

War on Terrorism and its Political and Economic Impact on Pakistan

Mubashir-ul-Hassan Khan Lodhi

M.Phil Political Science

mubashirlodhi6@gmail.com

Muhammad Ahmad Khan Lodhi

PhD Economics (Scholar)

maklodhi71@gmail.com

Abstract: Terrorism is the core issue in the globe. The security and peace of the whole world is at stake. The 9/11 attacks on the twin towers have awakened the world to fight against the brutal and bloody terrorism but it is impossible for us to eradicate terrorism from gross root level if we will not comprehensively understand the causes of the wide spread terrorism across the world. No doubt, terrorism has grown up due to the wrong and double-standard foreign policy of the U.S.A. and the other western superpowers. These super powers make their foreign policies to protect their vested interests and they do not make such policies that could protect the interests of the small nations. If the ‘war on terrorism’ is the war of the west, sorry to say, the west alone cannot succeed. This article is a little struggle to comprehend the causes and consequences of the ‘war on terrorism’. The objectives of the research work will cover the whole story of the war on terrorism and its significance is manifest. We discuss the U.S. Foreign policy in detail which enhances the knowledge of the people to comprehend the political intricacies in the globe. By this way, we also present the cost and benefit analysis of the war on terrorism’. Both qualitative and quantitative methods are used to analyze the real facts of the war and various previous and present other related research studies are provided which support the argument. Finally, the conclusion provides us the solid evidence of whether the ‘war on terrorism is economically and politically suitable or not.

Key Words: Terrorism, 9/11 attacks, USA, Economically, Politically,

Introduction

Terrorism is the main issue in the modern civilized world. The whole world is facing terrorism in its worst form. Perhaps it will continue in the future if we do not understand its causes. No solution will be possible without the proper understanding of its nature and scope. Therefore, international consensus is required to eradicate terrorism. Unfortunately, the nations of the globe could not evolve consensus on terrorism because they have failed to provide internationally admitted and un-controversial definition of terrorism. First of all, before defining terrorism in its broader sense we should distinguish among wars, insurgencies, independence movements and terrorist attacks. The western literature available on terrorism is insufficient to produce the functional definition of terrorism. In fact, they ignore to understand the relation among violence, conflict and terrorism. After the events of 9/11, they only blame Muslims and Islam as the main source of terrorism in the whole world. Actually, they ignore to comprehend the causes of violence in the world, especially, in the Muslim world. The 1.5 billion of the people of the world are Muslims and believe in Islam. By defaming Islam and Muslims, no attempt to maintain peace in the globe can be succeeded. So far as the violence in the Muslim world is concerned, there are many factors such as historical, economic, social, geographical and political are involved to present the comprehensive analysis. No doubt, the sober analysis always finds out the socio-political-economic roots in the problem.

Historically, there are three religions such as Judaism, Christianity and Islam which have tradition, culture, customs and monotheist beliefs. They have the common holy lands in the same area of the globe. In deed firstly the west understood Islam during the period of crusades (the holy wars). They fought many crusade wars against Muslims and Arabs. At that time, they were the staunch enemy of Islam and the Arab World. Secondly, the west found its involvement with Islam in the period of colonialism and imperial expansionism. Thirdly, the west is facing the revival of Islam in the period of post colonialism.

That is why, the confrontation between the west and the Muslim world has been witnessed since centuries. And behind this confrontation there is a series of events occurred subsequently. A sequence of events is presented as below:

- 1) The crusade wars
- 2) The rise of Ottoman Empire and the Fall of Arab Hegemony.
- 3) The extensive European influence and interference.
- 4) The western Colonialism
- 5) The liberation of Arab and non-Arab Muslim states
- 6) The creation of Jewish state __ Israel in the Heart of Muslim Arab world.
- 7) The conflict between Israel and Arab States
- 8) War between Arabs and Israel (Egypt-Israel war)

- 9) War in Lebanon
- 10) The struggle for Palestinian state and Intaqada Movement.
- 11) The Iran-Iraq war and the role of the west.
- 12) The Gulf war
- 13) The civil war in Afghanistan
- 14) The Taliban factor and the emergence of al-Qaeda
- 15) The attack on the world trade centre dated on September 11.2001.
- 16) War on terrorism

But before discussing the abovementioned factors involved in the confrontation between the west and the Muslim world, we can not ignore to focus on the downfall of the USSR and the depletion of the oil resources in the world during cold war. After the World War II, the world was divided into two major blokes, one block was sponsored by the Soviet Union and the socialism was its economic and political system while the other block was funded and sponsored by the U.S.A. The two superpowers started cold war and produced heavy destructive atomic and conventional weapons in the world. The race of the mass destruction weapons begun and the superpowers sought markets and sold their weapons heavily to the allied states. The emerging and developing countries were forced to purchase such lethal weapons and their economies were destructed. Such developing countries faced with strife, famine, hunger, starvation, poverty, illiteracy. Some times, to check each other, the superpowers imposed wars on the developing countries for their domination. The wars in Korea Vietnam, Yemen and Afghanistan are the best examples and showed how the super powers fought for their vested interest and how they deserted the economics of the developing countries. By this way, both super powers controlled over the Muslim world and depleted the oil resources of the Arab states. For this purpose, the puppet governments were established and military regimes were supported and funded to complete their agendas. The popular leadership and the people of the Muslim countries were suppressed ruthlessly. The super powers started covert operations in different countries to attain power over them. After the defeat in the wars of Korea and Vietnam, the U.S.A started covert operations in Afghanistan with the help of CIA (Central intelligence Agency) against the soviet supported government of Afghanistan to get the calculated result. First of all, the U.S.A backed the military government in Pakistan and overthrew the democratic government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. In collaboration with ISI, the CIA trained the Afghan people. More than there million Afghan emigrants were settled in Pakistan. Nevertheless, the Mujahideen camps were set up inside and outside Afghanistan. The whole proxy war was fought under the flag of Islam. The Taliban were the integral part of Mujahideen. The Taliban came into power in the name of consolidating the scattered nation and maintain law and order in the light of Islamic rule of justice. On the other side Taliban had no idea of governing the country. Basically, they were the students of Islamic schools run by the orthodox Mullahs. So far as, Al-Qaeda is concerned it is the international organization which attacks on American's interests in the every where of the

world. In the Afghan war the warlords and the (Muslim extremist like al-Qaeda) were fighting against the USSR. After cold war, terrorism became a widespread issue.

Some states define terrorism in accordance with their own interests. Various states, institutions and international organizations have different definitions but all indicate only non-state agents. Historically, it is observed that terrorism was introduced to stop anarchy in Europe. It was a state practice. During French Revolution, the government of Maximilien Robespierre was considered as the “Reign of Terror” but after 9/11 it has been the act of private agencies, groups and non-state individuals.

