

## Counter-terrorism program as a forming factor of U.S. foreign policy in the Persian Gulf

**A**fter the tragic September 11th events in the United States in 2001 the issues of effective prevention and consolidated confrontation of the world community to international terrorism and holistic coordination of counteractions to various forms and manifestations of religious extremism and fundamentalism as a menacing phenomenon of global nature have acquired an extremely high relevance. International terrorism as a criminal phenomenon has been actively adapting to the conditions of rapid technological progress and high communication of the modern world. Nowadays, a wide-ranging terrorism developing in its criminal demonstrations acquires various gradations of political, economic, energy and religious connotations. In particular, the American Dictionary of English language interprets the term “terrorism” in the following way: it does not ascribe given outrage to the categories of traditional crimes. This interpretation considers the mentioned unlawful phenomenon as a result of destructive social and political processes, that declares itself in specific criminal acts – such as taking of hostages, attacks on government institutions, hijacking, violence, threats to the population, destruction of state or private property. All mentioned is done with the purpose to intimidate and put pressure on the society or state structures due to the ideological or political motives and reasons. The authors of the Dictionary consider it necessary to stress that in accordance with the international law the legislation of all countries in the world without exception anticipates the execution of criminal liability for committing the above acts<sup>1</sup>.

At a turn of the millennium the reckoning of time started with bloody politically oriented terrorist acts with different dimensions of religious

---

<sup>1</sup> *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/terrorism>.

connotation which caused mass human victims (blast of two apartment houses in Moscow in 1999 caused deaths of 224 people); As a result of series of September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks in 2001 in the USA 29,784 people were killed; in 2002 916 people were captured as hostages at the Theatre in Moscow – 130 people killed. The Beslan tragedy 2004 in Russia where 334 persons from 1100 hostages (including 96 children) were killed, etc. Despite the inexpressible losses such atrocities of fanatics cause terrible destruction of material and cultural values which are not usually amenable to recovery and provoke armed conflicts and power confrontation. That creates mistrust and hatred between different national and religious groups, stipulate the occurrence and deepening of both new and already existing antagonistic tendencies which entrench into the historical memory of generations.

The present stage may be characterized by difficult realities of global transformations of foreign relations and the problem of terrorism that carries a threat to national, regional and global security has reached a planetary level. After a series of tragic above mentioned events in the end of XX–beginning of XXI century terrorism turned over the national borders and became a threat for any country all over the world. Now, geopolitical factors are becoming the most important factors of occurrence and spread of terrorism on a political map of the world. Most often, exactly the political contradictions and conflicts between certain states encourage some of the mentioned actors of foreign relations in order to weaken the adversaire to use the mechanism of terrorism in the context of confrontation. So far, the international community has not developed a single consolidated approach for identifying, understanding and interpretation of terrorism and extremism. To some extent this permits the extension of these disgraceful phenomenon promoting its rapid adjustment to modern geopolitical space and disguise themselves under political, religious and national liberation rhetoric.

The approaches formulated by American research and analytical system in the fight against international terrorism are mainly presented in force conceptions of H.Kissinger and Z.Brzezinski and other political scholars supporting the hard line policy where the choice for the power decision of the problem is submitted through a component of political risk. In the

opinion of mentioned scholars only a violent overthrow of political state systems in such countries as Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan, which support and finance the terrorist networks, will inevitably lead to disappearance terrorism's problem itself. This theory is based on the understanding of the real threat of terrorism that in the long the Western states will face and whose aggressive outbreaks should be expected in different regions of the world. Under such circumstances the authors without the alternative options offer a hard line solution of the problem. It includes military actions using special detachments, national forces and modern high-tech arms. At the same time certain concepts of fighting terrorism are represented mainly by scholars of the Arab world and are based on the perception of terrorism as a response of economically oppressed and underdeveloped Muslim countries in asymmetric confrontation to the West. Based on the above vision the scholars of indicated category directly bind an effective confrontation to terrorism with overcoming of poverty in the countries which are vulnerable to the "virus of terrorism and extremism"<sup>2</sup>.

