Social Sciences and Humans Review
Available online at https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/PresentationRevue/65

ISSN: 1112-685X
EISSN: 2588-2236

Vol : 15 / Issue: 01 /June 2022
PP : 319 - 332

An Alteration within American National Security Strategy Post - 9/11 Attacks

تعديل في استراتيجية الأمن القومي الأمريكي بعد هجمات 11 سبتمبر

Kahina GOUDJIL*
Mostefa Benboulaid
Batna 02 University
Batna / Algeria
Kahina.goudjil@unf.edu

Hachemi ABOUBOU
Mostefa Benboulaid
Batna 02 University
Batna / Algeria
H.aboubou@univ-batna2.dz

Received: 17/10/2021 Accepted :07/06/2022 Published :10/06/2022

Abstract:

According to several American and European scholars, intellectuals, and media experts in U.S. foreign policy, the American national security strategy had witnessed a reformulation in the 21st century after the 9/11 attacks. In reality, never after Pearl Harbor, America has experienced such a dramatic security event. For which the obvious question remains posed: did President Bush's National Security Strategy mark a new path to a universal American security measure? Did it develop a new policy process with new norms to fit the modern era? Accordingly, U.S. military intervention in Afghanistan aims to preserve; freedom, liberal values, deter terrorism, and protect the threatened American security. Hence, we have come with this study to evidence that by the fact that Bush's unilateral preventive war strategy, which witnessed a blatant violation of International Law, Human Rights, and the United Nations Charter of State's sovereignty, was no more than the natural reaction to their foreign policy adoption of duplicity. The American National Security Policy is, in reality, an overtly way of military expression policy to enforce duplicity.

Keywords: National Security Strategy, Duplicity, Unilateralism, Terrorism, Violations, UN Charter.

* *Corresponding author.*

الملخص:

شهدت استراتيجية الأمن القومي الأمريكية إعادة صياغة في القرن الواحد والعشرين وفقًا للعديد من العلماء، المفكرين وخبراء الإعلام في السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية والأوروبية، وذلك بعد هجمات الحادي عشر من سبتمبر. حيث لم تشهد أمريكا مثل هذا الحدث الأمني أبدًا بعد "بيرل هاربور". ويبقى السؤال مطروحًا: هل استراتيجية الأمن القومي للرئيس بوش شكلت فعلا رؤية جديدة للنظام الأمني الأمريكي العالمي؟ وهل طورت سياسية جديدة بمعايير تلائم العصر؟، وعليه فإن التدخل العسكري الأمريكي في أفغانستان كان يهدف إلى الحفاظ على الحرية والقيم الليبرالية وردع الإرهاب وحماية الأمن الأمريكي المهدد، ومن هنا توصلنا -في هذه الدراسة-إلى حقيقة أن استراتيجية الحرب الوقائية الأحادية لبوش، والتي شهدت انتهاكًا صارخًا للقانون الدولي وحقوق الإنسان وميثاق الأمم المتحدة لسيادة الدولة، لم يكن أكثر من رد فعل طبيعي على تبني سياستها الخارجية للازدواجية. وكنتيجة لهاته الحقائق فإنّ سياسة الأمن القومي الأمريكية هي في الواقع طريقة علنية لتبني سياسة التعبير العسكري لفرض الازدواجية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: استراتيجية الأمن القومي، الازدواجية، الأحادية، الإرهاب، انتهاكات، ميثاق الأمم المتحدة.

Introduction

Every leading nation has a science of employing political, economic, psychological, and military forces to achieve evolutionary foreign policy success. However, America appears to have more than a science; it has a unique aptitude to employ such intelligence in engaging strategies and ideologies within its predominant duplicity in applying its foreign policy. As it appeared to be, the Bush administration framed the new American Foreign policy of the 21st century. It was also thought to be on the same path as previous U.S. presidents. In fact, President Bush incrusted a slight change in U.S. national security policy doctrine within the mother one, namely: duplicity. The ‘Freedom Agenda,' or ‘Bush doctrine,' was not necessarily a manifestation of a new turn in U.S. foreign policy, which emphasized a full-scale militarization and unilateralism to defend the U.S. hegemony in the world, but merely a use of the double standard guideline. Nevertheless, according to the same views, the NSS doctrine contributed massively to changing U.S. grand strategy in the 21st century. We advert that it did not know an impressive change, but was probably for the first time overtly expressed militarily.

