

The United States Counter Terrorism Strategy 2001-2020 (Evolution, Prospects and Challenges)

Dr. Muhammad Iqbal Roy¹, Muhammad Waqas Nawab² Saima Rafique³

1. Associate Professor Chairman, Department of Political Science, Govt. Murray College Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, International Relations, University of Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Ph. D Scholar, Department of Political Science, GC Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan

Abstract

The qualitative study examines the awful events of 9/11 which led the United States to adopt a coherent counter terrorism strategy with the leading agenda of homeland security and protection of its citizens. It included the program to crush the global terror sponsoring individuals and organizations. The safekeeping of the people and country settled the leading determinant of the US counterterrorism policy immediately after the occurrence of horrible terrorist attacks. The Washington administration submitted its resolution to the UN Security Council which allowed the US and its allies to initiate Military Operation in Afghanistan against the dissidents & perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks. The War on Terror emerged as the policy response of the United States to the events of terrorist attacks on its soil. The dreadful attacks changed the American security policy, and threat perception, which led the evolution of US global war on Terror against al-Qaeda and its associates.

Key Words: Counter Terrorism, Zero Tolerance, Military Operations, Coercive Diplomacy, Conflict Resolution

Introduction

The US policy paradigms were featured by Power shift, economic change, socio-political mobilization, increasing actors of world politics, dialogue diplomacy with the global leadership and change from conflict to cooperation. The Post 9/11 arena contrary to the cold war global politics has observed a complete paradigm shift in international politics. The emergence of Non state actors, the Arab Spring, challenges to human rights, the complex interdependence, cultural interaction and overwhelming influence of the globalization process were the salient features of the contemporary world politics guided the United States to rearticulate and reform its counter terrorism policy. The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 on the World Trade Center and the pentagon created a wide space of opportunity for the formulation of a unified counter terrorism strategy and measures. The United States and many other Countries started a serious work against the tactics of violence and terror by various non-state actors and extremist organizations that twisted a transatlantic threat perception and danger in a peaceful World. The US President George Bush used the term war to describe the American Counter Terrorism Campaign through wide and large military efforts to pursue the network of al-Qaeda and other terrorist organizations after the incident of 9/11. The Bush administration incorporated the term Global War on Terror in the context of inspiration to arouse the American public and to highlight the US government's commitment to defeat a formidable and cruel enemy. (Keppel, 2002). The American critics have charged that

the GWOT is not a war on terrorism or Islam nor it is a “global war on things that annoy us”. Rather, it is a campaign against al-Qaeda that is something of a contested concept having been described as a “franchise”, a “multinational network”, a “global insurgency”, a “clearing house” and a “secret international brotherhood” (Raufer, 2003). The United States Congress passed the USA Patriot Act after the 9/11 incident. The US department of homeland security was established to combine domestic security agencies of America for manifestation of an anti-terrorism strategy in response to major natural disasters and accidents. The director of the CIA George Tenet famously “declared war” on al-Qaeda and told to the senate select committee on intelligence in February 2001 that Osama bin Laden and his global network and associates remained the most serious and immediate threat to the United States. The FBI declared counter terrorism as a “Tier One” priority and added Osama bin Laden to its “Ten Most Wanted List”. The American agencies across the government were spending an estimated US\$7 billion annually to contest terrorism at home and abroad by the end of 2000 (King, & David, 2000). Counter terrorism policy remained a top priority during the Clinton administration as the president frequently spoke against the case of biological, chemical and nuclear terrorism (Daily News, Feb 21). The practice of apprehending terrorists and bringing them to court for trial also became a major policy perspective of the Washington administration to combat Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda network, as a center for producing international terrorism and guerrilla warfare. The United States assumed and declared Afghanistan under the Taliban regime as world’s first terrorist-sponsored state. The US counter terrorism officials were convinced that a major attack probably abroad was imminent by the summer of 2001. The US administration adopted a new strategic plan against fighting Bin Laden’s terrorist circle, al-Qaeda (Keppel, 2002). According to the new strategy of countering terrorism, a greater emphasize was laid to use military force against the vicious activities of al-Qaeda and eliminate the Taliban regime from Afghanistan.

The Major Physiognomies

Preservation of Zero Tolerance

The US state department has described terrorism as premeditated and politically motivated violence against the non-combatant targets. Terrorism is a crime that should be prosecuted. The rule of law should be applied and strengthened as a principle tool while fighting against any kind of terrorism. The United States has advanced its anti-terrorism policy and approach through the application of domestic laws, maximum support to international conventions and treaties that curtail different forms of terrorism. Therefore, the administration of the rule of law to curb terrorist activities stands a prime policy of the US anti-terrorism campaign. In searching for the best way to combat terrorism, the United States even relied on law and law enforcement. The fundamental principle of American policy towards counter terrorism is that no political cause or grievance can justify the killing of innocent civilians and that any such act must be considered a crime. The United States forced the other governments to deal with such acts with iron hands and suggested to bring them to court for legal penalty and punishment through the application of law and law enforcement (Jehl, 2004).