At first, the fight against terrorism was declared as a top priority of the U.S. foreign policy under President R. Reagan. To persuade that the United States should address the neutralization of the threat of terrorism by full use of their legal, diplomatic, economic, military and information capacities. Within the context of realization of set tasks and on the president's initiative the coordination system of agencies in a frame of State Department was urgently formed. The most successful example of these organizational innovations was the appearance of an inter-departmental committee, whose members conducted a large-scale political and analytical study of problematic regions in order to prevent the establishment of terrorist networks and initiated an exchange of research results and information system of all related agencies. At the same time they accumulated their efforts for searching the new approaches for the solution of this paramount and highly complicated issue. The said unit continued its existence under the George Bush Sr. administration. However, after the "cold war" and due to decrease of problem and priority issues on fighting terrorism it occupied a minor position.

---

<sup>2</sup> В. Тишков, *Социально-культурная природа терроризма*, "Неприкосновенный запас" 2002, №6 (26), <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2002/6/tish.html>.

In 1995 the President B. Clinton delegated the major powers concerning the coordination of counterterrorism efforts to the National Security Council (hereinafter – NSC), having formed the so-called “Coordination group of assistants inside the mentioned entity, which was eventually renamed to Security Group against terrorist attacks”. The representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, General Staff Office, Justice, the FBI and the CIA joined the Security Group at the level of deputies or agencies heads’ assistants. With time, in addition to that a separate department of the National Security Council was established carrying responsibility for coordination of antiterrorist efforts of state bodies, protection of critical infrastructure of the country and the fight against drug trafficking. With an arrival of President George Bush Jr. to the White House the Security Group against terrorist attacks inside the NSC has been reorganized into a Committee on Counter-Terrorism and National Preparedness.

After the September 11<sup>th</sup> tragedy the White House radically reorganized the state agencies whose activities were related with counteractions to extremist manifestations and combat international terrorism. Thus, in September 2001 the state authority established the Homeland Security Council (hereinafter – HSC) intended to constitute a highly effective mechanism in facilitating coordination among all executive agencies for developing and implementing the security policy within the state. Besides this, the Council was vested with advisory powers for advising the President for processing homeland security strategy. In the context of the organized implementation of this conception a new position of the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security emerged in the presidential administration. Meanwhile, the coordination of U.S. authorized agencies’ efforts to address international terrorism was laid on the HSC.

In this regard in order to implement a practical realization of main objectives the Council’s office introduced a position of the deputy of National Security Advisor holding him responsible for the fight against terrorism. Thus, as a result of mentioned reorganizational measures all external and domestic efforts to combat terrorism have received systemic coordination of relevant committees and agencies of National Security Council and Homeland Security Council. Finally, after the above coordinating agencies had organically occupied a designated place in the state executive branch,

on 25 November, 2002 the country's leadership announced the creation of the U.S. Department for Homeland Security. The primary responsibility of a new federal agency was the implementation of the idea of unification of most agencies and divisions into a centralized system responsible for homeland security in the country (agencies for protecting borders and transport, agency for protecting critical infrastructure, department of emergency and national preparedness). The Secretary for Homeland Security faced with stated goal to avert and effectively prevent terrorist attacks within the country, create a strong domestic protection system against terrorist attacks, minimize loss and provide universal aid and assistance for elimination of consequences of terrorist attacks<sup>3</sup>.

With the view to coordination of power entities within the counterterrorism operations there were introduced the United inter-institutional coordination groups combating terrorism in the headquarters at different levels. The United Groups formulated its primary mission in effective cooperation to combat terrorism in their own «responsibility zone» at the inter-institutional level and exchange the information between civil and military entities. In addition, in 2003 the Center for Combating terrorist threats was founded being responsible for the collection and analysis of information regarding the terrorist hazards within the state and overseas. The Center's personnel potential included the representatives of the Department for Homeland Security, anti-terror division of the FBI, Center for Combating Terrorism, the CIA and Department of Defense. The Center was located in the headquarter of the CIA and guided by this organization<sup>4</sup>.