The 9/11 attacks interpreted what Francis Fukuyama called an 'unprecedented security challenge' to American invulnerable security

strategy. Regardless of what the world may consider an incomprehensible American policy in dealing with national and international security. The belligerent defensive strategy of the Bush Administration re-conceptualized the main grand strategy of the United States in response to the deemed threat of terrorism. The U.S. considered the rationale of full-scale militarization in its NSS and the open-ended battles against terrorism, ignited by the U.S. in many parts of the world, as an act of perseverance to protect its territories. Regardless of the disastrous outcomes of these campaigns. The U.S. bluntly envisioned objectives to achieve.

Pertaining to President Bush's NSS set to mark a new path to a universal American security with a new policy process and new norms, to fit the contemporary era; the American foreign policy blatantly configurated its national security to cope with the American greed to the whim of sustainable security. It openly unveiled to the world the desire to deter terrorism and spread democracy through which it will expand its power and supremacy. American duplicity prevailed again; however, it is shielded by its worldwide NSS of democratization this time.

1. National Security Strategy in Perspective

National Security Strategy (NSS) is a process that starts with an assessment of the given situation as the crucial point to ignite the hierarchical process of achieving the ultimate goal of preserving and promoting national interest. Those ends impose a political aim and specific objectives that must be attended to achieve the final political goal. Therefore, NSS marks a transitional stage of the problem, from the state of current status conditions to the expected and wanted state of affairs using the political frame as a mediator (NSS Primer 1). This strategic thinking considers the five fundamental elements of logical strategy. First, as explained before, Government analyzes the strategic situation; what the challenges to National Security are? Second, it finds the answer by using political objectives for final achievements. Third, reinforcing and developing the means by which the objectives will be attained. Fourth, processing the ways and using the means to attain the ultimate objective. Lastly, assessing the risks and costs accompanied the strategy and finding a way to minimize them (3).

Looking at National Security (NS) from a contemporary perspective will figure in a new challenging international system and the

rise of a modern structural change that was heralded by the passage of the 1947 National Security Act, culminating after the end of the Cold War in 1991. Though international security stands on the indispensability of a military interaction of sovereign states, the 'state-centered approach,' which is the core value of international relations, was the cornerstone of all international relations and global strategies (Patman, 2006, p. 3). However, the post-Cold War era was deeply characterized by the emergence of individuality and the unilateralism of sovereign states. Unequivocally, new dimensions and environments of security measures were created, where the clash overpasses the state sovereignty and its perilous security protection.

2. The American National Security Strategy post 9/11 Attacks

The Advocates of American hegemony were actively profiling the new America after the Cold War era, these organizations such as the Project for a New American Century (PNAC), which suggested new strategies featuring the new America, in the 21stcentury, with new policies and fundamental changes to be adopted after the 9/11 attacks on the U.S. territory. A galvanized idea was put into reality after the attacks. President Bush's Administration' boosted its documents, series, and speeches to re-interpret the act as what it became known as 'The War on Terror,' which symbolized the succeeding American new strategy of engagement in the world (Jervis, 2003, p. 156). This Doctrine can be summarized in the following elements;

> *The Bush Doctrine has four elements: a strong belief in the importance of the state's domestic regime in determining its foreign policy and the related judgment that this is an opportune time to transform international politics; the perception of great threats that can be defeated only by new and vigorous policies, most notably preventive war; a willingness to act unilaterally when necessary; and, as both a cause and the summary of these beliefs, an overriding sense that peace and stability require the United States to assert its primacy. (Jervis, 2003, p. 356)*

The key element in the U.S.National Security Strategy post the 9/11 attacks was extracted from a series of statements and speeches on what was later named 'the Global War on Terror (GWOT). By September 2002, A new collection of ideas had become 'The National Security

