The Global Fight of Terror
Implications of 9/11

Tamta TSKHOVREBADZE*

Abstract

The attention which is given to terrorism is often considered disproportionately to its real danger. The use of terror as a mean to attain personal or political objectives exists all over the world. Terrorism incidents kill and maim millions of people. People strive for power and these power-wielding individuals may commit terrible acts.

Modern terrorist ideology has changed. Victims of terrorism are often those who have no offensive intentions towards the terrorists – passengers, journalists, diplomats, educators, students, business executives and other civilians.

Nowadays terrorists are more likely to choose this tactics rather than the traditional methods - assassinations of heads of state or prominent officials. Terrorists prefer easy targets.

Less than 12 hours after the 9/11 attacks, George W. Bush proclaimed the start of a global war on terror. Ever since, there has been a vigorous debate about how to win it. Bush and his supporters emphasized the need for the offensive attack against terrorists and to use all existing levers for countering such brutalities.

Radicalization and terrorism have become major problems at national, regional and global levels, as a threat to collective security. Deepening the problem even more, the significance of Terrorism personifies not only casualties and annihilation of the enemy but also implies moral claims.

The aim of this paper is to analyze whether it is possible to win the global war on terror and make readers get acquainted with the coordinated, collective and global structuring war effort which has developed since 9/11.

Keywords: collective security, global war on terror, terrorism

Introduction

Terrorism has not just begun, and even though it has been used since the beginning of recorded history it can be relatively hard to define. Terrorism has been described variously as both a tactics and a strategy; a crime and a holy duty; a justified reaction to oppression and an inexcusable abomination. (Terrorism History, Insurgency, Types of Terrorism, 2010). Obviously, a lot depends on whose point of view is being represented. It has often been an effective tactics for the weaker side in a conflict. The United States Department of Defense defines terrorism as "the calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological." (International Terrorism and Security Research, 2013) Outside the United States Government, there are more variations among definitions of terrorism. The United Nations produced this definition in 1992; "An anxiety-inspiring method idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby - in contrast to assassination - the direct targets of violence are not the main targets." (Schmid & Jongman, 1988)

Terrorism is a denial of the obligation of self-control and involves unacceptable violence because of its cruelty and unexpectedness. The victims of terrorism are often those who bear the least offensive intentions toward the terrorists – airline passengers, journalists, diplomats, educators, students, business executives and other civilians.

Terrorism is often referred as the "weapon of the weak". It usually refers to small ideological groups that lack a large numbers of supporters. However, terrorist tactics can accompany large-scale liberal movements.[1]

It influences an audience by using an immediate victim. The strategy of terrorists is to commit acts of violence that draws the attention of the local populace, the government, and the world to their cause. The terrorists plan their attack to obtain the greatest publicity, choosing targets that symbolize what they oppose. The effectiveness of the terrorist act lies not in the act itself, but in the public's or government's reaction to the act. For example, in 1972 at the Munich Olympics, the Black September Organization killed 11 Israelis. The Israelis were the immediate victims. But the true target was estimated 1 billion people watching the televised event.[2] That is why preemption is being considered to be so important. In some cases, terrorism has been a mean to carry on a conflict without the adversary realizing the nature of the threat, mistaking terrorism for criminal activity. Because of these characteristics, terrorism has become

* Master Program student, Faculty of Social Sciences, International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia.
E-mail: ttskhovrebadze@ibsu.edu.ge

[1] The Algerian FLN was responsible for the 1956-57 campaign of bombings of European civilians in Algiers, which together with the severely repressive French response constituted the "Battle of Algiers", subsequently dramatized in a popular film directed by Gillo Pontecorvo.