In September, 2003 a fundamentally new research and coordination center for counterterrorism studies was created, known as the Terrorism Research Center. The fact that practically the whole U.S power elite was related to this event defines it as a very important. Thus, State Secretary, Attorney General, Secretary for Homeland Security, the FBI and the CIA directors have been involved with its announcement. The key idea of

---

<sup>3</sup> Our mission: Official website of the Department of Homeland Security, <http://www.dhs.gov/our-mission>.

<sup>4</sup> Responses from John O. Brennan to post-hearing questions, <http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/ttic/qfr120403.pdf>.

foundation of this Center and its main objective was to combine all materials collected by relevant agencies about potentially wanted terrorists and bring them into a single synchronized database and to provide the wide monitoring, detailed data acquisition and thorough analysis of the information in Internet and other communication sources concerning terrorist groups and extremist movements. Finally, in August 2004, President G. Bush Jr. initiated the creation of a unit directly subordinated to the head of National Intelligence Agency of National Counter-Terrorism Center, which in fact engulfed an existing Center for counteractions against terrorist threats. The list of main objectives of a new entity consisting of about 200 analysts included the analysis and coordination of intelligence analytics, having been worked out by sixteen U.S. intelligence agencies, and also ensuring the strategic planning, maintenance and support of the interventions aimed at preventing and combating terrorist attacks.

An important component of the state policy in emergency situation became the adjustment of national legislation to conditions of increased terrorist threats and standard legal regulations of basic counterterrorist activities of state bodies and agencies with appropriate content. In October 2001, immediately after the terrorist attacks, the United States Congress adopted temporary amendments to national legislation called the USA Patriot Act. The purpose of the USA PATRIOT Act was to provide the maximum assistance to law enforcement agencies for prevention terrorist acts. According to the adopted document the powers of the FBI and other intelligence agencies have been significantly expanded. Thus, they received the right by simplified legal procedures to bug the telephone conversations of those who were suspected to have been engaged in terrorist activities, keep track of email correspondence of the individuals noted in practicing extremist ideologies, to demand the information from libraries and book stores about the subscribers or consumers of literature that could be used to build the bomb and denotative mechanisms etc. However, American legislature introduced the criminal penalties for harboring terrorists.

After a series of terrorist attacks on 11 September, 2001 the main objectives of the U.S. National Security Strategy were defined as follows: combat international terrorism and providing counteractions to spread

of weapons of mass destruction, the priority of which was fixed by the Strategy provisions in 2002 and 2006. Counterterrorism policy despite the traditional external dimension has received a domestic aspect: the fight against terrorism and radicalism was no longer perceived as a purely foreign policy problem and got in parallel a definition of key element of domestic security. American analyst R. Perl in his report to the U.S. Congress in 2003 said: "...before September 11, Americans perceived the problem of terrorism as an element of foreign policy and the fight against it – as one of the aspects of foreign policy. In 2001 according to the information of State Department 63% all terrorist attacks, committed in the world, were targeted against American citizens and American property. For comparison, in 1995 the corresponding proportion of the attacks totaled 23%, but all attacks targeted on life and property of American citizens took place overseas. Therefore, the 11<sup>th</sup> September tragedy forced Americans to change the perception of terrorism – from the external phenomenon it turned to be a domestic one"<sup>5</sup>.

In September 2002, in the year after the tragedy a new National Security Strategy was introduced to the world community. At the presentation of the document Vice-President Richard Cheney stressed the necessity of the U.S. to use preventive measures to ensure its own safety. The first chapter of the 2002 Strategy entitled as a "Review of U.S. foreign strategy" outlined the guidelines of foreign policy and objectives for the near future. In particular, the United States declared the intention to protect and defend the human dignity in the world, strengthen and reinforce the alliances designed to ensure victory over global terrorism and to take all necessary measures to prevent attacks on the United States and its partners; to cooperate with other countries to resolve regional conflicts; to hinder the enemy and deprive them of opportunities to threaten the United States or its allies or friends with weapons of mass destruction; to start a new era of global economic growth through the opening of markets and the introduction of free trade, extension of progressive development; increasing and supporting the transparency of societies and building a robust security system; deepen and expand the scope of cooperation with other major

---

<sup>5</sup> R. Perl, *Terrorism, the Future and U.S. Foreign Policy: Issue Brief for Congress*, <http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/IB95112.pdf>.

global centers of power and make systematic reorganization of the national security institutions of America considering the challenges and opportunities of the XXI century<sup>6</sup>.