Strategy of the United States of America,' this document was considered the official document that contains the strategies and geopolitics of the 21st century. The document depicted the Bush doctrine and 'the war on terror' (Korb, 2003). The Bush doctrine is considered the cornerstone of the new American strategy of the 21st century. This document universalized liberal democracy as a unique political model to spread freedom and liberal values and provide Global Security. Undeniably, this document turned out to be the core value of the Bush doctrine in the 21st century. Not only did it underline the strategies and the policies to be directed to the rogue states and the terrorists, but it also projected the American rhetoric of the "city upon a hill" as an identity with a regenerated nationalism interwoven with supremacy and power (Bush, 2011).

The 2002 NSS document elaborated on the landmarks of the American strategy for a new century. This distinctive document enacted a pathway to U.S. formulated strategy. First, the NSS raises global war on terrorist networks and outlaw regimes considered threats to the United States' security and stability. Second, the new strategy emphasized that the U.S. military forces must remain dominant for the foreseeable future. The United States should maintain military dominance and project it with a worldwide network of Forwarding Operating Bases. Third, the new strategy stresses cooperation among the Great Powers to preserve a unified front against terrorism. It advocates that this cooperation be carried out under the guidance of U.S. leadership. Fourth, the security strategy enunciates, for the very first time, a policy that specifically calls for removing the root causes of terrorism and tyranny (Korb, 2003).

Unprecedentedly, the NSS no longer believes in deterrence by containment or any other traditional strategy; instead, a preemptive military action will be the only solution to these tremendous threats to the world's security, and the risks would be immeasurable if the terrorists had access to Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). Ultimately, in these circumstances, the U.S. was determined that the defensive war against terrorist acts must be unequivocal. The document encouraged free commerce and enterprise and ranked them as universals in NSS, with a detailed demonstration of the U.S. willingness to help and support the nations presumed to endorse this free economy and enterprise model. Last but not least, the 2002 NSS was more global in covering all the elements that will contribute to maintaining an international political and

economic order; it was more about a political and cultural aspiration of the American identity and interests than a strategy. It practically demanded a "balance of power based on freedom" (The National Security Strategy of the United States of America., 2002).

3. Bush Doctrine

On October 7, 2001, the United States of America attacked Afghanistan as an anticipatory self-defense measure after the 9/11 attacks. The campaign's motto is to preserve global liberal values and deter terrorism, threatening American national security and the international community. Promoting democracy (as it stands for Americans) worldwide was the cornerstone of the Bush administration and the key element of his foreign policy. Many experts believe that democracy promotion is vital for a nation's economic prosperity and an edged weapon against terrorism. U.S. foreign policy debates were essentially based on repositioning democracy in the war on terrorism. Moreover, to recalibrate democracy, promotion to better fit broader changes occurred in the overall international context (Carothers, 2007, p. 2).

In his speech at Fort Drum New York, 2001, President Bush confirmed his intention to act deliberately, "We will prepare deliberately and act decisively," he added. "America will not leave the safety of our people and the future of peace in the hands of a few evil and destructive men, "We will defeat the enemies of freedom," Bush emphasized (Be Proud, Strong, and Ready). The President's words were a declaration of his new policy, reflecting his unilateral national security decision-making. The U.S. and UK submitted a report to the UN alerting that "In response to the attack [9/11 attacks], and following the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense, United States armed forces have initiated actions designed to prevent and deter further attacks on the United States" (Negroponte Letter to UN Security Council President., 2017). The new threat to American security, according to Bush, cannot be contained as the Cold War and the Soviet archetypal. This threat of terrorism is fanatic and should be exterminated. A preventive war must be waged, expressed Bush, against an escalating threat to the United States and its allies. This evidence of an approaching threat after the 9/11 attacks made the U.S.'s preventive war doctrine a straightforward strategy. Safe territory, predominance, and supremacy are its key items.

