the War in its military, diplomatic, political, intelligence-gathering and economic tracks—that is, in the different ways the U.S. uses power [See Chapter Four on Foreign Policy Formation and Execution]. More than one coalition is involved and that fact complicates the problem. Coalitions include: (1) the NATO countries; (2) Islamic countries (like Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt) (3) and the coalition inside Afghanistan (Northern Alliance and its supporters). Keeping these coalitions intact while military action against Afghanistan proceeds poses a big challenge to say the least—not only in volatile Pakistan and among members of the Islamic Conference, not to mention Saudi Arabia and Egypt, but also in how the U.S. deals with Russia and NATO allies. India-Pakistan relations complicate everything. Additional challenges stem from the widespread nature of Osama bin Laden’s al-Qaeda organization—which operates in roughly 68 countries.¹⁰

WILL THE COALITIONS BE ABLE TO FORGE AN EFFECTIVE NEW POLITICAL LEADERSHIP FOR POST-TALIBAN AFGHANISTAN?

Who will follow the Taliban? Most political observers see this issue as a number one major challenge to U.S. policy-makers—given Afghanistan’s turbulent history and divisive faction-torn society. The big question is how to create a viable and broad-based coalition government, while initiating economic rebuilding and establishing a security force to keep the peace? The fear at the time of this writing is that the Taliban will be removed in Afghanistan before a new-established coalition government is in place, thus leaving Afghanistan under the same conditions that prevailed when the Soviets departed in 1989. One thing is certain: nobody in U.S. decision-making circles or in Pakistan want the Northern Alliance to dominate a new government, for its return would undermine

Pakistan's President, General Pervez Musharraf, among his military and influential Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) agency.¹¹ Pakistan in fact would like to see Taliban defectors, moderates, to be part of the new government. Once idea circulating discussion of a new post-Taliban government is that it would be counterproductive to press for a strong central government in Kabul. Afghanistan is more likely to move toward some form of loose federation after the Taliban are removed—with representatives from various ethnic, tribal, and sectarian groups guaranteed representation. It will have to be decided whether or not King Mohammad Zahir Shah, ousted by his brother-in-law in 1973, and living in exile in Rome, should be invited back as a symbolic figure to help pull together a Loya Jirgah (General Assembly of tribal, religious, political and rural notables) to begin discussions on power sharing amongst the many ethnic groups.¹²

WHAT POLICY WILL SHAPE AFGHANISTAN'S POST TALIBAN ECONOMY IN TRYING TO STABILIZE THIS SHATTERBELT REGION?

Will the U.S.-led coalition try to apply a Marshall Plan solution to post-Taliban Afghanistan? [See the Textbook Chapter Seven, Political Geography, p. 303]. That huge U.S. effort to revitalize Europe's shattered economies through financial and reconstruction assistance [about \$88 billion in today's dollars; \$ 13 billion at the time it was applied right after World War Two] would find Afghanistan a far more daunting place for this type and scope of aid. While the Western countries that received the aid understood capitalism and had the social and economic infrastructure to absorb the money effectively, Afghanistan is so poor it would be difficult to know where to begin. Other issues that post-Taliban reconstruction will face include the following:

- What to do with the over 2 million **refugees** driven from Afghanistan into Pakistan by more than two decades of warfare in Afghanistan—in addition to refugees in Turkmenistan (1,300), Uzbekistan (8,000), Tajikistan (12,000), and India (12,000) plus many more in other countries.
- How to deal with a country which may be the most heavily **land mined** place on earth.
- How to cope with the millions of refugees and civilians who face not only hunger and disease but also **winter's freezing temperatures**—with no electricity, poor canvas tents.
- How to meet the **cost** of providing food; the World Health Organization notes that only \$114 million has been donated thus far, less than half of the estimated \$ 257 million that the WFP believes it needs to feed the 7.5 million people in Afghanistan in need of food this winter.

Still, the U.S. and the West cannot walk away from the problem and abandon Afghanistan like the Soviets did in 1989. Aid must go to feeding people—including the estimated 3 million Afghan refugees that have fled the country because of civil war and Taliban repression. Initial priorities probably would include distributing food and water, encouraging farmers to shift from poppy for opium production to some other type of crop, and clearing this desolate country of land mines. Secular schools, hospitals, roads and bridges, power plants and water treatment facilities are next in line. Down the road, somewhat akin to Bosnia, the country will need assistance in creating a functioning legal system, putting a central bank into operation, establishing political parties and holding elections. This list of issues that the U.S. and the West take for granted is tied basically to modernization—but how to do it without infringing on religious and cultural traditions

or having much of the money wind up in corrupt hands as it has in Bosnia—remains to be seen. Will a transition to democracy and capitalism work in post-Taliban Afghanistan work?¹³ This is a question that has many sub-questions and no simple answers.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. September 11, 2001, is a day the world will long remember in terms of its impact on international politics. In fact, a compelling case can be made that now the Cold War era is over—and the Post-Cold War era is over—and an entirely new phase of international relations has begun. How, and in what ways, would you say international system dynamics were changed by the events of that day? In what ways has the international system remained constant?
2. Was the Bush Administration correct in calling for a "war" on terrorism? Consider the principle of discrimination as discussed in Chapter 9 and the definitions of justice presented in Chapter 10.
3. From your knowledge of the international system and the levels of analysis, what chances do you give that the U.S.-led coalition will hold together, given the challenges it faces?
3. Discuss this question from the viewpoint of each of the levels of analysis—with special attention to a state-level and individual level assessment.
4. What types of power factors seem best suited for conducting the War on Terrorism?
5. Why do militant Muslims hate the United States? Do the reasons for their hatred justify the attacks of September 11, 2001?