Washington administration believes in not making any kind of concession to the terrorists inside and outside of America. Therefore, the US government adopts zero tolerance agenda against all suspects and terrorists from its soil and to crush malicious network and objectives of terrorist organizations like the Taliban and the al-Qaeda in the contemporary international environment. A fundamental belief of this policy is that the United States will not yield to terrorist threats and attempts to intimidate or extort concessions to the terrorists (Graham, 2003). The major objective of no concession policy is to put all potential terrorists on notice that using terrorism is futile and non-beneficial, thereby discouraging similar acts in future. The zero-tolerance policy against the terrorists has been brought to bear in incidents of aircraft hijacking, the seizure of embassies, hostage taking and bomb threats for ransom or to extract concessions. The United States policy of zero tolerance and no concessions doesn't mean refusal of negotiations with terrorists. The US officials occasionally adopted an established dialogue posture in order to gain the release of hostages and dissuade the terrorists from the commencement of their brutal terrorist acts.

Detection and Deterrence

The United States counter terrorism policy includes intelligence sharing and features of cooperation among intelligence agencies and law enforcement entities throughout the world. Detection of terrorist organizations, creation of the situation of deterrence and prevention of planning and projects of terrorists to stop their apprehensions stands on the top priority of US counter terrorism program. Different civil and military agencies have been deployed for law enforcement and to deter the dissidents.

The Diplomatic Engagement

The United States has encouraged international cooperation and coordination to control and combat all forms of terrorism. The US government provided facilities and assistance of training, practice and operation in apprehending and bringing the terrorist suspects to justice and preventing them to find safe haven in different parts of the world. International cooperation has required intensive diplomacy, bilateral and multilateral close, and coordinated relationships among law enforcement, intelligence agencies and foreign ministries of the states. The United States extended support to all peace-loving countries pursuing the terrorist organizations through the application of military and diplomatic tactics, because the globalization of terrorism has reached the last generation and a worldwide consensus has been developed to combat terrorism with a maximum force and full strength of action. The United States has composed a worldwide NATO alliance against the evil of terrorism. The United States encouraged the policy of cooperation with willing and capable states, it assisted willing but weaker states, pressurized reluctant states and also compelled uncooperative states while fighting against global terrorism.

The Coercive Diplomacy

Imposition of economic sanctions against the states and groups that sponsor terrorism is another important feature of the US counter terrorism policy. Laws and executive orders imposed a wide variety of sanctions against the states sponsoring terrorism. The United States identifies, condemns and applies different prohibitions

like the economic trade embargo and military assistance, restrictions on organizations, networks and countries that promote criminal and pro terrorism environment as an instrument of counter terrorism strategy. The United States Congress has occasionally passed several acts to condemn, curtail and freeze program and funding of such aforesaid platforms involved in the projection of certain terrorist incidents and attacks in different corners of the world. The US Congress imposed different military and economic sanctions against the states like Afghanistan, North Korea, Libya, Iran, Iraq, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Pakistan being the sponsoring centers of different kinds of terrorist activities. Denying terrorists access to monetary sanctuary and reservoirs of weapons, including material that can be used to proliferate terrorism is an important component of the US anti-terrorism approach (Ochmanek, 2003). The United States has adopted multiple physical protective measures to secure buildings, aircraft, airports, railway stations, government offices and other vulnerable country wide installations. The use of detective devices, searching mirror, metal detecting device, walk through gates, close circuit TV cameras and other important secret electronic devices have been installed by the American civil, military and intelligence authorities to discourage and avert terrorist attacks. The United States government has formulated a comprehensive and coherent team work between civil and military establishment to contest different terrorist activities. It also included the measures like defending the US homeland through improved border control, intelligence and other security measures like diminishing poverty and conditions that terrorists can exploit. (Rosenau, William, 2008). The legitimization of terrorism as a tool of statecraft and an instrument of non-state actors is included in the contours of the US counter terrorism policy A close coordination and effective network among the civil and military agencies share responsibility through domestic cooperation in the context of working relationship against terrorism (Wilcox, 2003).

Acquiescence of International Law

The United States has expanded its anti-terrorism campaign from domestic to international arena. America and its allies have enlarged the reach of international law against terrorism in a wide scale series of treaties and conventions The United States reliance on the rule of law and commitment for the compliance of international law has greatly strengthened Washington's ability to investigate and prosecute the crimes of terrorists against American nationals inside and abroad (Rosenau, 2008).