[2] Read more about Black September and the Murder of 11 Israelis at the 1972 Munich Olympics: http://middleeast.about.com/od/terrorism/a/me080803e.htm

increasingly common among those pursuing extreme goals throughout the world. (International Terrorism and Security Research, 2013)

There are three perspectives of terrorism: the terrorist's, the victim's, and the general public's. The phrase "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" is a view that terrorists themselves would accept. Terrorists do not see themselves as evil. They believe they are legitimate combatants, fighting for what they believe in, by all available means. A victim of a terrorist act sees the terrorist as a criminal with no regard for human life. General public's view is the most unstable. Terrorists take great pains to foster a "Robin Hood" image in hope of swaying general public's opinion towards their cause. This sympathetic view of terrorism has become an integral part of their psychological warfare and needs to be countered vigorously. (International Terrorism and Security Research, 2013)

In the process of defining the concept of terrorism it is critical to isolate terrorism from specific political goals; that is, all nationalists, and revolutionaries of far-right extremists are not terrorists. No particular ideology or religion is responsible for such actions. That is why identifying risk groups is especially difficult and that weakens progress of countering terrorism.

Research on terrorism and terrorism-related issues has increased dramatically in the wake of the 9/11 attacks. This is not surprising. 9/11 witnessed the most destructive terrorist assaults in recorded history, and the attacks led to far bloodier conflicts as part of the subsequent war on terror. Terrorism has become the defining issue of international politics of the first decade of the 21st century.

A Historical Turning Point

On September 11, 2001, 19 militants associated with the Islamic extremist group al-Qaeda hijacked four airliners and carried out suicide attacks against targets in the United States. Two of the planes were flown into the towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, a third plane hit the Pentagon just outside Washington, D.C., and the fourth plane crashed in a field in Pennsylvania. Often referred to as 9/11, the attacks resulted in extensive death and destruction, triggering major U.S. initiatives to combat terrorism and defining the presidency of George W. Bush. Over 3,000 people were killed during the attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C., including more than 400 police officers and firefighters.

Suspicion quickly fell on al-Qaeda, and in 2004, the group's leader Osama bin Laden, who had initially denied involvement, claimed responsibility for the attacks afterwards. Al-Qaeda and bin Laden cited U.S. support of Israel, the presence of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia, and sanctions against Iraq as motives for the attacks. The United States responded to the attacks by launching the War on Terror and invading Afghanistan to depose the Taliban, which had harbored Al-Qaeda. Many countries strengthened their anti-terrorism legislation and expanded law enforcement powers. In May 2011, after years at large, bin Laden was found and killed.

The September 11 attacks still remain the deadliest terrorist attacks in the history of the world. The attackers of New York's World Trade Center created an unparalleled shock effect, but signally failed to communicate their motivation and intention to their victims. It changed the millennial generation's lives. (Thomas H. Kean et al, 2004)

A survey by American University's School of Communication found 7 out of 10 respondents said their lives were changed by the events of September 11, 2001. The survey questioned 18-29 year-old people about attacks, and showed that although young adults were affected they do not live in fear. The same margin of respondents said they do not worry about another terrorist acts. (Crowe, 2011)

Resulting Global "War on Terror"

The phrase 'War on Terror' was first used by US President George W. Bush and other high-ranking US officials to denote a global military, political, legal and ideological struggle against terrorist organizations and regimes accused of having connection to them, providing them with support or posing a threat to the US and its allies in general. (Political, 2012) It was typically used with a particular focus on militant Islamists and al-Qaeda.

The global war on terrorism (GWOT), according to the U.S. Department of State, is "being fought by many means-- through diplomatic, military, financial, intelligence, investigative, and law enforcement actions--at home and abroad," with the Department of State in the "lead role on the diplomatic front abroad to advance the cause of the coalition against terrorism. The Department also works closely with other agencies and organizations to shut down terrorist financial networks, provide humanitarian aid, and to investigate terrorist organizations and activities and bring terrorists to justice."

"The attack took place on American soil, but it was an attack on the heart and soul of the civilized world. And the world has come together to fight a new and different war, the first, and we hope the only one, of the 21st century. A war against all those who seek to export terror and a war against those governments that support or shelter them." (Johnston's Archive , 2001) - President George W. Bush.

Operations Enduring Freedom

Afghanistan

On 20 September 2001, in the wake of the 11 September attacks, George W. Bush delivered an ultimatum to the Taliban government of Afghanistan to turn over Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda leaders operating in the country or face attack. The Taliban demanded evidence of bin Laden's link to the 11 September attacks and, if such evidence warranted a trial, they offered to handle such a trial in an Islamic Court. The US refused to provide any evidence.