6. Of what importance is the UN role in America's War on Terrorism?
7. What kind of role would you like to see the U.N., NATO, and individual states play in the framing of a post-Taliban government and security zone in Afghanistan? Why? Tell us about your underlying assumptions.
8. Where and how do you see international intergovernmental organizations coming into play since the events of September 11, 2001?
9. What measures can or should the U.S. and the West take to moderate radical Islam's anti-Western and anti-U.S. stance? Among other things, Osama bin Laden has said an independent Palestinian state is essential to ending Islamic terrorism. Do you agree or disagree?
10. Are there ever times when military force is necessary? If so, is the terrorist crisis one of these times? Explain why or why not? Is there ever a time when military force is clearly required? Is the terrorist crisis one of these times? Explain why or why not.
11. As the U.S.-led War on Terrorism has gotten under way, there has been virtually no discussion of human rights. Where do you stand? Do you think that nothing should stand in the way of "getting the terrorists? How do human rights and justice issues affect the outcome of this war?
12. Many in the developing countries see this war as a war between the haves and the have-nots. How do you see the war? Elaborate.
13. From what you have seen so far in this War, how do you think it will impact on relations between India and Pakistan Relations over the coming months?
14. What, if any, positive outcomes do you see from this War in terms of great power relations among the U.S., China and Russia?

15. How, and in what ways, would you say political geography helps to understand some of the major driving forces in world politics when applied to this War on Terrorism?
16. What would you say should be the end game in Operation Enduring Freedom? That is, under what conditions or circumstances should the military campaign against Afghanistan end.
17. Do you think the world was more or less safe during the Cold War compared to the world in which we now live? Explain the reasoning of your answer and cite evidence to support it.

RELEVANT WEB SITES

1. These special reports are available free in PDF format at the *Christian Science Monitor's* web site, <http://www.csmonitor.com>

The Thursday, 10/12 edition of The Christian Science Monitor includes "THE TENETS OF TERROR", a comprehensive report on the ideology of jihad and the rise of Islamic militancy. In this report, CSM correspondents from Egypt to Indonesia explore the fast-spreading strain of Islam claimed by Osama bin Laden and his sympathizers, and compare it to that of other Islamic extremist groups ...thousands of young men steeped in violent visions of a new Islamic world order. Islam's major sects, Sunni, Wahhabi, Shiite and Sufi, are also described.

Tuesday 10/12 edition, Jane Lampman's article "MORALITY AND WAR compares Islam's "jihad of the sword" with Christendom's concept of a "just war".

Thursday, 09/27 "WHY DO THEY HATE US?," the Monitor's report on street-level political ideology in the Muslim world.

Monday, 09/17 "A CHANGED WORLD", the Monitor's report on the impact on American life of the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington D.C.

2. US War Against Terror: Retaliation, Investigation, Recovery, Victims, Missing, Day of Terror, America's Voice. <http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center>

CNN Special Reports on the World Trade Center attacks and on subsequent US actions. Complete with interactive maps of Afghanistan.

3. For Russian opinion on the war on Terrorism, go to www.lenta.ru and click on the English version. You will find news of Chechnya intermingled with news of what is going on in Afghanistan.

4. The *Democrat and Chronicle's* Series, Understanding our World is a series of video and interactive reports on world events since September 11. http://www.rochesternews.com/flash/world/afghan_index.html

5. Try tuning into the radio broadcasts of Al-Jeseera (sp.?) for an Arab perspective on world events.

OTHER USEFUL WEB SITES FOR BREAKING NEWS ANALYSIS

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: www.bt.cdc.gov

US Department of Energy: www.energy.gov

US Department of Health and Human Services: www.hhs.gov

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA): www.rris.fema.gov

Environmental Protection Agency: www.epa.gov/swercepp

Johns Hopkins University: www.hopkins-biodefense.org

ENDNOTES

¹ *The New York Times*, September 12, 2001.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *The Economist*, September 29 – October 5, 2001, p. 11.

⁵ Alvin Z. Rubinstein, “Afghanistan After the Taliban,” *Foreign Policy Research Institute*, October 15, 2001, e-mail distribution.

⁶ *The Economist*, September 29, 2001, p. 20.

⁷ *The Economist*, October 13, 2001, p. 23.

⁸ Fareed Zakaria, “The Allies Who Made Our Foes,” *Newsweek*, October 1, 2001, p. 34.

⁹ “Confronting the Mob,” *Newsweek*, October 22, 2001, p. 50.

¹⁰ Remarks by Roger F. Noriega, Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States, Washington, D.C., October 16, 2001.

¹¹ Rubinstein, *Op. Cit.*

¹² Rubinstein, *Op. Cit.*

¹³ *The New York Times*, October 14, 2001.