Provocation of Counterterrorism Interaction

The roguish attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 dazed the United States in particular and the World in general. The terrorists hijacked American commercial passenger jet airlines. Two of the planes were crashed into the twin towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, one plane into each tower, resulting in the collapse of both towers within two hours. The third aircraft was crashed into the Pentagon headquarter of the department of defense of the United States of America. The fourth hijacked plane crashed into a field of a rural Somerset County in Pennsylvania killing all persons on board. The strike and crash of hijacked planes into the WTC provided a horrendous scenario & killed almost 3000 people. (Christine, 2004). The 9/11 occurrence shattered the pride and honor of American think tanks, leadership and the statesmen. The traumatic

situation spread around the country with an addition of anger and the urge for revenge. The international community condemned these barbarous attacks in condolence and also expressed solidarity with the American people.

The President of Pakistan General Pervez Musharraf quickly responded on national television “we condemn this vile act, we are against all forms of terrorism and stand with America at this appalling time, and that we would assist it in any way we could” (Musharraf, 2006). The American think tanks and media promptly raised fingers of accusation at the Taliban and Osama bin Laden, as the mastermind behind the twin tower tragedy. President Bush evaluated his foreign policy agenda and expressed his desire to promote American internationalism in the world, assuring that the United States will promote peace and share values in the global arena. The UN Security Council and General Assembly also adopted resolutions on 12 September 2001 that condemned the terrorist attacks on the United States and called for bringing the organizers, sponsors and perpetrators of 9/11 to justice. The NATO appealed for a joint defense to combat terrorism. Different states, i.e. Canada, France, Germany, Denmark and United Kingdom offered their military deputations for a global coalition force for curtailing the Taliban terror. On the other hand, China, Japan, Russia, Turkey, India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka offered their willingness to provide logistic facilities in the US led allied forces. Immediately after the dreadful attacks on the US soil the military action and intervention policy against the terrorist organizations working in territorial jurisdiction of other was justified by the major states and international organizations i.e. NATO and the United Nations.

The War on Terror

The war on terror was launched to capture the chief of al-Qaeda, to destroy its sanctuaries of Al-Qaeda and to dislodge its staunch supporter, the Taliban government. The WOT doctrine clearly described that the United States will make no differences between the al-Qaeda and its sympathetic or harboring quarters while dealing with terrorism. The United States has been suffering from the evil of terrorism and formulated certain tactics, devices which were not concentrating on the issue of the apparatus and working of the terrorist organizations. This policy remained in touch with the cause of WMD. The United States was formulating a policy for the elimination of terrorism and Taliban from the mountains of Afghanistan even prior to the occurrence of the 9/11 event. The United States well perceived that Osama bin Laden would emerge as a top sponsor of terrorism and Taliban, government in Afghanistan provided him with bases to train the associates of Al-Qaeda. (Goraya, 2013).

Major Shift in US Policy Paradigms

There has been a great shift in conventional to modern concept of security. The wars of today are not war between states, but are those among the people. The cities and populated sites have developed a battlefield. The security and economic crisis have become deeply interrelated in the world politics (Ali, 2013). The Security Council meeting was chaired by President Bush on 11 September and the secretary of state Collin Powell said “the United States had to make it clear to Pakistan, Afghanistan and the Arab states that the time to act was now” (The 9/11 Commission

Report, 2004). The 9/11 attacks presented a foreign policy challenge to the United States. President Bush stated in an address to the nation from his oval office on the evening of September 11, “today our fellow citizens, our freedom and our very way of life has been attacked by deliberate and deadly attacks, freedom will be defended. Thousands of lives have just been ended by the evil, despicable act of terrorism. Our country is strong, great people have moved to defend the greatest nation. Our military is powerful and prepared. The search is underway for those who are behind this, make no mistakes the US will hunt down and punish those responsible for these acts. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them. Today we and our allies stand together to win this war against terrorism” (Bush Address, 2001, September 11). President Bush collected feedbacks and suggestions from his cabinet and his top rank security officials on how America should actually react, he made his mind to afflict the sponsors and mastermind behind the terrorist incident. The US secretary of State Collin Powell stated, “We have to make it clear to Pakistan and Afghanistan, this is a show time”. American leadership, think tanks and intelligence got a firm belief that a fundamentalist government of the Taliban had been supporting Al-Qaeda terrorists who were the major sponsors of global terrorism in return of financial support and supervision of Osama bin Laden. (Lindsey and Daalder, 2003). On the other hand, Pakistan’s powerful intelligence service, the ISI too had a main role in establishing and keeping the Taliban in power (Khattak, 2011). Collin Powell stressed on the need to get Pakistan engaged, since it had the closest ties with the Taliban regime Collin Powell further announced on 12 September 2001 that the US expected the fullest cooperation from Pakistan (Sattar, Abdul, 2007).