However, the 2002 Security Strategy contains a number of innovative provisions that can be represented by a following selection of program notions of military and political content:

- The main threat to U.S. security originates from the «rogue states» and terrorist networks seeking to obtain weapons of mass destruction. On that base the White House announces a transition from declarative policy of non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to implementation of practical measures for the prevention and prohibition of its spread;
- The United States will not allow any state in the world to achieve military parity with them;
- The White House declares its preparedness to use military force first to prevent the hostile actions, even in the absence of specific evidence of a coming attack on the United States or when it is not possible;
- «America will counteract the threats that emerge before they are fully formed». For formal reflection of this notion the American foreign policy ideologists have introduced the new Concept of Preemption into a political turnover, which in Ukrainian version literally can be represented as “a preemptive action”;
- The U.S.A. intends to remain the only state in the world empowered to use force against potential threats before they are fully formed. The United States are determined not to let the other actors of foreign relations to justify their aggressive assaults using the principle of prevention<sup>7</sup>.

Summing up the concept of key notions of the 2002 National Security Strategy it becomes clearly visible and obvious that the backbone of the main objectives of the President G. Bush Jr. foreign policy is to ensure an effective protection of the American people by conducting universal fight

---

<sup>6</sup> National Security Strategy of the United States of America, 2002, [http://history.defense.gov/docs\\_nss.shtml](http://history.defense.gov/docs_nss.shtml).

<sup>7</sup> Ibidem.



against terrorism and implementing preventive military interventions against potential states–opponents which provide political and financial assistance to extremists. It is in the context of key challenges of mentioned Strategy that U.S. foreign policy will implement and move the democratic ideals in the Middle East region in the short term.

During the President G. Bush Jr. second term the Middle East vector of U.S. foreign policy has been built up through the principle of “fundamental transformation of the Greater Middle East region” in the context of active counteractions to global terrorism. The strategy changes and the correction of foreign policy course of the George Bush’s Jr. team were urged by acute constructive criticism on the part of the opponents (Democrats) during the election campaign. That was understood and fully accepted by the US population: First, the increase of American society’s protest tendencies and public dissatisfaction with the “involvement” of the USA into “a dragged-out” Iraq campaign, which was marked by large-scale financial and economic losses and turned fatal to thousands of American soldiers during the military operations and even during the postwar period; Second, disapproving comments of NATO partners, demonstrative expressions of dissatisfaction of Allied States in Europe (Germany France, Italy) concerning the inconsistent and unjustifiably tough U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf region; Third, the growth of “tension” in the relationship between America and the Russian Federation, which has overcome economic and domestic political difficulties in the 1990 ‘s and started to restore slowly but repeatedly the lost positions in the international arena, at the same time disagreeing with an unacceptable reality of the unipolar world; Fourth, growth of discontent among the Muslim population and public disappointment of ruling monarchies of the Persian Gulf (Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bahrain, Kuwait and Oman ) due to unjustified U.S. aggressive policy in the region. However, in our view the reason of qualitative changes and definition of formal and clear international rules, motives and preconditions for the preventive behavior was in the authority’s demand and understanding of the necessity to adjust the U.S. foreign policy strategy to new realities of the world and objective domestic and external factors.