Bruce Hoffman (2004) defines it as “the deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change”. But this is not a complete and comprehensive definition of terrorism. However, Alex P. Schmidt defines (2011) terrorism in broader sense. He defines it as “An anxiety inspiring method of violent action, employed by (semi-) clandestine individual, group or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby- in contrast to assassination- the direct targets of violence are not the main targets. The immediate human victims of violence are severally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively representative or symbolic targets from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat and violence- based communication processes between terrorist (organization), (imperiled) victims and main targets are used to manipulate the main target of (audiences) turning it into a target of terror, , a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation or propaganda is primarily sought”. The United States department of Defense defines terrorism as “The calculated use of violence or the threat of violence to inculcate fear, intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious or ideological.” The British government defines it as: “The use of threat for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological course of action, of serious violence against any person or property.”

But generally speaking, these definitions do not distinguish between the acts of “harboring terrorists” and the freedom fighters. In this regard, the United Nations General Assembly in 1999, defines terrorism as “criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes are in any circumstance, unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other nature that may be invoked to justify them”. In this respect, the main question arises that whether the politically operated violence in political movements is termed as “terrorism” and the civilian victimization in guerrilla warfare is the act of terrorism. It gets much more attention when we discuss liberation movements and the casualties caused by freedom fighters in the civilian areas. Therefore, all activities of freedom fighters are called terrorist activities by any state entity. The blame game begins in the freedom movement. Each side considers the other side as “terrorists.” That is why, Leonard Weinberg (2009) argues: “by saying that one man’s terrorist is an other man’s freedom fighter, the observer is simply confusing the goal with the activity. Almost everyone concedes that terrorism is a tactic, one

involving the threat or use of violence. If this is true, there is, in principle, no reason why this tactic can not be used by groups seeking to achieve any number of goals and objectives, including a fight for freedom or national liberation”

In the light of above definition, the movements against racial discrimination, the struggle for self- determination and the fight for national interests can not be interpreted as the form of “terrorism.” Therefore, three things should be clear in any struggle or movement such as:

- 1) Methods
- 2) Objectives
- 3) And Goals

Moreover, we should observe the collateral Damage caused by the authorities and the government agencies to crush the nationalist and the independence movements. In the cases of Kashmir and Bosnia, the violent and coercive systematic apparatus of suppression used by the Indian and Serbian governments for the elimination of freedom fighters and to suppress the freedom movements may be viewed as the acts of terrorism because they caused fear, violence and ‘collateral damages’ in the civilians. That in why, Water Laqueur (2002) stresses on the rational understanding of terrorism. He argues: “With all the misunderstanding deliberate and involuntary, on the subject of terrorism it is still true that people reasonably familiar with the terrorist phenomenon will agree 90 per cent of the time about what terrorism is just as they will agree on democracy or nationalism or other concepts. In fact, terrorism is an unmistakable phenomenon even if the search for a scientific, all comprehensive definition is a futile enterprise. Any definition beyond the systematic use of murder, injury and destruction or the threat of such acts aimed at achieving political ends will result in controversy and arguments will go on endlessly. The position of the student of terrorism is not unlike that of a physician dealing with a disease the exact causes of which remain unknown to this day, or a drug of which it is not known how precisely it functions. But this will not prevent him from diagnosing the disease, or from prescribing the drugs that are applicable.”

According to the abovementioned definition of terrorism, the understanding of terrorism depends on rationality of human being. Therefore, all groups of people who are fighting for achieving liberation and changing the status quo should not be considered as terrorists. However, the terrorism spread by some extremist Muslim groups should not be related with Islam and the Western Scholars should not depict religion as a goal. They should avoid to portray terrorism as a religious war. It is pertinent to understand this fact that the terrorist groups use religion as a means to achieve their targets. And the so-called Muslim terrorists misinterpret the religious and Qurranic scriptures in order to justify their activities. However, the terrorism is not a religious phenomenon. In fact, it is a socio-politico-economic phenomenon and before defining terrorism we should consider all factors involved in formulating terrorism as a threat to the peace of the globe. So, in the case of Taliban, without help of U.S.A and other western countries Taliban’s were not familiar with statecraft. In 1998, the U.S.embassies in Kenya and Tanzania were hit, the

U.S.A blamed Osama bin laden and Al-Qaeda for this bombing. In this regard, the U.S.A charged Taliban for harboring Al-Qaeda. The U.S.A put pressure on Taliban to hand over Osama bin laden to U.S.A. But the Taliban refused to hand over Osama bin laden without any evidence. After 9/11 attacks, the U.S.A demanded that Osama Bin Laden be handed over to U.S.A, unconditionally. But Mullah Umar - the head of the Taliban government -- refused to do so. The Taliban government argued that before handing over Osama bin laden to U.S.A, a legal procedure should be adopted and Osama bin laden should be tried in the court of any Islamic country and the complete evidence of his involvement should be provided, before the court and the world media for any trial. But the U.S. government refused the proposals of Taliban. The Bush administration was strongly determined to throw over Taliban government by waging war. In this respect, Al-Qaeda, Taliban and all other extremists were declared terrorists and the war on terrorism became the first option to eradicate militancy to maintain peace in the globe. Before and after the burning of Twin towers, the whole Muslim world is being burnt in the fire of militancy, ignorance, hatred, starvation, famine, illiteracy, religious ethnicity and poverty. Whether it is the war on terrorism' or the 'war of aggression', in both cases, the innocent Muslims are being victim in the power game of super powers.

So, for as American foreign policy is concerned, the war in Iraq, the war in Afghanistan and the drone attacks on Pakistan show the American's line in reshaping the foreign policy. Michael Scheuer (2004) describes American foreign policy in his book 'Imperial Hubris' as: "The lesson is not only that others will not do our dirty work but that others will stop us from doing over dirty work as completely as possible. So committed are we to finding others to do hard and bloody things for us that we misread reality and enlist allies who can not or will nor do the job".

In this regard, before discussing the American foreign policy after 9/11 attacks, it is necessary that we first look into the Eisenhower's doctrine of Industrial Military complex'. Secondly, we should take into account the neo-cons and 'this new assignment of the world order'. In order to achieve complete hegemonic dominance over the world, the U.S.A has promoted militarism for 'authoritarian' rule. Regardless of all American's designs of supremacy, the attaches on 'twin towers' in 9/11/2001 were no doubt, the brutal and frightful acts of terrorism. In this respect these acts have divided the world into two school of thoughts. In the view of one group the 9/11 attacks are the net results of American foreign policy in the Middle East. The Saudi prince Alwaleed says: "America has to understand that if it wants to extract the roots of this ridiculous and terrible act, this issue of the Palestinians has to be solved." But on the other hand, the other group considers it as the attacks on the western civilization. Therefore, the U.S.A blamed Al-Qaeda and considered as 'the enemy non-combatant.' The president Bush said at the time: "... hate our freedom __ our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other." Herman(2011) argues that the patriotic Act and other post 9/11 antiterrorism measures affect Americans at large. The Patriot Act empowers the FBI to spy on the millions of innocent Americans. The post 9/11 policies have fostered grave mistakes. He also criticized the Dick Cheney's 1% doctrine. "If there is a 1% chance that Pakistani scientists are helping Al-Qaida build or develop a nuclear weapon, we have

to treat it as a certainty in terms of our response. It is not about our analysis.... It is about our response”.