Subsequently, in October 2001, US forces (with UK and coalition allies) invaded Afghanistan to oust the Taliban regime. On 7 October 2001, the official invasion began with British and US forces conducting airstrike campaigns over enemy targets. Kabul, the capital city of Afghanistan, fell by mid-November. The remaining al-Qaeda and Taliban remnants fell back to the rugged mountains of eastern Afghanistan, mainly Tora Bora. In December, Coalition forces fought within that region. (Political Sciences Concepts, 2013)

In March 2002, the US and other NATO and non-NATO forces launched Operation Anaconda with the goal of destroying any remaining al-Qaeda and Taliban forces in the Shah-i-Kot Valley and Arma Mountains of Afghanistan. The Taliban suffered from heavy casualties and evacuated the region.

The Taliban regrouped in western Pakistan and began to

unleash an insurgent-style offensive against Coalition forces in late 2002. Throughout southern and eastern Afghanistan, firefights broke out between the surging Taliban and Coalition forces. Coalition forces responded with a series of military offensives and an increase in the amount of troops in Afghanistan. In February 2010, Coalition forces launched Operation Moshtarak in southern Afghanistan along with other military offensives in the hopes that they would destroy the Taliban insurgency once and for all.

Horn of Africa

This extension of Operation Enduring Freedom was titled OEF-HOA. Unlike other operations contained in Operation Enduring Freedom, OEF-HOA does not have a specific organization as a target. In October 2002, the Combined Joint Task Force - Horn of Africa (CJTF-HOA) was established in Djibouti at Camp Lemonnier. It contains approximately 2,000 personnel including US military and special operations forces (SOF) and coalition force members, Combined Task Force 150 (CTF-150). (Feickert, 2006).

Task Force 150 consists of ships from a shifting group of nations, including Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Pakistan, New Zealand and the United Kingdom. The primary goal of the coalition forces is to monitor, inspect, board and stop suspected shipments from entering the Horn of Africa region and affecting the US' Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Operation consists of training of selected armed force units in counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency tactics in Djibouti, Kenya and Ethiopia. The program expands as part of the Trans-Saharan Counterterrorism Initiative as CJTF personnel also assist in training the armed forces of Chad, Niger, Mauritania and Mali. However, the War on Terror does not include Sudan, where over 400,000 have died in an ongoing civil war. [3]

On July 1, 2006, a Web-posted message purportedly written by Osama bin Laden urged Somalis to build an Islamic state in the country and warned western governments that the al-Qaeda network would fight against them if they intervened there.

Somalia has been considered a "failed state" because its official central government was weak, dominated by warlords and unable to exert effective control over the country. Beginning in mid-2006, the Islamic Courts Union (ICU), an Islamist faction campaigning on a restoration of "law and order" through Sharia law, had rapidly taken control of much of southern Somalia.

The Prime Minister of Somalia claimed that three "terror suspects" from the 1998 United States embassy bombings are being sheltered in Kismayo. On 30 December 2006, Al-Qaeda deputy leader Ayman al-Zawahiri called upon Muslims worldwide to fight against Ethiopia and the TFG in Somalia. (Viv, 2012)

Iraq

The Iraq War began in March 2003 with an air campaign, which was immediately followed by a U.S.-led ground invasion. The Bush administration stated the invasion was the "serious consequences" spoken about in the UNSC Resolution 1441.[4] Bush administration also stated the Iraq war was part of the War on Terror, something later questioned.

Baghdad, Iraq's capital city, fell in April 2003 and Saddam Hussein's government quickly dissolved. On 1 May 2003, Bush announced that major combat operations in Iraq had ended. However, an insurgency arose against the U.S.-led coalition and developing Iraqi military and post-Saddam government. The insurgency, which included al-Qaeda affiliated groups, led to far more coalition casualties than the invasion. Other elements of the insurgency were led by fugitive members of President Hussein's Ba'ath regime, which included Iraqi nationalists and pan-Arabists. Many insurgency leaders are Islamists and claim to be fighting a religious war to reestablish the Islamic Caliphate of centuries past. (Ware, 2004) Iraq's former president, Saddam Hussein was captured by U.S. forces in December 2003. He was executed in 2006. In 2004, the insurgent forces grew stronger. The US conducted attacks on insurgent strongholds in cities like Najaf and Fallujah.