Consequently, the 2006 National Security Strategy in general repeated the basic provisions of the 2002 Strategy with regard to the definition

of the main objectives of the U.S. foreign policy where the key priorities contained freedom, human dignity and commitment to justice. The above program document also strengthened the leading role and world leadership of the United States in combating terrorism and in counteracts against the global threats to humanity. The main difference between the new 2006 Strategy and the previous doctrinal document was an official proclamation of Iraq which was charged with the proliferation of nuclear weapons and aiding terrorism – enemy number one for the White House<sup>8</sup>. Also, in the 2006 Strategy version the concept “preemption” has got a comprehensive definition (first introduced into a political lexicon by the 2002 Strategy). In particular, the legislature informatively described a mechanism for realization of “preemption actions” based mainly on the right of self-defense that allowed to apply proactive military attacks. Actually it legitimizes the immediate U.S. intervention in any part of the globe for protecting the national interests.

Having motivated the introduction of outlined innovations, the authors of the 2006 Strategy concept appealed to a fundamental transformation of a nature of threats to U.S. national security. “During the cold war period the opponents considered weapons of mass destruction as an weapons of extreme circumstance, using it might bring an imminent risk of destruction to those who applied it first. From the rogue states’ standpoint all weapons of mass destruction is a tool of intimidation, blackmail and military aggression towards neighboring countries. Familiar concept of deterrence no longer works against such an enemy as terrorism”<sup>9</sup>– statement by V. Kroening, one of the ideologists of the 2006 Strategy.

To move away from the ambiguous treatments and distorted interpretation of U.S. position in an official language of the document, the country’s leadership unambiguously warns that America will not only actively oppose the spread of extremist and radical ideas but will also systematically work on initiating changes of state regimes unable to implement a liable co – partnership policies. Thus, in contrast to the unrestrained emotional

---

<sup>8</sup> National Security Strategy of the United States of America, 2006, [http://history.defense.gov/docs\\_nss.shtml](http://history.defense.gov/docs_nss.shtml).

<sup>9</sup> V. Kroening, *Prevention or Preemption? Towards a Clarification of Terminology PDA*, <http://www.comw.org/pda/0303kroening.html>.

military rhetoric of the 2006 Strategy version Washington appeals to the world community and establishes the responsibility as a measure of danger in front of the world society. The American nation finds no alternative, what in author's opinion is quite sensible, stating that «the genius of democracy» could be the most powerful and influential factor to confront the international terrorism successfully. In particular, the third chapter of the 2006 Strategy states: "... freedom and human dignity through democracy create today an effective long-term method to overcome the problem of transnational terrorism. Furthering democracy is the most effective long-term way to resolve a conflict and to prevent terrorism"<sup>10</sup>. Following the designated approaches and declared principles the authors of the 2006 Strategy view Iran as a source of nuclear problem, which could be overcome only if the leaders of an indicated state had an appropriate political will and being guided by distant strategic decisions will open the political system of the country and give freedom to the people<sup>11</sup>.

Acute dissatisfaction and tough criticism expressed by the world community on the address of the American leadership due to an unilateral decision to conduct the anti-Iraq campaign in 2003 and the reluctance to coordinate their actions in the international arena together with NATO military allies and EU countries significantly influenced the rhetoric of the American President. In his public speeches G. Bush Jr. repeatedly focused on absence of the U.S intentions for combating terrorism in isolation from the world community and the U.S efforts to mobilize an impact on the allies states and the world community having built a strong united coalition. "Our nation's cause has always been larger than our nation's defense. We fight for a just peace, a peace that favors human liberty. We will defend the peace against threats from terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers"<sup>12</sup>, – said the head of the White House in his West Point speech.

---

<sup>10</sup> National Security Strategy of the United States of America, 2006, [http://history.defense.gov/docs\\_nss.shtml](http://history.defense.gov/docs_nss.shtml).

<sup>11</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>12</sup> *President Delivers Commencement Address at the United States Merchant Marine Academy*, 2006, June 19, <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2006/06/text/20060619-1.html>.