Shapiro (2007) argues that the containment is the best idea which renders hope to save Americans and the American democracy from the terrorists. In cold war era Americans developed the strategy of containment and won the cold war. Similarly, this strategy is necessary after the 9/11 attacks for American security. Mudd (2013) argues that counter-terrorism fight after 9/11 has entered its second decade. This complex and complicated campaign of counter terrorism directs the united States intelligence Agencies and its foreign policy. Mudd also argues that the ruthless violence and the senseless killing of the innocent people would essentially change the mind of the Muslims. The violent Islamists rose and sew the seeds of self-destruction in the hearts of Jihadists during 1990s. of fighting. Goldstein (2004) argues that the terrorists target the American economy and they want to make the war on terrorism very costly and expensive. The “War on Terrorism” is a war of attrition. Gerges (2011) argues that the brutal attacks of 9/11 have changed the policies of the greatest superpower. The superpower has launched two wars. The small groups of Muslim extremists have dominated the landscape of international affairs. They guide the foreign policy of the superpower and the domestic policies are set in the direction of their reactions and the counter-reactions. Hodges (2011) argues that the peace and justice start with understanding the realities. The attacks on twin towers on 9/11 were horrified but the response of the U.S government to terrorism was much more horrified because the government has gone on waging war as the answer. Jenkin and Godges (2011) argues that a group of terrorists is “a party to a virtual civil war within Islam a war between extremists and moderates”. Asseri (2009) argues that there is a need to be taken serious measures against non-state actors who are funding terrorists.

Furthermore, terrorism can not be eliminated overnight. In order to eradicate terrorism across the world, the international organizations, the U.N.O, the U.S.A, the concerned regional states and the governments of the homelands should address the causes of terrorism and the terrorism in its all forms should be eliminated. Ikenburry et al (2009) argue that Bush has continued the most controversial foreign policy after 9/11 attacks. He introduced a new doctrine of national security. But the American war against Iraq (2003) has provided the provocative ideas of American hegemony on the globe. Hanson (2008) argued that “they could hit us and we could not hit them back because they are not even there to hit back at.” He argued that the insurgent’s use of offensive’ is more effective than the coalitions.” Palmer and Fernandez (2005) defined terrorism as: “terrorism is the organized use of violence against civilians, or their property, the political leadership of a nations or soldiers (who are not combatants in a war) for political purposes.” Laqueur (2002) provided the definition of terrorism. He argued that “terrorism constitutes the illegitimate use of force to achieve a political objective when innocent people are targeted.” Lejeunesse (2008) argued that ‘to win an insurgency, you must win over the people’. Vacirca-Quinn et al (2008) argue that ‘CA (Civil Affairs) operations can not succeed without winning the hearts and minds of the people.’ Fritz (2008) claimed that the decline in violence in Iraq in 2007 was due to a focus on population (as opposed to the enemy). Jones (2008) argued

that “The population is the centre of gravity for both the insurgents and counterinsurgents.” Bebbler (2008) argued that the main objective of GWOT is security. Scott and Agoglia (2008) argue that communications were the primary offensive of the GWOT. They further argued that communications lie at the care of the insurgents’ actions [v]irtually every lethal operation they. Hanle (1989) provided taxonomy for terrorism in which three forms met the criteria for war such as military terrorism, revolutionary terrorism and state sponsored terrorism. Bush (2001) argued that “War on terrorism is a global war. He stressed that the whole world would support the ‘war on terrorism’.” Musharraf (2006) says that he had little choice after the September 11 attacks but to back the US-led war on terror. Abid Ullah Jan (2006) describes the tragedy and absurdity of the pre-planned war on Afghanistan. He also claimed that the war on Afghanistan is illegal and illegitimate with respect to the international law.

In this paper we will discuss both point of views in detail and American foreign policy at large. In this regard, we will also trace the root cause of 9/11 attacks and draw the cost-benefit analysis of war on terrorism. Nevertheless, the overt and covert military operations legislation regarding security and all-American struggles to stop the financial support to the terrorism are also discussed in this research paper.

U.S Foreign Policies Before War on Terrorism

The American foreign policies must be highlighted. The important and essential events and the ultimate goals of the United States foreign policy is described in detail. There are different arguments of various scholars and researchers about the U.S foreign policy. Some argue that the United States has believed in an unending quest for power and supremacy. Some argue that the basic objective of the United States’ foreign policy was to dominate the world economically. Some argue that the U.S is “exceptional”. It plays a role as a global leader. Some argue that United States is a hyper power.

Walter Russell Mead (2001) has divided American foreign policy making into four groups such as

- 1) Hamiltonianism
- 2) Jeffersonianism
- 3) Jacksonianism
- 4) Wilsonianism.

Alexander Hamilton was a staunch federalist and presented the idea of continental realism. Hamiltonianism believed that the economy must lead the United States foreign policy because the national interest is interlinked with national economic prosperity. Hamiltonianism remained as dominant ideology which led the American foreign policy from 1865 to 1929. On the other hand, Thomas Jefferson believed that the powerful central governments had much more ability to suppress the common people and he had a grave mistrust of centralized government. Jeffersonian believed that the U.S foreign policy should be isolationist and the U.S should be kept away from

making alliances with Europe. The idea was first introduced by George Washington and then propagated by Jefferson. The third ideology was introduced by the president Jackson. Honor, individualism and courage became the popular values of Jacksonian ideology. The U.S foreign policy was shaped under the tenets of Jacksonianism. The Jacksonians believed in the wars of expansion. Jackson Stressed on the people to fight for what they believed. He said: “Every good citizen makes his country’s house his own, and cherishes it not only as precious but as sacred. He is willing to risk his life in its defense and is conscious that he gains protection while he gives it”

The fourth ideology found in American foreign policy is known as wilsonianism rather similar to idealism. The religious president Woodrow Wilson believed in the moral and religious superiority of the United States. Wilsonians believe in the “liberal internationalism”. They believe that the United States have a religious obligation to spread Christianity to the rest of the world. Wilsonianism in foreign policy making was the popular school of thought in the twentieth century. Mead (2001) argued that the Wilsonion school tried to establish international institutions like League of Nations. Wilson believed the expansion of democratic rule in all over the globe. The “idealism” was a natural ideology for the people. The new order was created on the basis of identity issues. The issues of culture, religion and ethnicity were tried to be addressed in Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen points. Unfortunately, Wilson’s world order could not prevent the Second World War. Realism took place and refused to accept idealist utopianism. According to realist, there are four elements of power such as 1) Military force 2) economics 3) population 4) natural resources. And the issues of identity, religion and culture are of secondary importance. After the World War II, the era of cold war begun. Gaddis (1989) called this period “the period of long peace”. The Truman’s doctrine of ‘containment’ was widely adopted. The NATO was established to provide the defense to the western European nations against the communist influence. The policies of geostrategic imperatives and economic expansionism were adopted. Many proxy wars were fought in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. But in 1953, President Eisenhower introduced the doctrine of “Rollback”. He refused to interfere the “Hungarian uprising” in 1956. President Johnson again adopted the policy of containment to promote his policies in Vietnam. During cold war, the United States helped establish dictatorships in Iran, Pakistan, Chile, Brazil, Nicaragua, Argentina, Guatemala, Turkey, Greece and Elsalvadore. The United States helped the illegitimate Arab monarchs. The United States helped establish the state of Israel in the heart of the Arab land. Israel defeated neighboring Arab countries in war with the endless support of the United States. In the period from 1969 to 1974, President Richard Nixon adopted the doctrine of ‘détente’. He wanted to make friendly relations with the Soviet Union and China. The doctrine of ‘détente’ included the expansion of trade and cultural contacts with the Soviet Union and China. In the period of President Jimmy carter (1977-81), the agenda of ‘Human Rights’ became the essential and integral part of the U.S foreign policy. But in those years, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, president Jimmy carter again adopted the policy of ‘containment’. President Ronald Reagan (1981-88) introduced his doctrine named as ‘Reagan doctrine’. In his state of the union address, president Reagon said; “Freedom is not the sole prerogative of a chosen few; it is the universal right of all God’s children”. He