The Bush Doctrine

It was in a similar manner in which wars in Afghanistan and Iraq had been justified (Najam, 2002). There was another significant aspect of the Bush doctrine, as the American government has always been under pressure from the US industrial complex for a prolonged intervention in Afghanistan. The Caspian region rich in gas and oil resources made Afghanistan a gateway towards Central Asia, being of vital concern for the United States. A report published by the Brookings institution in September 2001 had revealed that the exploitation of the Caspian and Asian energy markets was an urgent priority for the Bush administration. The United States were required to have a combination of military, economic and political strategies for endeavoring or prevention of any hostile power dominating the region (Ahmed, 2005). President Bush wrote in the document, “the great struggle of the 20th century between liberty and totalitarianism ended with the decisive victory for the forces of freedom. We will defend the peace by fighting terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations between the great powers. We will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent” (Lindsey and Daalder, 2003). The US strategy incorporated by President Bush was based on the use of unmatched American power to remake the world from its perspective. The Bush doctrine elaborated that to forestall or prevent any attack from an enemy, the United States will, if essential, act preemptively. This new Bush doctrine of preemption and prevention represented a major departure of American foreign policy of fairly non-interventionist, isolationist tradition (Bush remarks, 2002).

The Strategic Linkages Policy

After an abrupt change in post 9/11 international environment the United States foreign policy required careful attention for its vital relationship with different important states of the European Union, Russia, China, India and Pakistan. American relations with these states were critical to global security and stability. The United States required stable Europe, NATO and European Union that would have a credible and compatible approach towards the war against terrorism. Therefore, the Washington administration developed cordial and credible approach towards the European Union, despite having differences of the opinion about certain international issues (Hoge, James, 2004). Pakistan once again strategically became a front-line ally for the United States. The United States desperately needed Pakistan in its war on terror.

The Conflict Resolution Method

President George W. Bush concentrated on the global conflicts which needed to be examined in the light of post 9/11 environment of international relations. The existing conflicts were linked to the complications of old issues which were still unsettled particularly in the Middle East and South Asia. The ongoing Kashmir and Palestine conflicts were the two major issues in contemporary world of post 9/11 scenario (Ahmar, Moonis, 2003). The Washington administration gave vital importance to these regional conflicts and wanted to bring India and Pakistan to dialogue table for bringing about a solution to the Kashmir conflict. Although both India and Pakistan joined the United States in its war against terrorism, but the latter could not bring two South Asian rivals to dialogue table on the issue of Kashmir. Nevertheless, the United States played a key role in preventing war between India and Pakistan, following the border escalation in South Asia. The Bush administration invested time and its resources in developing bilateral relations with India and Pakistan to diffuse regional conflicts. It followed upon the principle of defusing regional conflicts as an important determinant of its conflict resolution policy. The nuclear capability of India and Pakistan could bring the South Asian region on the verge of danger, collision and destruction that led the United States to contain its power and influence compelling India and Pakistan to review their bilateral relationship and agreements.

Operational Dynamics to Counterterrorism

The term war on terror has been adopted by the Washington administration as a policy response of the US to the dreadful attacks of September 11, 2001 for assuring the security of its people and homeland. The US Security Strategy 2002 provided justification for pre-emptive strikes against any threat to its national security (Khattak, 2011). President Bush announced another principal attribute of American foreign policy and that was to target the terrorists who have horrified and victimized the American nation through the WTC massacre. The United States government made it clear that it would never be able to win the war against terrorism without the formation of a coalition force and international cooperation. The region of South Asia once again acquired immense importance due to its strategic outlook. Pakistan once again became a frontline state in the WOT led by the United States (Khattak, 2011).

The US President has adopted the preemptive strike policy and considered it as legitimate in the context of the terrorist attacks. Consequently, after a quick and favorable response from Pakistan, Washington decided to attack Afghanistan to clear it from the control of Taliban and their associate terrorist network of Al-Qaeda. President Bush now decided to pursue nations that provide assistance or safe haven to the terrorists. Washington administration revealed to every nation in every region that it was time to make decision; either you are with us or you are with terrorists. The United States also decided to punish those who harbored the terrorists. The preemptive strike strategy and intervention policy earned a great global support after the 9/11 bloodshed (Butt, 2012).