In January 2007, President Bush presented a new strategy for Operation Iraqi Freedom based upon counter-insurgency theories and tactics developed by General David Petraeus. The Iraq War troop surge of 2007 was part of this "new way forward" and, along with US backing of Sunni groups it had previously sought to defeat, has been credited with a widely recognized dramatic decrease in violence by up to 80%. [5]

In March 2009 the Obama administration ordered an end to the use of the phrase "War on Terror". In a memo sent from the Defense Department's office of security to Pentagon staffers, members were told: "This administration prefers to avoid using the term 'Long War' or 'Global War on Terror.' Please use 'Overseas Contingency Operation.'" In a similar spirit, Obama's Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, broke with the tradition of warning the American public about potential terrorist threats. Instead, Napolitano began referring to acts of terrorism as "man-caused disasters." (Issues - War on Terror, 2012)

Countering Terrorism

9/11 changed not only American psyche but the global as well. The whole world saw the devastating effect of terrorism and felt in danger. The necessity of collaboration and collective security become even more vital.

The fight against terrorism has been high on the agendas of NATO and the wider international community before 9/11. Massive terrorist attacks in Allied countries around the world maintained the danger of this threat, which does not halt at boarders and does not know nationality or religion. As reflected in the 2010 Strategic Concept for the Alliance, tackling with this threat remains one of NATO's key priorities today. International society came up to the idea that only multilateral effort, coordination and actions among allies and partners can

---

[3] For additional information about the Republic of Sudan and recent history including independence and civil wars see http://www.sudan.net/about.php, the complete guide on Sudan.

[4] Full text of the Resolution 1441 (2002) , Adopted by the Security Council at its 4644th meeting, on 8 November 2002, is available here: http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeairaq/iraqres.pdf

[5] Complete text available at the website of VFW – Veterans of Foreign Wars: http://www.vfwpost8905.org/VFWHistory.asp

effectively address the challenge.

NATO ensures it has the full range of capabilities necessary to deter and defend against any threat to the safety and security. The Alliance contributes to the international fight against terrorism in several ways.

• Develop and maintain robust, mobile and deployable conventional forces to carry out both our Article 5 responsibilities and the Alliance's expeditionary operations, including with the NATO Response Force;

• Maintain the ability to sustain concurrent major joint operations and several smaller operations for collective defense and crisis response, including at strategic distance;

• Carry out the necessary training, exercises, contingency planning and information exchange for assuring our defense against the full range of conventional and emerging security challenges, and provide appropriate visible assurance and reinforcement for all Allies;

• Ensure the broadest possible participation of Allies in collective defense planning on nuclear roles, in peacetime basing of nuclear forces, and in command, control and consultation arrangements;

• Develop the capability to defend our populations and territories against ballistic missile attack as a core element of our collective defense, which contributes to the indivisible security of the Alliance. Actively seek cooperation on missile defense with Russia and other Euro-Atlantic partners;

• Further develop NATO's capacity to defend against the threat of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons of mass destruction;

• Develop further ability to prevent, detect, defend against and recover from cyber-attacks, including by using the NATO planning process to enhance and coordinate national cyber-defense capabilities, bringing all NATO bodies under centralized cyber protection, and better integrating NATO cyber awareness, warning and response with member nations;

• Enhance the capacity to detect and defend against international terrorism, including through enhanced analysis of the threat, more consultations with our partners, and the development of appropriate military capabilities, including to help train local forces to fight terrorism themselves;

• Develop the capacity to contribute to energy security, including protection of critical energy infrastructure and transit areas and lines, cooperation with partners, and consultations among Allies on the basis of strategic assessments and contingency planning;

• Ensure that the Alliance is at the front edge in assessing the security impact of emerging technologies, and that military planning takes the potential threats into account. (North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 2010)

A "Global" War on Terror: Multilateral Achievements since 9/11

In the decade since 9/11, the international community has shown remarkable cohesiveness and solidarity in its effort to protect innocent people from terrorist attacks, despite signifi-

cant challenges that remain. Much of this cooperation has occurred under the radar, through quiet, everyday multilateral and bilateral cooperation among law enforcement agencies, intelligence services, and militaries.