further said: “We must stand by our democratic allies. And we must not break faith with those who are risking their lives on every continent, from Afghanistan to Nicaragua to defy soviet supported aggression and secure rights which have been ours from birth.”

The U.S covertly supported the Afghan “freedom fighters” (Mujahdeen) against the Soviet Union supported government and the anti – communist powers in the civil war of Angola. President H.W. Bush’s era was the period of historic shift. It was the victory of western liberal Democracy. Fukuyama (1992) presented the theory of “end of history”. He argued that the end of cold war not only presented the end of a particular era but also presented the end of history. In 1991, Bush and Gorbachev redefined relations in the post cold war environment. They signed strategic armed Reduction Treaty (START). The U.S.A used forces in panama against Noriega and started ‘Operation Desert Storm’ against Iraq when Sadam Hussein occupied Kuwait. After Gulf war, the U.S forces were used in northern Iraq to rescue Kurdish refugees. President H.W. Bush’s address before a joint session of the congers on the state of the union dated January 29, 1991 outlined the new world order. He states:

“What is at stake is more than one small country; it is a big idea, a new world order, where diverse nations are drawn together in common cause to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind – peace and security, freedom, and the rule of law. Such is a world worthy of our struggle and worthy of our children’s future”. Charles Krauthammer (1990) stated: “It has been assumed that the old bipolar world would beget a Multipolar world..... The immediate post cold war world is not multipolar. It is unipolar. The centre of world power is an unchallenged superpower the United States, attended by its western allies”. Lawrence Freedman (1991) commented on Bush’s new world order: “An underlying theme in all the discussions is that the United States has now acquired a preeminent position in the international hierarchy. This situation has developed because of the precipitate of the Soviet Union. Bush himself has indicated that it is the new relationship with Moscow that creates the possibility for his new order. For many analysts, therefore, the new order’s essential feature is not the values it is said to embody now the principles upon which it is to be based but that it has the United States at its centre In effect, the debate is over the consequences of the west’s victory in the cold war rather than in the Gulf for the generality of international crisis”.

Samuel Huntington (1996) criticized the ‘new world order’ and wrote “The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order”, “The expectation of harmony was widely shored. Political and intellectual leaders elaborated similar views. The Berlin wall had come down, communist regimes had collapsed, the United Nations was to assume a new importance, the former cold war rivals would engage in “Partnership” and a “grand bargain”, peacekeeping and peacemaking would be the order of the day. The president of the world’s leading country proclaimed the “new world order”. But, on the other hand, Joseph Nye (1992) in his article “What New World Order” wrote: “Realists, in the tradition of Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger, see international politics occurring among sovereign states balancing each other’s

power. World order is the product of a stable distribution of power among the major states. Liberals, in the tradition of Woodrow Wilson and Jimmy Carter, look at relations among peoples as well as states. They see order arising from broad values like democracy and human rights as well as from international law and institutions such as the United Nations”.

Bill Clinton’s foreign policy was extensively criticized. With the failure in Somalia and Rwanda. Bill Clinton introduced a cohesive foreign policy. He presented the doctrine of enlargement. This idea consisted of multilateral peacekeeping struggle, market democracy, free trade, international alliances and a strong commitment to interfere in the world crisis situations and regional cooperation’s. This doctrine was designed to protect the democratic norms and the civil rights in the world. Bill Clinton continued the policies of H.W. Bush against Iraq. The U.N sanctions against Iraq remained intact under the Clinton era. Clinton administration passed the ‘Iraq liberation Act’ in 1998. This act was signed by Clinton to adopt the policy of ‘regime change’ against Iraq. In the most important goal of the U.S foreign policy after cold war was to prevent the emergence of any powerful enemy which could not challenge the domination of the U.S. In 1992, Paul Wolfowitz drafted the Defense planning Guidance which was a policy statement about the new global situation. He stated:

“Our first objective is to prevent the re – emergence of a new rival. This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power. These regions include western Europe East Asia, the territory of the former Soviet Union and South East Asia.”

BACKGROUND OF WAR ON TERRORISM

In his speech on dated 16 September 2001, President Bush said: “This crusade, this war on terrorism, is going to take a long time.” He strongly believed that it was a mission from God to wage the crusade war. But later on, President Bush tried to conceal his strain of Christianity and did not repeat the word ‘crusade’ again. Mark Crispin Miller (2004) wrote in his book “cruel and unusual: Bush/Cheney’s New World Order” that “Bush has been less successful, unable, as he is, to mask his true intentions and desires”.

In February 2002, Bush addressed to the United States troops in Anchorage and openly declared that Canada was with the U.S.A in this war. He said:

“.... Stand with us in this incredibly important crusade to defend freedom, this campaign to do what is right for our children and our grand children”.

Indeed, Bush perceived the war on terrorism’ as the crusade war. He saw this war as a religious war. In his view, the Muslims were killing the Christians and the U.S would attack on the Muslims with heavy force and ferocity in reply. No doubt, All Americans wanted to punish

the masterminds' of 9/11 attacks on the world trade centre. They also wanted to crush all those who supported and abetted a heinous crime in which thousands of people were ruthlessly killed. But the enemy was hidden. The media launched a powerful campaign against the Muslim extremists. The western media nominated Al-Qaeda as the organization of harboring terrorists. The main stream media presented Al-Qaeda as the staunch enemy of the west before the people of the U.S.A and The Europe. Therefore, the Bush administration was justified to attack on Al-Qaeda First of all the Bush administration struck Al-Qaeda and then it struck at Saddam Hussein. For this purpose, the U.S.A invaded Afghanistan and blamed Taliban for such a complex strike on the U.S.A. But on the other hand, Thomas F. Madden (1999) wrote in his book 'A Concise History of the crusades: "Clearly the crusades were much on the minds of our enemies long before Bush brought them to their attention". Indeed, Thomas F. Madden (1999) tried to shift the blame. So, in the background of the war on Terrorism', the crusade was the eminent factor. According to Madden (1999) the crusade war is "in every way a defensive war". In spite of all allegations, Osama Bin Laden refused to own the responsibility of the 9/11 attacks. He told the world, "The United States is pointing the finger at me and I categorically state that I have not done this". But the Bush administration did not pay any attention to Osama's clarification. The United States repeatedly put pressure on Taliban's government in Afghanistan to hand over Osama to the U.S.A. Whereas Mullah Omer refused to hand over Osama to the U.S.A. without any evidence or proof So, after 25 days of 9/11 attacks, the U.S.A attacked on Afghanistan. The Bush administration did not get any permission from the security council to attack on Afghanistan. Because the Bush administration thought that it was the U.S.A right of 'pre – emptive strike' to crush the enemies. But actually all designs of American hegemony are found in the report named "Rebuilding America's defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources For A New century" prepared by Dick Cheney in 1997. The main signatories of this report for the project of New American century (PNAC) were Paul Wolfowitz, Donald Rumsfeld, Jeb Bush, Dick Cheney and other prominent neoconservatives. The report states:

"As the 20th century draws to a close, the United States stands as the world's most preeminent power. Having led the west to victory in the cold war. America faces an opportunity and a challenge. Does the United States have the vision to build upon the achievement of past decades? This report proceeds from the belief that America should seek to preserve and extend its position of global leadership by maintaining the preeminence of U.S military forces. Today, the United States has an unprecedented strategic opportunity. It faces no immediate great – power challenge; it is blessed with wealthy, powerful and democratic allies in every part of the world; it is in the midst of the longest economic expansion in its history; and its political and economic principles are almost universally embraced at no time in history has the international security order been as conducive to American interest and ideals."

Undoubtedly, the wealthy, powerful and democratic allies destroyed every part of the world for their economic expansion and political interests. The most universally accepted principles of the U.S.A are to deplete the natural resources of the developing countries. The war

is waged to impose the destruction agenda in the globe. In the abovementioned report for the PNAC four substantial missions were identified so that the U.S.A would maintain its extensive dominating position of global leadership.

- 1) Defend the American homeland.
- 2) Fight and decisively win multiple, simultaneous major theatre wars.
- 3) Perform the ‘constabulary’ duties associated with shaping the security environment in critical regions.
- 4) Transform U.S forces to exploit the revolution in military affairs.”

To defend the American homeland, Bush administration waged “war on terrorism” after the false flag attack of 9/11. Two simultaneous major wars of Afghanistan and Iraq were being fought. The U.S.A spread its armed forces in the critical regions like Mid East and south Asia. The U.S.A used 9/11 and after 9/11 it had been about to cross the borders of central Asia by force. It was its everlasting dream to send troops to central Asia and establish military bases. Similarly, the U.S.A destroyed the rich Muslim country of Iraq. The U.S.A tried to loot the Muslim world by performing the constabulary duties to shape the security in the region. Michael Rupert (2006) wrote in his article “By the light of a Burning Bridge”, “After the 9/11 attacks the U.S government lied to create a war for oil in Iraq telling us that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction almost – ready atom bombs, poison gas and deadly germs. We were told that he helped execute the 9/11 attacks. It was all lies, and no one was held accountable for hundreds of thousands of deaths (murders) in Iraq and Afghanistan since then. Few have tried to hold the government accountable for 2500 Americans who have died needlessly, and those who have, have been remarkably in effective”

COST AND BENEFIT ANALYSIS

The United States has hidden the entire picture of the “war on terrorism”. Bush administration has completely concealed the total cost of the war on Terrorism”. The immense toll and unestimated death of Afghans, Iraqis and Pakistanis in the ‘war on terrorism’ are approximately 4 million of noncombatant peoples. The U.S administration and the mainstream media have provided widespread and vast cover-up to hide the crimes against humanity. During and after the ‘war on terrorism’ the whole region including Pakistan, Afghanistan, Libya , Syria, Iraq, Palestine and Yemen was destabilized and the terrorizing Islamist group ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria) triggered another round of violence and brutality in Iraq and Syria. On the other hand, the U.S policymakers have tried to like the total costs of the war from the western people. The U.S has expended almost trillion dollars on the “war on terrorism”. However, the increasing military budgets of the U.S were allocated for U.S/ NATO militarism in the Middle East and the shrouding region. It is very tough to access to the authentic and reliable information about the assessment of damages within the region where the war was waged. But the accessible information about the realities of destruction and casualties are gathered from news agencies, police records, non – governmental organizations and hospital records etc. There was a loss of

innocent non – combatant civilians at large scale in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan. The U.S Journalist NIR Rosen stated, “The hundreds of thousands of dead Iraqis are not better off [.....] the hundreds of thousands of refugees are not better off”. [.....] The children who lost their fathers are not better off.”

In 2007, a poll was conducted in which Americans estimated that less than 10,000 Iraqis were killed in war on terrorism. While in 2012, the existing scientific studies analyzed that almost one million Iraqis were killed; in other words, 5% of the total population was butchered. The WikiLeaks video presented the collateral Murders and damages in Iraq and Kunduz, the province of Afghanistan. The data about the death figures of three countries including Iraq, Pakistan and Afghanistan is somewhat available. While the casualties in Somalia and Yemen are countless. So far as Libya is concerned, in 2011, the NATO forces intervened and killed 50,000 Libyan civilians. Some investigations suggested that one million people were killed in Iraq; two lakh and twenty (22000) were killed in Afghanistan and eighty thousand (80,000) were killed in Pakistan. The total number of killed people is almost 1.3 million in the above said war zones. Other investigations suggested that more than two million people were killed in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan during and after war on terrorism. These statistics are provided by U.N organization, non – government organizations (NGOS), government’ departments and individual studies. According to Brookings Institution’s Afghanistan Index and the German government’s “Progress report of Afghanistan” published in January 2014, nearly 15000 security forces were killed between 2007 and 2013. The former British EU commissioner for external relations Chris Paten wrote:

“Europe has failed to take any effective steps to pressure [The government] to stop the war and crimes against humanity being committed by its troops and proxy militias”

He further wrote:

“During this time over two million people have been forced from their homes, and more than 200,000 civilians have died.”

The political scientist of Boston University, Peter C. Crawford, estimated that nearly 10,000 Iraqi soldiers were killed by the U.S troops and the opponent killed 10,000 members of the troops and the policemen from 2003 to 2007. Since in accordance with the internal commission on Missing persons (ICMP) hundreds of thousands of people are presumed missing in Iraq. It ranges from 250,000 to one million people. Similarly, according to the International Campaign to Ban landmines (ICBL) and the Cluster Munitions Coalition (CMC), 13000. Cluster bombs had been used by the U.S and U.K troops in Iraq since 2003. According to the U.S Refugee Agency UNCHR, 1.7 million people of Iraq fled the county. While more than 1.3 million people were internally displayed since 2003. These people are registered with the UNCHR. Furthermore, the UNCHR reported that these figures are rather low, many more people are still unregistered in its record.