The Operation Enduring Freedom

The tragedy of 9/11 transformed the security policies of the United States. The United States sought President Musharraf's unequivocal support in its global war on terrorism due to Pakistan's proximity to Afghanistan, the hub of Al-Qaeda training camps and its ideological core supported and supervised by the Taliban government (Ali, Farhana, 2007). The need for logistic facilities for military operations and intelligence information about Al-Qaeda and its host, the Taliban regime in Afghanistan compelled the Washington administration to approach Islamabad. After a prompt and positive response from Pervez Musharraf, the United States decided to launch Operation Enduring Freedom, in order to tear down and wipe out the terrorist network of Al-Qaeda and the Taliban. The NATO allied forces attacked Afghanistan on 7th October 2001. Consequently, they could not resist and maintain their control over Kabul and fled towards their hideouts in the mountains of Afghanistan and northern areas of Pakistan. After the crushing strikes of NATO forces, members of the Taliban and Al-Qaeda's adopted guerilla war to attack NATO forces and Pakistan army across the Durand Line border (Griswolt, 2004). The issue of terrorism heightened as a top agenda of the international community. The major objectives of OEF were to defeat and destroy Al-Qaeda and overthrow the Taliban government who were the shelter ground for Al-Qaeda network, establishing rule of law and human rights (Singer, 2004) President George W. Bush addressed to state military academy at West Point stated "a clash has cropped up between the good and evil and the US is going to label the evil by its name". Therefore, America affirmed a rejoinder, with all relevant resources despite the fact that "everything" had changed with 9/11. The US policy choices have remained constant with their pre 9/11 ideas on dealing with terrorism (Stohl, 2008, p. 9).

The Non -Coercive & Democratic Approach

The purpose was to give protection and home security to the American people who had faced a traumatic time of turmoil after the events of 9/11. The Bush doctrine included neo-realistic and preemptive; unilateral policy to achieve the designed target under the charter of the United Nations. The UN charter legitimized the use of force in the case of armed attack on a state security. The Washington administration and the European Union got themselves on the same page for curbing the terrorists while launching OEF in Afghanistan. (Dao, 2003, February 13). The United States emphasized on the evil of terrorism and introduced a coherent counter terrorism policy, including the strategy for protecting US citizens from internal and

external terrorist threats and the total elimination of terrorist sponsoring or terrorist sponsored organizations. The counter terrorism strategy during OEF was based on the idea of homeland security, being the prime concern of the Washington administration and the American people at that time. The United States moved to UN Security Council to the passage of a resolution and authorization of allied forces for launching military operations on the hideouts of Al-Qaeda and the Taliban inside the Afghanistan. The United States also formulated a plan to reshape the political, economic and social in the world politics. The capitalization of democratic process in the Arab world reflected US interests in the resources of the Middle East, particularly that of invasion and spread of democratic values in the Muslim world (Ridel, 2005).

The Doctrine of Aerial Drone Warfare

The United States adopted the doctrine of aerial drone technology against the suspected terrorists of Al-Qaeda, the Taliban and other terrorist organizations in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen. The US led drone campaigns are conducted by the CIA having little oversight of Congress, whereas most of the American people remain unaware of the intensity of effects and scale of the drone program operating in these countries along with its repulsive consequences and implications. The UAVs targeted the areas like Hangu, Khyber Agency, North and South Waziristan in the Northern areas of Pakistan. The drone attacks killed hundreds including civilians and a few wanted militants of TTP and Al-Qaeda. The Washington administration occasionally has argued that drones are remarkably precise and limited in terms of collateral damage and are the only games in town in terms of dislocating the leadership of Al-Qaeda. The use of drone technology has made regions in Pakistan like PATA and FATA neither safe nor a 'haven' for Al-Qaeda and its associated militant organizations. The unmanned drone strikes have knocked Al-Qaeda on its heels because of destruction of its network and death of several of its leading operatives. The US administration has repeatedly insisted that the drone strikes are ethical, wise and essential to perish the attacking terrorists in the remote regions (Boyle, 2013)

Challenges & implications of counter Terrorism Strategy

The United States and its people have suffered a heavy cost of human and material loss against the WOT. A huge debt and declining standard of American people have put the US economy under a huge pressure and an increasing number of the Americans turned against the US involvement in the ongoing war against terrorism. Even the public has resorted to street demonstrations to register their anti-war protest in the street of America and the European states. The American economic infrastructure has been affected and foreign debt increased more than 100% of its annual economic output. The cost of war on terror during Bush regime was \$864.82 billion, since 9/11 whereas the cost of war during Obama's first three years was \$477 billion which was almost half the cost of that during Bush regime (Rana, Shehbaz, 2011).

The Economic Cost of WOT

After the awful terrorist attacks of 9/11, the Washington administration has to face different failures in the context of fighting war on terror. The United States spent

1 trillion\$ since 2010 on Afghanistan and Iraq. The current annual cost of the United States reaches at 30 billion\$ fighting against terrorism (Mazhar and Goraya, 2010). The United States have been affected and victimized its peace and security, due to launch of a worldwide campaign against terror which has challenged the global security. Almost 95 Americans banks have been locked and the people over 3 million people lost their jobs (Daily Jang, 2010 February 4). Robinson writes that, “It by no means made good judgment to believe of the fight against terrorism as a “war” since it is not doable to overwhelm and conquer a modus operandi or a plan by the power of weapon, according to him, George W Bush picked a path towards a more or less enduring situation of an expensive fatal low -level war. Barack Obama must have taken a diverse track” (Gorvachev, 2010, October 28). The budget of US domestic security, external defense and military affairs increased 50% from \$354 to \$547 billion and it was an excessive amount that the United States cost of its homeland security since 1950’s (9/11 Commission report, 2004). The United States have cost almost \$ 2,407 billion during 2001-2020 to contain and combat the scourge of terrorism around the world.