The most dramatic achievement, perhaps, is a more robust legal architecture to combat this scourge. There are now sixteen major UN conventions to combat terrorism. [6] Immediately after September 11, the UNSC passed Resolution 1373 forcing all UN member states to criminalize and police terrorist activity, including its financing. This resolution also created a Counterterrorism Committee (CTC), composed of all fifteen UNSC members. Assisted by a Counter terror Executive Directorate (CTED), the CTC regularly assesses UN member states' efforts to implement relevant resolutions, evaluates gaps in state capacity, and facilitates donor coordination for technical and financial counterterrorism assistance.

Informal institutions have also contributed heavily. The Financial Action Task Force—an intergovernmental body of thirty-six members originally established by the Group of Seven (G7) in 1989 to address money laundering—penned nine special recommendations to counter terrorist financing. [7] These measures became the global yardstick for states' counter terror efforts, and the threat of landing on its blacklist of Non-Cooperative Countries or Territories (NCCT) compelled many states to upgrade domestic legislation, ratify international conventions, and monitor financial transactions.

Nuclear terrorism remains an existential threat to global security, but in April 2011 the UN Security Council extended the mandate of Resolution 1540, which requires states to protect nuclear materials and related technology from falling into the hands of non-state actors. A 2008 report had documented its success in requiring countries to ratify relevant treaties and take national action to protect nuclear sites from terrorists. (Patrick, 2011)

The Security Council has passed Resolution 1456 - requiring that states' counter-terror efforts comply with international human rights law.

• Build capacity in developing countries: The U.S. and other UNSC members should provide vulnerable countries with nonmilitary security funding that often falls into the gap between traditional development assistance, on the one hand, and military spending that does not adequately combat terrorism, on the other.

• Link human rights and counterterrorism: The United States and other Security Council members should encourage the UN General Assembly and Human Rights Council to designate terrorism as a violation of human rights, given the threat it poses to human life and dignity, to freedom from fear, and to civilian immunity from deadly force.

• Strengthen nuclear security to prevent terrorist access: UNSC Resolution requires UN states to take "appropriate effective measures" to safeguard nuclear material, but the standard remains vague and lacks provisions for effective monitoring.

• Fortify compliance and enforcement: The Security Council should instruct CTED to monitor enforcement of counter

---

[6] See International Instruments related to the Prevention and Suppression of International Terrorism, UN Sales No. E.01.V.3, ISBN 92-1-133631-7 http://treaties.un.org/Pages/DB.aspx?path=DB/studies/page2_en.xml

[7] The 40+9 Recommendations, together with their interpretative notes, provide the international standards for combating money laundering and terrorist financing. The FATF revised the 40 and IX Recommendations. The revision of the FATF Recommendations was adopted and published in February 2012. http://www.fatf-gafi.org/

terror laws, so that UN member states cannot ignore legislation they have enacted. The United States should also seek to establish a UN body to investigate states' compliance with their commitments, and publish reports of their findings that can be made publicly available.

Yet that cannot change the atrocity of September 11 as it killed many innocent people. People have surmised that when other regions around the world have faced similar terrorist attacks, the outpouring of concern and condemnation has not been as much.

Conclusion

Real problems still remain. Threat perceptions also differ. Even after two severe attacks Kenya considers terrorism as a lesser priority than other pressing challenges like HIV/AIDS, extreme poverty or high levels of crime. Even more glaring, the world has not agreed on one definition for terrorism yet, throwing a wrench in counter terror efforts. Too often, one person's terrorist remains another person's freedom fighter. Terrorist financing, too, continues to bedevil law enforcement and intelligence agencies. Notwithstanding immense success in blocking access to banks, terrorist groups are adept at exploiting "hawala" and other forms of informal cash transfer, which remain nearly impossible to monitor. Finally, human rights concerns continue to plague counterterrorism. Over the past decade, indefinite detention, extraordinary rendition, ghost prisons, and enhanced interrogation techniques have all been employed in the name of defending civilians from terrorism. And some repressive regimes—including a few U.S. allies—have invoked the bogeyman of terrorism to defend brutal oppression of legitimate political opposition. (Patrick, 2011)