CONSEQUENCES OF WAR ON TERRORISM

Now we discuss the consequences of ‘war on terrorism’ inside America and in other countries like Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq and Africa etc. The U.S.A. put pressure on Pakistan in terms of ‘do more. The West considered Pakistan as “the safe haven of Al-Qaeda and ruminants of the Taliban government.” Consequently, Pakistan faced terrorism and suicide bombing, inside the country. The economy of the country collapsed. Thousands of people have been the victim of terrorism. The U.S.A. used the most sophisticated weapon against Al-Qaeda in Pakistan. The U.S.A. attacked on Pakistan with drone in 2004. This was the first drone attack on Pakistan. Global post Reports says: “This number has claimed over the years, with 38 in 2008, 52 in 2009 and 1. During the “War on terrorism” The U.S.A. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has established strong base camps in FATA. The CIA activities were disclosed when the CIA agent Raymond Davis was arrested. The U.S. forces killed Osama Bin Laden in a compound of Abbottabad. This was the unilateral operation of the U.S. forces. They succeeded in killing the head of Al-Qaeda. Nevertheless, Obama administration has enlarged the war in Pakistan. As a war partner, Pakistan itself fights against the terrorists in FATA and in the province of Baluchistan. The terrorists have undermined the security situation in the province of Baluchistan, where much of the Chinese investment is made. The terrorists want to destroy the CPEC economic corridor. It is the national potential wealth. It has enhanced the geo-economic and geo-political situation of Pakistan in the region and in the world as well. After war on terrorism”, Pakistan is in a difficult situation. War on terrorism” has much more drastic impact on South Asia in one way or the other. Pakistan got benefits in some minor ways. The most important consequence of ‘war on terrorism’ is the growing Indo-US strategic understanding and cooperation in the region. This Indo-US understanding is not in favor of Pakistan because the U.S.A. provides sensitive equipment to India. Moreover, India has become the most core state in the region while the Pakistan’s nuclear assets are under threat from the U.S.A. The U.S. military presence and the U.S. permanent involvement have changed the entire situation of the region. In Nepal, after 9/11 attacks, the government of Nepal declared the Maoists as terrorists. The Nepal’s army fought against the Maoists and received un-precedented support from the U.S.A. Similarly, the U.S.A. did the same in Kashmir issue. As India became the integral part of the U.S. international strategic coalition after 9/11 attacks, India struggled to declare the Kashmir’s freedom fighters as terrorists. The U.S.A. and India both have built pressure on Pakistan to withdraw its support from Kashmir issue.

So far as terrorism is concerned in Pakistan, terrorism has disturbed inhabitants; destructed infrastructure; caused a fall in economic prosperity; brought political instability; broken the social fabric and lessened foreign investment. The net effect of the terrorism on economy is the low capital formation and low GDP per capita growth. The economic loss of Pakistan is almost \$ 67.93 billion. Pakistan has launched military operations to fight against terrorism. The military operation is called ‘Zarb-e-Azab’ Due to Zarb-e-Azab, Millions of people from Swat district and FATA have been displaced. V According to some reliable sources, Pakistan has lost nearly fifty thousand citizens and military personal. The terrorist have blasted the

many schools in KPK The people of KPK province and FATA have lost their private businesses and property.

IMPACT OF TERRORISM ON PAKISTAN

Sectors	Impact of Terrorism
Economy	Negative impact on earnings, consumption tourism, foreign direct investment, security expenditures etc.
Political impact	Negative impact on the country's image at the local, regional and international level
Social impact	Negative impact on employment, poverty, infrastructure and has high human cost.
Psychological Well-ben	Negative impact on human health and causes traumas, stress and headache

Source Ali (2010) Bartn et al (2006), Bari (2009) & Michael (2007).

This table shows the economic, political, social and psychological impacts of 'war on terrorism' on Pakistan. This war shows negative impact on each sector, The ex-Prime Minister of Pakistan Muhtrama Benazir Bhutto was also killed during election campaign in Rawalpindi. The general headquarter of Pakistan army was attacked by terrorists in 2009. Sri Lanka's cricket team was hit by terrorists in Lahore in 2009. Manawa Police Centre was attacked in Lahore. In KPK and FATA, many political leaders and activists were killed. Ex-Minister Bashir Ahmad Baloor was killed in KPK. Malala Yousaf Zai was attacked but she was saved. The unemployment data shown in table below give the details of unemployment in Pakistan from 2009 to 2011. Rate of unemployment in Paksitan and Khyber PakhtunKhwa from 2009 to 2011.

Region	Unemployment in Millions					
	2009-2010			2010-2011		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Pakistan	3.12	1.91	1.21	3.40	3.22	1.18
Rural	1.89	1.12	0.77	1.85	1.14	0.71
Urban	1.23	0.79	0.44	1.55	1.08	0.47
KPK	0.55	0.35	0.20	0.53	0.32	0.21
Rural	0.45	0.29	0.16	0.41	0.25	0.16
Urban	0.10	0.06	0.04	0.12	0.07	0.05

Source: Labor for survey Pakistan Bureau Statistics

The table shows that the unemployment has increased in Pakistan. The unemployment was 3.12 million in 2009-2010 and it has increased to 3.40 million in 2010-2011. The terrorists have destroyed 401 schools in Swat Valley in 2010-2011 and 640 schools in Malakand division. Similarly, when we examine the data of total cost on war on terrorism, we find very drastic situation in this regard. The cost on 'war on terrorism' was presented in table below in detail.

Estimated Losses to Pakistan Due to War on Terrorism

Rs. Billion	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Cumulative 2005-2010
Direct Cost	67	78	83	109	114	262	712
Indirect Cost	192	223	278	376	564	707	2340
Total	259	301	361	484	678	969	3052
US \$ bn	404	5	6	7.7	8.6	11.5	43.0

Source: Economic Survey of Pakistan 2009-10.

It is very hard and tough to assess the accurate economic losses because of war on terrorism. But it is admitted fact that there is a negative relationship between political, economic and social development and growth. The table shows that the direct cost was Rs. 67 billion in 2004-2005 but it increased to Rs. 262 billion in 2009-2010.

Actual Cost of War on Terror for Pakistan from 2010-2011

Year	Billion \$	Billion Rs	% Change
2001-2002	2.669	163.9	-
2002-2003	2.749	160.8	3.0
2003-2004	2.932	168.8	6.7
2004-2005	3.410	202.4	16.3
2005-2006	3.986	238.6	16.9
2006-2007	4.670	283.2	17.2
2007-2008	6.940	434.1	48.6
2008-2009	9.180	720.6	32.3
2009-2010	13.560	1136.4	47.7
2010-2011	17.830	1528.0	31.5
Total	67.926	5036.8	

Source: Economic Survey of Pakistan 2010-2011

The table shows that the central cost of war on terrorism for Pakistan was Rs. 202.4 billion and it increased Rs 1528 billion in 2010-2011. But the very essential point is that Pakistan's losses were \$ 68 billion in 2010-2011 but it received only \$10 billion from Coalition Support Fund (CSF). It is clear from fact that Pakistan is paying a heavy price to support war on terrorism. In every walk of life Pakistan has been affected due to ongoing 'war on terrorism. Its GDP growth declined. Its military expenditure increased. Its foreign direct investment decreased. Its stock exchange showed low performance. Its tourism sector has collapsed.