Table
The US total Cost of War on Terror (in billions) 2001-2020

FY	WoT OCO	DoD Budget Increase	VA Budget Increase	Total WoT	Boots on Ground*
2001	\$22.9	\$6.5	\$1.5	\$31.0	9,700
2002	\$16.9	\$40.8	\$1.5	\$59.1	9,700
2003	\$72.5	\$36.7	\$2.6	\$111.9	136,800
2004	\$90.8	\$11.6	\$2.6	\$105.0	169,900
2005	\$75.6	\$23.6	\$3.1	\$102.3	175,803
2006	\$115.8	\$10.5	\$0.7	\$127.0	154,220
2007	\$166.3	\$20.9	\$5.3	\$192.5	186,563
2008	\$186.9	\$47.5	\$1.2	\$235.6	181,000
2009	\$153.1	\$34.2	\$9.8	\$197.1	183,300
2010	\$162.4	\$14.7	\$3.9	\$181.0	144,205
2011	\$158.8	\$0.3	\$3.3	\$162.4	105,555
2012	\$115.1	\$2.2	\$2.3	\$119.6	65,800
2013	\$82.0	-\$34.9	\$2.6	\$49.6	43,300
2014	\$85.2	\$0.8	\$2.0	\$88.0	13,700
2015	\$62.9	\$1.0	\$1.8	\$65.7	12,480
2016	\$58.9	\$24.3	\$6.5	\$89.7	15,062
2017	\$82.5	\$1.5	\$2.8	\$86.8	n.a.
2018	\$88.1	\$51.3	\$2.9	\$142.3	n.a.
2019	\$69.0	\$72.5	\$9.3	\$150.8	
2020	\$174.0	-\$71.0	\$6.5	\$109.5	
TOTAL	\$2,040	\$295.1	\$72.2	\$2,407 billion	

Source: <https://www.thebalance.com/war-on-terror-facts-costs-timeline> 3306300

Upshots on Global Politics:

The US led global war on terror has widened the gap between the west and the Muslim world. The WOT has also enhanced anti-western and anti-American sentiments in Muslim society and created a worldwide western perception of Islam as an extremist and pro militants' ideology. The international media have played a vital role to amplify the distance between the Western and Muslim world through the projection of Islam as the region of sponsoring militancy, fanaticism and extremism (Niaz, 2011).

Effect on American National Security

The 9/11 carnage and the US counter terrorism strategy against war on terror proved to be a vague deal as the guerilla warfare and insurgency jeopardized the sovereign nation states and their national security. The threat of terrorism spread from one corner to another, from war prone zone to the adjoining states in the rest of the world. Another blame game of associating terrorism appeared to practice between the pro-western and pro terrorist factions in the world politics (Singh 2006 P.576). The United States has paid the heavy cost of psychological, social and economic loss which has made quite cumbersome conditions (Stohl, 2008).

The Institutional Repercussions

The American military personnel soldiers have been fighting wars in Afghanistan have been severely suffered, victimized and sacrificed and 17% of them have become addicted to anxiety medication (Notte, 2009, March 17). Moreover, the conflict-stricken areas of the world have to face a high rate of somatic disorder. There have been different indirect effects of trauma due to the war and its aftermaths i.e. political instability, poverty, economic crises, unemployment and disintegration of social support system (Cardoz, Bilukha, et.al, 2004).The US led NATO forces got disappointment over its failure to eliminate the resultant toughest resistance of the local groups for it had to face the loss of lives of its soldiers bringing about a huge material setback. The states of the European Union states and NATO countries have to face a serious financial crisis.

Amplified gap between Muslims and the West

The US led global war on terror has widened the gap between the west and the Muslim world. It increased anti-Western and anti-American sentiments & hater in Muslim societies and generated the world wide perception of Islam as an extremist and pro militants' ideology. Consequently, the international media played a significant role to amplify the distance between the west and Muslim World through the projection of Islam as the religion of fanaticism, militancy & extremism. (Niaz,2011)

The Psychological outflows

The US military personals have fought a long war against terror in different parts of the world particularly in Afghanistan which severely suffered, sacrificed and victimized in term of psychological disorders. The US solders fighting abroad against the terror have become addicted to anxiety medication over 17% of their total number. (Notte, 2009). Furthermore, conflict and war-stricken areas of the world have to face a high rate of somatic disorder. There have been indirect effects of trauma due to fighting of war against the terror. The factors like poverty, hunger, political instability, unemployment and economic crises again promoted psychological diseases among the military men and civilian population in the United States. (Cardoz, 2004). The US led NATO troops got discourage over its failure to eliminate the toughest resistance of the dissidents in Afghanistan. The US led alliance faced loss of lives of its soldiers with a huge material set back.