By analyzing the root causes and preconditions for an increase of U.S. confrontation to international terrorism under President George W. Bush Jr. and evaluating the results and efficiency of implemented measures, it might be of use to summarize the ontology of this aspect of foreign U.S. strategy for objective and comprehensive coverage of the issues. Thus, positioning to a factor of counterterrorist activities as an important component of the U.S. foreign policy and the National Security Strategy was not a new issue introduced by the Bush political team. Over the past four decades these factors with varying degrees of importance and with different power of cognitive load have occupied its assigned place in American foreign policy strategy. However, as noted earlier prior the September 11<sup>th</sup> tragic events the U.S. political establishment perceived terrorism and combating terrorism mainly in three dimensions: first, as important component of international security, particularly, in terms of protecting lives and health of the American citizens and state property abroad; second, as a phenomenon primarily associated with the Arab world and the states of the Middle East; third, only as a radical political element of violent ideological confrontation of the “cold war era”.

In first decade of the XXI<sup>st</sup> Century the main priority of the U.S. counterterrorist strategy was the protection of the U.S. population and the state’s interest both within its territory and overseas through the constant strengthening of the state’s defense capacity and also through the detection and rapid neutralization of terrorist threats at the earliest possible stage of occurrence. For implementation of the planned strategy the White House used the full potential of its political, economic, diplomatic, military, strategic, informational and cultural capacity and influence. In conclusion, the two previously mentioned Strategies envisaged an effective use of U.S. military power in case of confirmed information about weapons of mass destruction being at the disposal of terrorists. Prevention of ingress of technologies, materials and scientific researches related to weapons of mass destruction into the hands of terrorist groups for years ahead has become a key objective of U.S. strategy against terrorist threats.

With the arrival of the President Barack Obama team to the White House the priorities of U.S. foreign policy strategy on a whole remained unchanged, demonstrating the continuity and consistency of the U.S. for-

eign policy course. However, an approach for a selection and application of tools for the implementation of strategic objectives in the world arena has experienced a significant correction. All this have determined the beginning of a new era in the history of American diplomacy. The 44<sup>th</sup> U.S. President has thoroughly analyzed the situation in the world in terms of the complicated realities of fight against international terrorism and came to a conclusion that the USA will be not able to combat the new global challenges alone. At the same time he made sure that the other countries were unable to solve the large-scale conflicts without participation of the U.S.A. The B. Obama administration faced new challenges and offered new objectives related to too aggressive and in some respects unjustifiably rigid U.S. policy in the Middle East including the Persian Gulf region in the context of a relentless fight against international terrorism and Islamic radicalism. All mentioned ultimately resulted in a growth of anti-American sentiments worldwide. The President B. Obama team was to give an answer to the difficult fundamental issues: is it possible to win the war against terrorism? Secretary of State Hillary Clinton giving comments on counterterrorist policy concept of the newly elected president, emphasized the possibility of defeating terrorism only after the victory over the said hostile ideology. In a view of the high rank official the consolidation of allied efforts of the world should become the needed guarantee and prerequisite for success of counter terrorism war<sup>13</sup>.

During the international summit in Washington on 15 April, 2010 the President B. Obama was vehemently convincing the world political elite of evidence of extremely high risk to commit terrorist acts using the nuclear weapons and stressed on the necessity of enhanced control and threat monitoring and an urgent need of its immediate solution. Relying on the materials of intelligence service the Head of the White House focused the attention of the presidents-colleagues of almost 50 countries on numerous attempts of active terrorist groups and their leaders to find ways and means of obtaining the nuclear weapons, calling on all world leaders to start work immediately and make all required for the nuclear components

---

<sup>13</sup> H. LaFranchi, *Hillary Clinton: more «smart power» needed in terrorism fight*, "The Christian Science Monitor", <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Foreign-Policy/2011/0909/Hillary-Clinton-more-smart-power-needed-in-terrorism-fight>.

do not get into the hands of terrorists<sup>14</sup>. In conclusion, the American president named the major goal of his administration's foreign policy course the continuation of strong uncompromising struggle against international terrorism and violence in the world.