In June 15, 2014, Pakistan armed forces, launched a joint military offensive called 'Operation Zarb-e-Azab' against different militant groups like Tahrik-i-Talban (TTP), the Islamic Movement of Wzbekistan, Lashkar-e-Jhangve, Haqqani network, Jundallah, The East Turkestan Islamic Movement and Al-Qaeda, Almost 30,000 Pakistan's armed soldiers were

taking part to crush terrorists and terrorism from gross root level. This ‘comprehensive operation’ started in North Waziristan. The ‘Operation Zarb-e-Azab’ started when the terrorists attacks on Jinnah International Airport at Karachi in June 8, 2014. The Chief of Army Staff Gen. Raheel Sharif announced that:

“Army won’t go back till job is done”

After two years, the director ISPR Lt. Gen Asim Saleem Bajwa addressed a press conference and said,

“June 15 is a historic day for us. Before Zarb-e-Azab, the country including North Waziristan was played with terrorism.”

The terrorists were well-equipped with modern weapons. Lt. Gen Asim Saleem Bajwa further said:

“Pakistan Army has recovered modern weapons from these terrorists which they had stolen from American troops.”

During two years, Pakistan Army killed nearly 3500 terrorists and destroyed 992 hideouts. Almost 7500 bomb making factories were deserted in Shawal. The DG ISPR further said:

“The Army successfully seized 253 tons of explosives-enough to make IEDs form for at least 15 years.”

But the losses of Pakistan Army were not less. In ‘operation Zarb-e-Azab, during two years, 490 soldiers of Pakistan Army were killed. This operation gained support from all sections at large. Pakistan Army has successfully restored peace in the country and broken the backs of the terrorists. The Prime Minister of Pakistan Mian Muhammad Nawaz Sharif said:

“Due to this (Zarb-e-Azab), the nation regained peace that was snatched by terrorists and anti-state elements.”

So far as Africa is concerned President Barak Obama signed a 20-years lease agreement for the Djibouti-based camp in 2014. It is the biggest army base camp in Africa. It covers 500 acres. This base was established to launch military operation against terrorists in Africa and Yemen. The African nations like Ethiopia, South Sudan Niger, Uganda, Kenya, Mauritania, Mali, the Seychelles have shared bases and military facilities with the U.S.A. The U.S.A has adopted various approaches to focus on African security. It has adopted the approach to use the host nation facilities before this, U.S Africa Command (Africom) was created in Stuttgart in Germany. The operating budget of Africom was nearly \$ 400 million in 2009. The Africom was created to focus on 3-D approach consisted of defense, diplomacy and development.

CONCLUSION

After 9/11 the U.S Military and foreign policies are structured to stop terrorists and terrorism. After Bush administration, Obama was also adopting the Bush's policies in regard of counter terrorism. President Obama said in April 11, 2010, "The single biggest threat to U.S security, both short term, medium term and long term is the possibility that terrorists might obtain a nuclear weapon." Actually, Bush administration had kept the American nation in fear to wage endless wars in the name of "Terrorism". It is very striking point that both Bush administration and Obama administration had focused their attention on the effect, of terrorism but not on its root causes. The U.S.A spent trillions of dollars, eroded America's civil liberties and killed millions of civilian people in Muslim countries but it could not achieve its objectives. President Obama changed the name of Bush's "War on terrorism." Obama did not deviate from President Bush's cruel and unjust policies. His administration renamed "War on terrorism" as "Overseas Contingency Operation". To widen wars, The Pentagon's budget has risen 67% since 9/11 attacks. It is very astonishing fact that the U.S.A the superstate has fielded the well equipped army with advanced and sensitive technology to crush non-state terrorist enemies in Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia and the Philippines, only almost 100 operations of Al-Qaeda and almost 15000 Afghan Taliban were in Afghanistan but the U.S.A deployed 94000 troops and NATO sent 40000 soldiers in Afghanistan. The U.S.A governments after 9/11 have adopted two plunged policies: To keep America safe from Arab and Muslim extremists. To extend U.S hegemonic power in the oil producing states of the Middle East, and the central Asia. No doubt, the U.S policies in the past decades were a main factor in spreading terrorism, the emergence of Al-Qaeda, The rise of Taliban and the September 11 strikes. If we have studied the U.S policies since the World War II, we can trace the root causes of terrorism and unrest in the region especially in the Muslim world. We can summarize these policies as follows.

After World War II the U.S.A started to enhance its hegemony over Middle East, central Asia and South Asia and Africa. First of all the U.S.A tried to stop the Soviet Union. Though the Soviet Union was its ally in the world war II, yet it continued its policy of global pre-eminence. For this purpose, the U.S.A provided strong support to the ultra conservative monarchies and dictatorships in the region. It protected the kingdoms in Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iran and other countries. Due to the monarchy, the democracy has not been established in the region. Because the puppet rulers are in the U.S.A's protective custody. In 1951, the democratic government came in power in Iran firstly, nationalized the essential petroleum reserves. The U.S.A overthrew the democratic government of Iran and established the kingdom in Iran. After 72 years of interference, the U.S.A has strong control over the all governments of the region except Iran. Syria is facing civil war and in Egypt the democratic government has been overthrown. Turkey is the member of NATO, but recently it has taken two steps in the opposition of the U.S.A policies such as:

- 1) It has criticized Israel over the invasion of Gaza.

- 2) It has joined Brazil to prevent the U.S.A imposing sanctions against Iran. These two positions taken by Turkey were totally against the policies of the Obama administration. The secular and Progressive forces in the region weakened and crushed ruthlessly. In the response, the extremists groups like Al-Qaida filled the vacuum. It was the Islamic resistance initiated by Osama Bin Laden in the name of Jihad.

The U.S.A has provided unlawful and unjust support to Israil against the people of Palestine. While the creation of Israel was unjust and in 1967 war, Israel occupied the large area of Palestinian territory. This support to Israel created antipathy in the Muslim world to the U.S.A the Muslim world better knows that Israel has subjugate the people of Palestine with the military, economic and political support of the U.S.A. it is the major factor in the progress of extremism in the region. This policy has given rise to terrorism in the world.

The U.S.A involved in the Afghan civil war in 1978 and supported the armed conservative Islamist war lords. The U.S.A supplied a great amount of money and war material to contain USSR. In this regard, both Al- Qaeda and Afghan Taliban got opportunity to be developed. In 1989, the USSR withdrew its troops from Afghanistan. The war worlds of Afghanistan could not remain united. The war for control of Afghanistan started and it remained four years. Consequently, the ultra orthodox extremist Taliban came into power in 1996. Al- Qaeda setup into foothold in Afghanistan till the 9/11 attacks on WTC and pentagon.

The U.S.A. imposed violent and cruel sactrins on Iraq after the 1991 Gulf War. The U.S.A. launched the most devastating air strike on Iraq in January 1991. In this war, the U.S.A. faced the loss of 147 troops while on the other hand, Iraq lost 200,000 troops and civilians. After the war U.A and UN imposed economic and trade sanctions on the people of Iraq. In the result of these sanctions, almost 1.5 million Iraqis died. These sanctions made the civilian life unsustainable. To the Arabs and Muslims, this inhuman act was not less than any genocide.