3.1. Unilateralism and Hegemony

The landmark of the Bush doctrine was his Unilateral action; as Jervis demonstrated in his article *"Understanding the Bush Doctrine*," the Bush administration confidently declared the nation's readiness to act preemptively against any perceived threat with less consideration to the Allies' consent or disapproval. The Bush administration declared its readiness to use U.S. military primacy to spread freedom, liberal democracy, and a free-market economy (Tarzi., 2014, p. 28). Unilateralism complemented the Bush doctrine of preventive war on terror; the U.S. government, acting unilaterally, unveiled little attention to the public opinion; rather, it stood by its interests. They saw the shared leadership as a hindrance to obtaining tangible international results since none of the participating nations would accept to take the lead and the responsibility for the alleged actions. Eventually, toppling Saddam Hussein's dictatorship and waging war on Afghanistan without the allies' or the UN's consent was the U.S. evidence of its unilateral action.

'Ideological supremacy' was the U.S. slogan after the 9/11 attacks. Bush Administration adopted hard power imperialism. The main objective of the U.S. new policy was to reveal its strategy of hegemony explicitly to the world; the main intention was based on military dominance and unchallenged power (Dalby, 1990, p. 3). In the NSS, the U.S. stated its intention to have an invincible global military control. However, the U.S. dominance strategy is not ordained to U.S. legitimacy exclusively. In a pivotal attempt, the U.S. coordinated with other nations as part of its strategy; the role of other nations was a minor role suppressed by the U.S.'s overwhelming and forceful dominance in decision making (Quinn, 2016, p. 156). Undeniably and clearly announced by Condoleezza Rice, the National Security Advisor of the Bush Administration, that:

> *The United States will build and maintain twenty-first century military forces beyond challenge. We will seek to dissuade any potential adversary from pursuing a military build-up in the hope of surpassing, or equaling, the power of the United States and our allies. (Rice, 2005)*

The Bush doctrine imposed the primacy of one nation over the others, an act that brought new terms of leadership and order in the world. His administration did not see the intervention in Iraq and Afghanistan without the consent of the UN or the allies as an act that would encourage other nations to behave the same if circumstances transpire. On the

contrary, the United States believed that the world order imposed unilateral leadership to secure stability and liberal democracy. The Bush administration strongly believed in the indispensable urge for a unique and strong leadership to reestablish the world order, and it will be fulfilled only when the U.S. acts hegemonically (Jervis, 2003, p. 367).

3.2. Preemptive and Preventive War :

Defining both terms "preemption" and "preventive" is required to understand its military implication in American national defense. The preemptive war was defined as "a military attack or war launched in anticipation of a serious military threat that can be reasonably construed as an imminent attack. It is a form of self-defense or defense of a third party". Seemingly, the presence of an immediate threat defines military actions as a preventive war. (Butler, 2012, p. 14) . Fundamentally, preventive war enacted the use of power and military interventions to eradicate an imminent peril of an unforeseen war that will be perceived under unpredictable circumstances. Thus, it was a tactical response to a long-term menace to anticipate the prevailing aggression of a dangerous armament and stop its expansion. Though the evidence of striking first was not seeable, still, the preventer could act to secure 'the margin of safety provided by the preventer's military superiority (Brailey, 2012, pp. 7-8).

The U.S. considered the 9/11 attacks as a global war on U.S. NS. This unequivocal threat has one interpretation; it is a "war ."The two noncontroversial terms, "war" and "global threat," were highly qualified to spark the U.S. altered foreign defense policy in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks (Butler, 2012, p. 14). The U.S. applied a strategic, operational plan against the terrorist attacks as an act of preemption to deter terrorism and the unperceivable evil of their intentions. The core of the Bush doctrine was a "preventive war against terrorism" founded on military primacy and superiority.

One of the Bush doctrine aims was to deter the threat posed by terrorism and the rogue states. The U.S. believed strongly in its role in making the world safer. Consequently, Bush supported the imminence of acting promptly to halt this threat as it was growing more dangerous if not forestalled; he stated in his West Point address on June 1, 2002:

> *Today our enemies see weapons of mass destruction as weapons of choice. For rogue states, these weapons are tools*

> *of intimidation and military aggression against their neighbors. These weapons may also allow these states to attempt to blackmail the U.S. and our allies to prevent us from deterring or repelling the aggressive behavior of rogue states. Such states also see these weapons as their best means of overcoming the conventional superiority of the U.S. (The National Security Strategy of the United States of America., 2002, p. 15)*

The Bush administration massively changed the U.S. grand strategy by introducing a full-scale militarization as the American foreign policy means to defend American interests; Jeffrey Record stated that this administration was "the most significant American foreign policy departure since the Truman Administration," It embraced a doctrine of an anticipatory military strike as the core of the foreign policy.