The counterterrorism policy of the President B. Obama is based on three main principles of military strategy: First, in author's view, is the most significant of all: it's a principle of maintaining a high level of American military power permitting the use military force in each case of a dangerous situation created by terrorists in any place of the world. Thus, despite the repeatedly declared and underlined importance of the U.S. foreign policy "soft line" resource, the military argument as a stand presence of multinational forces in high conflict areas remains an integral constant of the US foreign policy strategy. The second principle: besides the protection of the U.S. strategic interests in defense industry and military security system it involves the assertion of national economic, energy, innovative technologies and information priorities in the regions geographically distant from America, including the Persian Gulf. The third principle, in our understanding, is the most relevant in difficult conditions of radicalization of Islamism and nationalist extremism aggravation, it carries a power assistance for establishment and development of ruling regimes such as "Western democracies" in the Middle East and a comprehensive support of the democracy in the Arab countries of the Persian Gulf.

New vision of the U.S. counterterrorism strategy according to the B. Obama team was based mainly on understanding of inefficiency and inability of a fundamental solution of the problem of terrorism in the Gulf region by military actions. Instead, the head of the White House suggested that the U.S. Congress delegated hundreds of American professionals to Iraq united by a common idea and purpose to establish new jobsites and modern industries on the territory of this eastern state. Moreover, having realized the futility and irrationality of imposing mandatory building of the Western-style democracy in the Arab country with deep-rooted Mus-

---

<sup>14</sup> Обама каже, що ризик ядерної війни знизився, але зросла небезпека ядерного удару терористів, "Сайт новин", <http://www.newsru.ua/world/13apr2010/obama.html>; P.S. Meilinger, *American military Culture and Strategy*, "Joint Force Quarterly" 2007, Issue 46, p. 80–86.

lim traditions, the B. Obama administration decided to give up full control over the new political regime in Iraq. Instead, the White House decided to focus on preparation and ensuring of democratic elections in central and local government bodies of Iraq, to pay more attention to the fight against corruption and take care of quality education and training of future employees of administrative agencies of the young state.

Political experts and analysts of the President B.Obama team qualify the military political and religious radical terrorist groups “Al-Qaeda” as a widely branched international criminal organization with its own ideology of “liberation” of Muslim countries, mythpoetic sacrifice for the benefit of Islam and fight against “Pan-Americanism”. Consequently, the scholars have suggested that President first of all will intensify the fight against Islamic extremism and radicalism on the ideological front and at that pointedly expressing the continuing preparedness of the U.S. to protect the civilian population of Iraq and introducing the practice of publicity and broad coverage of America’s ongoing provision of humanitarian aid etc.<sup>15</sup>

It seems to us that in the context of the above the acknowledgements of American experts are just and expedient. In order to improve an efficiency of the fight against international terrorism they find it necessary to change constantly the approaches and tools for combating this evil looking for more efficient vehicles further on. Undoubtedly, today it is not sufficient to use “hard line” tools only as part of the punitive counter-terrorist policy. Indeed, physically destroyed militants – terrorists are replaced by other “men of action”, while the “people of thought” – carriers and spreaders of extremist and radical ideas remain beyond the bounds of notice and influence. So now, there is a critical need for the comprehensive “prevention activities” aimed at creating and cultivating a tolerant social economic environment, which would be able to confront consciously terrorist ideas and radical theory. For accelerating the achievements of expected results and for obtaining the desired effect, the experts strongly recommend that state officials take up a regular open dialogue of politicians, human rights activists and representatives of non-governmental organizations for de-

---

<sup>15</sup> P.S. Meilinger, *American military Culture and Strategy*, “Joint Force Quarterly” 2007, Issue 46, p. 80–86.

tailed discussion and analysis of all issues and contradictions that complicate and slow down the fight against terrorism.