Global Fight on Terror can't defeat terrorism for a quite long time, since there are not certainly defined tools how international society should act in process of countering terrorism. Firstly, in order to combat terrorism we should eradicate the motives and real reasons of terroristic acts. Secondly, distinction between an individual and collective terrorism should be made. As an asymmetric form of conflict, it confers coercive power with many of the advantages of military force at a fraction of the cost. Due to the secretive nature and small size of terrorist organizations, they often offer opponents no clear organization to fight against or to deter. Thirdly, we have to consider that inspirations of all risk groups to commit such terrible acts are various.

Identification of all these risk groups according to their risk commitment is most essential step in combating terrorism. It is easier to combat with terroristic organization than against individuals committing suicide bombing and attacks. Identifying collective aims and objections is also much easier than identifying individual concerns and commitment.

Therefore, achievements of counterterrorist actions will require attaining consensus on a definition and capacity of Terrorism. It will need an increase in counterterrorism legislative authorities, funding for further management planning and deepening efforts to keep the world's most destructive weapons out of the world's least trustworthy hands.

References:

Crowe, A. (2011, April 30). *School of Communication American University*. Retrieved on April 1, 2013, from http://www.american.edu/soc/news/gowing-up-in-shadow-of-911.cfm

Feickert, A. (2006). *U.S. Military Operations in the Global War on Terrorism: Afghanistan, Africa, the Philippines, and Colombia*. Congressional Research Service. The Library of Congress.

International Terrorism and Security Research. (2013). Retrieved on March 19, 2013, from Terrorism Research: http://www.terrorism-research.com/

Issues - War on Terror. *A Guide to the Political Left*. Retrieved on November 11, 2012, from Discoverthenetworks.org: http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/guideDesc.asp?catid=91&type=issue

Johnston's Archive. (2001, October 11). Retrieved on April 24, 2013, from http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/

North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. (2010, November 19). *Active Engagement, Modern Defence*. *Official texts (Chronological)*. Retrieved on December 1, 2012, from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_68580.htm

Patrick, S. M. (2011, August 19). *The Internationalist*. Retrieved on March 5, 2013, from Council on Foreign Relations: http://blogs.cfr.org/patrick/2011/08/19/a-global-war-on-terror-multilateral-achievements-since-911/

Political - Report. *War on Terror*. (2012, January 1). Retrieved on February 22, 2013, from political.com: http://www.political.com/Reports/War_on_terror

Political Sciences Concepts. (2013). *War on Terrorism*. Retrieved 2013, from https://www.boundless.com/political-science/foreign-policy/history-american-foreign-policy/the-war-on-terrorism--4/?from_concepts=true

Schmid, A. P., & Jongman, A. J. (1988). *Political Terrorism*. The Center of International Affairs, Harvard University.

Thomas H. Kean et al, L. H.-V. (2004). *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Terrorism History, Insurgency, Types of Terrorism. (2010, August 28). Retrieved on November 15, 2012, from Hubpages: http://iqra345.hubpages.com/hub/Terrorism-history-Insurgency-types-of-terrorism

Viv. (2012, November 06). *Horn of Africa*. Retrieved on May 23, 2013, from AfricanSeer: http://www.africanseer.com/articles/african-articles/us-deployment-in-africa/228577-horn-of-africa.html

Ware, M. (2004, June 27). *Magazie Articles*. Retrieved on

April 1, 2013, from Time Magazine: http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,658290,00.html

Additional Literature:

Moghaddam, F. M. (2010). *The New Global Insecurity: How Terrorism, Environmental Collapse, Economic Inequalities, and Resource Shortages Are Changing Our World* . Santa Barbara: Praeger Security International.

Silke, A. (n.d.). *A Review of the Impact of 9/11 and the Global War on Terrorism*. London, U.K.: School of Law, University of East Londo.