4. A Military Escalation within U.S. National Security Strategy

Most scholars and politicians agreed that the U.S. slogan of 'Striking first against terrorist attacks, was the drastic change ever brought to American NSS since Truman Administration. Military intervention in a sovereign state such as Afghanistan was unjustified neither under the UN Charter nor under the norms of customary IL. The U.S. curtailed an inherent right of sovereignty and international norms (Sikander, 2010, p. 101).

The U.S. infringed the UN Charter, to which all the member states adhere, the UN Charter stated that all the UN state members are required to settle international disputes peacefully without any unconventional use of force except in self-defense ("War in Afghanistan (2001–present).", 2014., p. 8). The UN Charter in article 2(4) prohibits massive military force in self-defense except in two main situations. First, states can use self-defense as a response to an armed attack. Second, states may use force with an agreement from the Security Council (SC) (Smith, p. 2). The International Court of Justice (ICJ) made it clear that self-defense is a 'term of art in international law'; the (ICJ) emphasized that the act of armed attacks must be accredited to a state where any counter-attack will take place (O'Connell, 2010, p. 3). In regards to article2(4), the U.S. military intervention in Afghanistan was not legitimized under article 51 of the UN charter because the 9/11 attacks did not fall under the condition

of an armed attack; this latter was not attributed to another state; it was aggression committed by a group of people categorized as non-state actors.

The full-scale militarization manifested in Bush's strategy and employed after the 9/11 attacks were a threat to small states. This latter was antagonized by the war on terror led by a hegemonic power like the U.S. Opposing any U.S. decision making would risk them being labeled 'enemies of humanity and a risk to be marginalized in international affairs. In this context of a unipolar hegemony, and under these circumstances, small states will be underprivileged and prevented from any inherent right of state's sovereignty. These States are left without an alternative and a limited level of national freedom. In other words, the new doctrine not only infringed nations' right to sovereignty and self-determination, but it also established new paradigms of duplicity on 'state sovereignty; the right and the privilege of being a sovereign state can be segmented and attributed to states depending on how far they serve American interests, a right which will be contested by a preponderance power (Koechler, 2002, p. 5).

The U.S. gave itself the prerogative to act on behalf of humankind, a right exclusively reserved for the UN and SC. This act seriously violated the norms of IL and legitimated uncontrolled and anarchistic inter-states relations (Kohen, 2003, p. 3). Igniting the state of self-defense by the United States on Afghanistan under the slogan of war on terror and later on other countries. U.S. 'self-defense' prerogative opened gates to a very contemporary crisis of an analogous pathology of use of force by other states. States worldwide will use force as their main solution to settle their disputes with their adversaries. (Kohen, 2003, p. 4). The fatal result of the propagation of Bush doctrine under the whim of 'war on terror' revealed his grand strategy blatantly to the world. President Bush envisaged his specific spectrum of power and hegemony by announcing his unilateral defense system.

The rhetoric of expanding and defeating terrorism created unrealistic expectations in the Middle East, the Arab world, and the world. Bush's doctrine of defeating terrorism and spreading freedom was a double standard policy, if not a disillusionment; his administration sent a message that the democracy and freedom agenda was first and foremost based on self-interest aimed at transforming societies for American interest. The concept "Indispensable Nation," expressed by Madeline K.

Albright, the Secretary of State, in her Interview on NBC-TV "The Today Show" with Matt Lauer, explicitly addressed the interests of the hard attacks on Iraq. Regardless of the allies' disapproval or the absence of the UNSC mandate to legally authorize the military intervention in Iraq. The U.S. abused its "imperialistic" power to serve its self-concerned foreign policy. This duplicity in serving its self-interests in the Middle East created an everlasting rise of mistrust and anti-American sentiment, especially in the Muslim world.