Conclusion

The horrible terrorist attacks of 9/11 on the soil of the United States proved to be a watershed for the formulation of a unified counter terrorism strategy. The United States decided to take certain serious initiatives against the gigantic evil of global terrorism conducted and sponsored by different non state actors and organizations. The threat of global terrorism created a trans-Atlantic danger to the peace of the World. Resultantly the Bush Administration reviewed its counter terrorism strategy, employed the terms of preemptive strikes, GWOT, Front line State, Bush Doctrine, Coercive Diplomacy and Military Operations. The US administration adopted the new strategic plan for fighting against Al-Qaeda and its associate in Afghanistan and different parts of the world. The use of military force against the vicious activities of notorious, global terror sponsoring organizations appeared as another addition in the US counter terrorism strategy. The Washington Administration adopted non coercive and soft approaches of rule of law, diplomatic Tactics, Zero Tolerance policy, Detection and Deterrence, Physical Protective measures, Strick Watch and ward System, Early Warning Threat assessment method and the compliance of international law as the major attribute to its counter terrorism policy. The United States has changed the concept of security from conventional to modern global coalition against terrorism. The daunting challenge of non-state actors particularly the terror sponsoring organizations and different associated militant groups in the contemporary world politics emerged as the dissidents and perpetrators of terrorist activities into the territorial jurisdiction of the sovereign states. The shift in counter terrorism policy paradigms has changed the concept of single state security into the global coalition led by the United State in the post 9/11 environment. The transnational nature of terrorism has guided the States to adopt new policies to promote regional and global peace while dealing with the menace of terrorism. The United States continues to engage with international community to strengthen its counter terrorism policy agenda through joint venture coordination, military operation and diplomatic engagement for an effective counter insurgency, militancy and terrorism eradication in the world politics.

References

- Ahmar, M. (2003). 9/11 and changing paradigm of conflict resolution. *IPRI*, 111(1), 2.
- Ahmed, M. N. (2005). *The war on truth: 9/11, disinformation and the anatomy of terrorism*. Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press.
- Ali, F. (2007). Countering terrorism and violent extremism. In Prof. Hayat Ullah Khatak. (ed.). *US-Pakistan strategic partnership; a track two process for long term security cooperation and stability*. (pp. 145-186). Islamabad: ISSRA and National Defense University.
- Boyle, M. J. (2013). *The costs and consequences of drone warfare*. Monthly current affairs, book 225, May 2013. Lahore: A.H. Publishers.
- Bush G. W. (2001, October 7). *Address to the nation*. Retrieved from www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011007-8.html accessed on 22-04-2015.
- Bush, G. W. (2001, September 11). The White House.
- Bush, G. W. remarks at Houston. (2002, June 14). Retrieved www.whitehouse.gov/newsreleases/2002/06/20020614-8.html accessed on 23-04-2015
- Butt, Usama. (2012). Changing dynamics in the war on terror: The Islamic orientation of the Pakistani state and the Islamic reaction of the masses. In Osama Butt and Schufield Julien. (ed.). *Pakistan: The US, geopolitics and grand strategies*. (pp. 15-44). London, LDN: Pluto Press.
- Cardoz, B. L. Bilikha, O. O. Crawford, C. A. G. Shaikh, I. Wolfe, M. I. & Gerber, M. L. (2004). Mental health, social functioning and disability in post war Afghanistan. *The Journal of American Medical Association*, 292(5), 575-584. Retrieved from <http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?articleid=199195>
- Christine, F. (2004). *The counter terror coalitions: Cooperation with Pakistan and India*. Washington, DC: Rand Corporation. Derived from www.rand.org
- Dao, J. (2003, February 6). Terror aid from Pakistan concerns senators. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/>
- Goraya, S. N. (2013). *Afghan-US relations and its impact on Pakistan*. Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Gorvachev, M. (2010, May 11). Website, America risking another Vietnam in Afghanistan. Retrieved from: <http://rt.com/politics/gorvachev-afghanistan-interview-america/>