## **Conclusion**

Confrontation against the international terrorism has been always considered by Washington as an important component of the US foreign policy. In the opinion of the White House the issue of combating political terrorism and religious extremism renewed a special emphasis in the early 60-ies of last century due to the activation of mentioned persistent attacks on American citizens overseas. However, after the September 11<sup>th</sup> tragic events the counterterrorism motif has become a key aspect of national security and determinative idea of foreign relations and domestic political activities. Similar transformations in a frame of perception and evaluation of this issue found its formalized reflection in the state strategy documents. Thus, the fight against international terrorism and religious extremism turned to be a fundamental mobilizing thesis of the U.S. National Security Strategy of 2002 and 2006. These policy documents have become the major precondition and fundamentals for changing focus and adaptation of the U.S. foreign policy in the Greater Middle East in order to complete the realities of the modern world. Under the auspices of the new national security course implementation in the context of confrontation to global threats, the Bush's administration substantiated the military invasion of Iraq and power overthrow of the Saddam Hussein state system defending the logic of the events by fighting against global terrorism.

The White House active implementation of tough counterterrorism oriented foreign policy towards the Persian Gulf countries prompted a number of regional countries to resort to appropriate urgent preventive measures of domestic nature. In particular, the government of Saudi Arabia paid a particular attention for monitoring the national media regarding the calls of violence and "programming" of the population attracting them to terrorist activities; the Qatar government introduced the practice of formal appeals to the citizens calling them for religious tolerance; The Bahrain political establishment introduced to the citizens the legislative proposals on criminal liability for aiding terrorists.



The U.S. constructive initiatives regarding the consolidated counteractions to terrorism and counter-extremism on the global level came forward as unifying element of the entire world community including the developed monarchies of the Persian Gulf. However, the ideas suggested by the Bush's administration for intense democratization of the Middle East, have caused rejection and sometimes protests of Muslim community of the Gulf region. It became a significant obstacle to the establishment of open partnerships of Washington with Ar Riyadh, El-Kuwait, Doha, Manama, Muscat, etc.

Now, the world community has no doubts for an expediency and necessity of application of force and use of military vehicles in a tough battle against international terrorism. However, from the standpoint of practical rationality it makes more sense of having an objective need for mandatory use of effective strategies to combat terrorism with all possible means available in the civilized society. List of modern instruments for combating terrorism should include financial (freezing the accounts of terrorist organizations and entire states), informational, political, cultural, promotional factors and other methods of influence. Today, the American analysts consider diplomacy, information and communication facilities, military power, financial instruments, economic strength, intellectual base, international and national law as equally important components of the fight against international terrorism in the XXI cent<sup>16</sup>.

Since the arrival of the new B. Obama administration to the White House Washington has been demonstrating a sincere desire to find the new approaches for solving the most critical and problematic issues of foreign relations and counteractions to global threats. In our view, the new war strategy against terrorism chosen by the B. Obama administration meets quite adequately the idea of establishing an optimal balance between the political, military and strategic components in solution of the most painful issues of mankind and practically signifies the parity use of "hard" and "soft" line.

---

<sup>16</sup> H. Rishikof, *Executive Summary. Juridical Welfare. The Neglected legal instrument*, "Joint Force Quarterly" 2008, Issue 48, p. 11–40.

## Streszczenie

W artykule przedstawiona została ewolucja poglądów elity naukowo-politycznej USA wobec problemu zwalczania terroryzmu i ekstremizmu na początku XXI w.: od „siłowych rozwiązań” H. Kissingera i Z. Brzezińskiego do „miękkiej polityki” administracji B. Obamy. Prześladowano mechanizm walki z terroryzmem i ekstremizmem na poziomie instytucjonalnym w USA. Analizie poddano strategię bezpieczeństwa narodowego USA z 2002 i 2006 r. oraz podkreślono zadeklarowane instrumenty polityki antyterrorystycznej.

## Абстракт

В статье представлена эволюция взглядов научно-политической элиты США на проблему противодействия терроризму и экстремизму в начале XXI века: от «силовых концепций» Г. Киссинджера и З. Бжезинского до «мягкой политики» администрации Б. Обамы. Изучен механизм борьбы с терроризмом и экстремизмом на институциональном уровне в Соединенных Штатах. Проанализированы Стратегии национальной безопасности США 2002 и 2006 годов и выделены задекларированные инструменты контртеррористической политики.