Acting unilaterally and without the consent of the international community was one of the Bush doctrine's disorders in American foreign policy and national security. Invading a country in the Middle East without the approval of the UN Council or the approval of the U.S., prominent European allies, or Muslim states shaped an international symbol of 21st- century American policy in the world. By interpreting its actions in the world after the 9/11attacks, the U.S. was seen as a self-centered country using force to achieve its interests without considering the legitimacy of its actions as long as it preserves its national security aims (Tarzi., 2014, p. 36). The U.S. portrayed itself as a coercive, dominant country and not the messenger of democracy; using force as a new means of national security unveiled its duplicity in playing the role of freedom and democracy in the world. Instead, it was portrayed as a tyrannical country that invaded a sovereign state.

5. Conclusion: Is it Democracy or a Double Standard Policy?

The U.S. foreign policy followed a semi-realistic approach, the U.S. pursued some modest efforts to bring political changes in some countries, but in parallel, it gave invisible importance to its economic and security interests. When the U.S. interests clash with the state democracy interest, as occurred in many places that were mentioned below, the U.S. administration put democracy on the back seat and maintained friendly relationships with non-democratic governments:

> *Close American relationship with authoritarian regimes in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, and cordial relationships with autocratic rulers in Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, and Equatorial Guinea undermines US credibility when criticizing similar types of autocratic regimes with less friendly ties to Washington. (McFaul, 2009, p. 163)*

Regardless of the democratization mission, 'Security interests' were the hidden gain the Bush Administration was seeking from its intervention in Iraq and Afghanistan. Bush's Administration announced its commitment to bring political change to these regimes. However, the call for democracy was ignited in some countries but not others (Carothers, 2007, p. 9). The Bush team supported the Pakistani president Pervez Musharraf as an ally against terrorism; the U.S. sustained this president despite his anti-democratic stance to go after Al-Qaeda and Taliban. In the east-central of Africa, Ethiopia was another case of seeking personal interests rather than spreading democratic principles. Prime Minister Meles Zenawi is an autocratic and powerful state man who manipulated and limited political freedoms in the country. Regarding the importance of the Ethiopian government to the U.S. as a security partner, especially with the U.S. struggle with Islamists in Somalia, the U.S. administration downplayed the democracy card for the sake of cooperative ties (8).

'A double standard' is an exceptional feature of American policy, said Michael Ignatieff in his article "American Exceptionalism and Human Rights" (7). The U.S. uses different standards when judging itself than those it uses to judge other countries; U.S. friends and allies are also judged differently from those it considers enemies. The U.S. criticized other states for curtailing or ignoring the UN rights and rules while it abridged and curtailed international norms and law. This double standard policy had an enormous impact on American image worldwide; when it called for a global war on terror after the 9/11 attacks, it did not have the estimated support from all nations. The U.S. faced bitter accusations and condemnation of culpability for its double standard foreign policy towards the civil rights of another country's citizens (Ignatieff, 2009, p. 8).

The war in Afghanistan was a failure on an international scale because the U.S. infringed an international norm of 'state sovereignty which is obeyed and applied worldwide. In a given crisis, such as applying the right of self-defense in Afghanistan, the U.S. prioritized its national security over the UN Charter of non-intervention. American unipolar engagement act of abridgment to the universal norms questioned its credible partnership in international relations with the world and the allies and its commitment to preserving human rights (Ignatieff, 2009, p. 6). The American objective was to spread and

preserve democracy globally, but the actions and deeds showed that it is passing the concept by. How the concept of democracy is seen by Americans and interpreted by the American government does not cope with what their foreign policy employed to preserve global liberal values by employing a duplicitous foreign policy. U.S. proved that democracy in US minds, thoughts, and actions is changeable, malleable, and configurative depending on the U.S. area of interest.

References

"War in Afghanistan (2001–present).". (2014., Sep.). Retrieved from Web.

Brailey, M. (2012). "Pre-emption and prevention: an ethical and legal critique of the Bush Doctrine and Anticipatory use of Force in Defence of the State ."pp7-8.