- Griswolt, E. (2004, July 26). In the hiding zone. *New Yorker*. Retrieved from <http://www.newyorker.com/>
- James, H. (2004, August). Global power shift in the making: Is the US ready? *Foreign Affairs Magazine*, 83(4), 15-16.
- Javaid, U. & Ali, Z. (2013). War on terror partnership: Problems and prospects for Pakistan. *Journal of Political Studies*, 20(1) 51-66.
- Jehl, D. (2004, April 15). Blerk prognosis by CIA nominee. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com>
- Keppel, G. (2002). *Jihad: The trial of political Islam*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Khattak, S. A. (2011). The Bush doctrine of preemption and US response after 9/11 attacks: Invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq. *Journal of Political Studies* 18(2).
- Lindsey, M. J. & Daalder. M. (2003). *America unbound: The Bush revolution in foreign policy*. Washington DC: Brooking Institution Press.
- Mazari, S. M. (2003). The New U.S. Security Doctrine: Implications for the South Asian Region. Retrieved from http://www.issi.org.pk/strategic_studies_htm/2003/no_1/article/1a.htm
- Mazhar, M. S. & Goraya. N. S. (2010). America's new Afghan or Pakistan policy. *South Asian studies*, 25(1), 39-64.
- Musharraf, P. (2006). *In the line of fire: A memoir*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Niaz, U. (2011). *Wars, insurgencies and terrorist attacks: A psychological perspective from the Muslim world*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Notte, J. (March 17, 2009). *Soldiers committing suicide: US troops are killing themselves*. Retrieved from <http://thephoenix.com/boston/news/78044-soldiers-committing-suicide/>.
- Ochmanek D. (2003). *Military operations against terrorist group abroad: Implications for United States air-force*, (MR-1738-AF) Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Rafiq, N. (2002). 9/11 a year after, appraising US regional strategies. *Islamabad: Strategic Studies*, 22(3), 18-51.
- Rana, S. (2011, March 20). Myth vs reality: US aid to Pakistan dwarfed by economic cost of war. *The Express Tribune*.
- Raufer, X. (2003). Al-Qaeda: A different diagnosis. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 26(6), 391-398.

- Riedel, B. (January 18, 2005). *Deadly embrace: Pakistan, America and future of global Jihad*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Rosenau, W. (2008). US Counter Terrorism Policy. In Doron Zimmermann and Andreas Wenger (Eds.), *How states fight terrorism: Policy dynamics in the West*. (pp. 133-156). New Delhi: Viva Books Private Limited.
- Sattar, A. (2007). *Pakistan's foreign policy 1947-2005: A concise history*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Singer, P. (2004). *The president of god and evil: The ethics of George W. Bush*. London, LDN: Grantta Publications.
- Singh, K. R. (2006). *Indian Ocean: Great power interventions*. New Delhi: Independent Publishing Company.
- Stohl, M. (2008). The global war on terror and state terrorism. *Perspective on Terrorism*, 2, (9).
- Tenet, G. (2007). *At the centre of the storm: My years at the CIA*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Wilcox Jr., Phillip C. (2003). United States. In Yonah Alexander (Ed.), *Combating Terrorism: Strategies of Ten Countries*. (pp. 25-29). New Delhi: Manas Publications.
- Woodward, B. (2002). *Bush at war*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Countering Terrorism. Terrorist groups such as ISIS, al-Qaeda, and Hizballah continue to plot attacks against the United States and our allies and partners. As the threats posed by these organizations continue to evolve, the Department of State works to build global consensus to degrade and defeat these adversaries. Through a combination of diplomatic engagement and foreign assistance, the Department works with foreign government partners to build the capabilities necessary to prevent, degrade, detect, and respond to terrorist threats. This includes efforts to strengthen law enforcement and justice systems in the United States, under the auspices of the Global Counterterrorism Forum—this is a group of like-minded countries that meets regularly to discuss counterterrorism challenges and responses—the GCTF has launched an initiative—last year launched an initiative on the protection of soft targets. How do we do this? Perspectives on terrorism. Volume 14, Issue 1. Recent Online Resources for the Analysis of Terrorism and Related Subjects. Compiled and selected by Berto Jongman. Most of the items included became available online between December 2019 and February 2020. They are categorized under twelve headings (as well as sub-headings, not listed below): 1. Non-Religious Terrorism 2. Religious Terrorism 3. Terrorist Strategies and Tactics 4. Conflict, Crime and Political Violence other than Terrorism 5. Extremism, Radicalization 6. Counterterrorism Strategies, Tactics and Operations 7. Specific Operations and/or Specific Policy Measures 8. Prevention, Preparedness and Resilience Studies 9. State Repression, Civil War and Clandestine Warfare 10. Traces the recent evolution of international terrorism against civilian and U.S. military targets, looks ahead to where terrorism is going, and assesses how it might be contained. Countering the New Terrorism: Implications for Strategy. Ian O. Lesser. "Countering the New Terrorism is a compilation of articles from some of the best and brightest analysts at RAND. Bruce Hoffman, one of the foremost authorities on terrorism, describes his views on terrorism trends and prospects, while the authors of 'netwar', Arquilla, Ronfeldt, and Zanini discuss networks, netwar, and information-age terrorism. The editor, Ian Lesser, details implications for strategy to counter the new terrorism. This book is full of fresh new ideas, and is a must read in considering the future of terrorism."