Bush, P. G. ((2011).). *Selected Speeches of President George W. Bush.*

Butler, T. A. (2012). *Prevention, Preemption, and the Bush Doctrine.* United States: Air War College Maxwell AFB.

Carothers, T. (2007). US Democracy Promotion During and after Bush. Washington, DC: *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, 2.

Dalby, S. (1990). "American Security Discourse: The Persistence of Geopolitics.". *Political Geography Quarterly, vol. 9,* (no. 2,), p. p3.

Darren W. Davis, a. B. (Jan 2004). "Civil Liberties vs. Security: Public Opinion in the Context of the Terrorist Attacks on America.". *American Journal of Political Science, .vol. 48,* (no. 1), p29.

Drew, D. M. (2006). *Making Twenty-First-Century Strategy. An Introduction to Modern National Security Processes and Problems.* Afb Alabama: Air Univ Press Maxwell.

Ignatieff, M. e. (2009). *American Exceptionalism and Human Rights.* New Jersey; Princeton, 2009: University Press.

Jervis, R. (2003). "Understanding the Bush Doctrine.". *Political Science Quarterly, vol. 118*(no. 3), pp. 365-367.

John K, B. (May 2004). *The Origin and Developmental Process of the National Security Strategy.* USAWC Strategy Research Project.

Jordan, A. A. (2009). *American National Security* (Vol. sixth edition ed.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Koechler, H. (2002). "The War on Terror, its Impact on the Sovereignty of States, and its Implications of Human Rights and Liberties. *The World Council of Churches and Christian Conference.* Asia, Manila: The National Council of Churches in the Philippines(NCCP). Retrieved Sep 2014

Kohen, M. G. (2003). *"The Use of Force by the United States after the End of the Cold War, and its Impact on International Law.* (B. a. Eds.Michael, Ed.) Cambridge: University Press. Retrieved Oct 2014

Korb, L. a. (2003). "Strategies for US National Security: Winning the Peace in the 21 st Century.". pp 21-23.

McFaul, M. (2009). *Advancing Democracy Abroad: Why we should and how we Can.Why we should and how we Can.* U.S.: Rowman &Littlefield.

Mueller, K. P. (2006). *Striking First: Preemptive and Preventive Attack in US National Security Policy.* . Rand Corporation,.

Negroponte Letter to UN Security Council President. (2017, Oct). Retrieved from Source:<file:///E:/final%20corrections/Negroponte%20Letter%20to%20UN%20Security%2 Council%20President.html>.

O'Connell, M. E. (2010). "International Law and the Use of Drones ."London: Chatham House. Retrieved Sep 2014

Patman, R. G. (Ed.). (2006). *Globalisation and Conflict: National Security in a New Strategic Era.* London: Routledge.

Quinn, M. (2016). *The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act: Reforms and Considerations.* Nova Science Publishers, Inc,.

Reilly P, T. (May 2004). *The National Security Strategy of the United States: Development of Grand Strategy.* USAWC Strategy Research Project.

Rice, C. (2005, January 18). *"Confirmation Hearing* ."Washington, D.C. Retrieved October 2014, from Speech Web.

Sarkesian Sam., et al. (2013). *US National Security: Policymakers, Processes, and Politics.* Lynne Rienner.

Sikander, A. S. (2010). "War on Terrorism: Self Defense, Operation Enduring Freedom and the US Drone Attacks in Pakistan. *77*. Retrieved Mar 2013

Smith, B. a. (n.d.). "The Legal Basis for the Invasion of Afghanistan.". Retrieved Sep 2014

Tarzi, S. M. ((1992)). Iran-Iraq Foreign Policies: impact of US Gulf Intervention. *International Journal on World Peace, 9*((3)), 35-48.

Tarzi., S. M. (2014). "The Folly of a Grand Strategy of Coercive Global Primacy: .A Fresh Perspective on the Post-9/11 Bush Doctrine. *" International Journal on World Peace, vol. 31,* (no. 3,), p28.

(2002). *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America.* Washington: President of the U.S,.