The U.S.A. invaded Afghanistan and continued endless bombing on the people of Afghanistan and Pakistan as well after 9/11 attacks. It was a war against Al-Qaeda which a small non-state organization and how erroneous it was that the U.S.A. devastated the 'state' to punish the non-state organization. In order to gain complete dominance over the region, the U.S.A. killed 1.2 million people in Iraq and rather 4 million sought refuge. In both wars ... Gulf war and the Iraq War nearly 2.5 million Iraqis have killed. President Obama's policy to widen. The Afghan was to continue drone and hand of violence drone attacks on Pakistan and penetrate in Yemen has triggered to strengthen of the hands of Al-Quade in consequence. In the U.S.A. wants to eliminate 'terrorist' and 'terrorism' it must reverse its policies and strategies to implement such policies. In this regard, some suggestions are recommended while are as follows:

- 1) To postpone wars in the region immediately and withdraw its troops from Afghanistan, Iraq and other countries of the Muslim world.

- 2) The U.S.A. must help to resolve Israel- Pakistan conflict to redress the grievances of the Arab nation.
- 3) The U.S.A. must withdraw its support from undemocratic governments and monarchies.
- 4) The U.S.A. must help to establish democracies in the Muslim world. Especially in the Arab world.
- 5) The U.S.A. and the other European countries must help the Iraqi people. It must make a huge investment in Iraq to rebuild, to eliminate poverty and to improve the social structure in Iraq.
- 6) Similarly, in Afghanistan, the U.S.A. must establish peace by gathering all the groups around negotiating table and should take Pakistan in confidence to maintain law and order in Afghanistan, because without Pakistan all efforts in this regard will be in vain. Therefore the importance of Pakistan cannot be ignored. Pakistan and Afghanistan need much support in terms of money to compensate to loses in Afghanistan war and in ‘war on the terrorism’. Because both countries are still in war and facing alarming terrorism in side.
- 7) The U.S.A. must not flare up Arab-Persian conflict. But the U.S.A. must allow them to resolve their political, social and cultural conflicts without interference.

If the U.S.A. takes such measures and adopt policies in the light of above mentioned suggestions, then the ‘terrorism’ in the name of religion can be eradicated from the region so specifically and the world in general far as ;the state terrorism’ is concerned, it is imperative to stop ‘state terrorism’ whether it is the state-terrorism of the U.S.A. by imposing sanctions an Iraq and Iraq or the state terrorism of Israel imposed on the people of Palestine and Libnan or the ‘State terrorism’ of India in Kashmir by its violent and brutal militancy operations to Usurp the independence of Kashmir is. In the current situation only the people of the West can play an important role. The enlightened people of America can put pressure on its government to stop interfering in the matters of the Middle East and the Muslim World as well. Only the liberal and moderate people of America can force the government to end ‘State terrorism against the developing and under-developed countries to maintain its hegemonic and imperialistic dominance.

REFERENCES:

Arrighi et al (1999); *Chaos and Governance in the Modern World System*. Minnerpolis!
University of Minnesota Press, U.S.A.

Asseri, Ali, S. Awadh (2009); “Combating Terrorism; Saudi Arabia’s Role in the War on Terror”; Oxford University Press, Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX26DP.

Bakunin, Mikhail (1873); “Statism and Anarchy”; source! Retrieved on February 24th, 2009 from [www. Marxist.org](http://www.Marxist.org). source: Bakunin on Anarchy, translated and edited by Sam Dolgoff, 1971.

Balmire, C.P. and Jackson P. (2006); “World Fascism A Historical Encyclopedia”. Santr Barbara ABC Clio, PP. 716-717.

Bebber, Robert J. (2008); “The Role of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in counterinsurgency operations: Khost Province, Afghanistan; Small wars Journal, 10.

Bergen, P and Tiedemann, K.(2010) “The Year of Drone”, New America Foundation.

Body,Count; “Casualty Figures after 10 years of the war on terror Iraq Afghanistan Pakistan. First International edition-Washington DC, Berlin, Ottawa-March 2015 translated from German by Ali Fathollah. Nepal. Website: www.ipnw.de , www.pgs.ca , www.psc.org.

Bush, George W. “Address to A Joint Session of Congress and The American People”; The Washington Post, 21 September, 2001.

Chssudovsky Michel; September 11, (2001): “The crimes of War Committed “in the name of 9/11”, Initiating a legal procedure against the perpetrators of 9/11; <http://www.globalresearch.ca/september-11-2001-the-crimes-of-war-committed-in-the-name-of-911/5311561>.

Coghlan Andy and Debora Mackenzie (2011); “Revealed the capitalist network that runs the world”; www.newscientist.com/article/mg21228345.500-revealed-the-capitalist-network-that-runs-the-World.html.

Franks, J. (2006); Rethinking roots terrorism; Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Fritz, Jason. (2008); “On the Future and option”; SWJ Magazine and Small wars Journal Published by Small wars Journal LLC. Website: www.smallwarsjournal.com

Fukuyama, Francis. (1992), “The End of History and the Last Man”, Free Press New York.

Gerges, Fawaz A. (2012); “Obama and the Middle East”. St. Martin’s Press ISBN: 9781137278395., New York.

Gerges, Fawaz A. (2011); “The Rise and Fall of Al-Qaeda”, Oxford University Press, Caledon Street, Oxford Ox 26DP.

Goldstein. Joshua S. (2004); “The Real Price of War. How you pay for the war on Terror”, New York University Press. New York and London.

Grant, S.B. (2003); “The understanding of evil! A joint quest for criminology and theology; In R. Chairs and B. Chilton (Eds.) Star Trek Visions of Law and Justice (Dallas: Adios Press 2003).

Greenwald, Glen (2010), Obama Confidant’s spine-chilling Proposal; www.Salon.Com January 15;2010.

- Griffin David Ray (1998); "Fascism"; Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Griffin David Ray (2004); "The New Pearl Harbour: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11"; Updated Second Edition Arris Books.
- Griffin David Ray (2011); Ten Years Later When State Crimes Against Democracy Succeed, Hans Publishing Ltd. P-30.
- Griffin, David Ray and M. Feldmai (eds.) (2004): "Fascism and culture." London Rutledge, 2004.
- Griffin, Daid Ray (2011); "Cognitive Infiltration: An Obama Appointee's Plan to Undermine the 9/11 Conspiracy Theory", Olive Branch Press, U.S.A.
- Griffin, David Ray. (2008); "9/11 contradictions Interlink Publishing Group, New York and Arris Books ISBN-10:1844370739.
- Hanle, Donald J. (1989); "Terrorism: The Newest Face of War"; Pargamon-Brassey 1989.
- Hanson, Mathew (2008); "The Economics of Road side Bombs"; College of William and Mary, Department of Economics working paper No.68 (2008)
- Herman, Susan N. (2014); "Taking Liberties: The War on terror and the erosion of American Democracy". Oxford University Press (2014), Great Clarendon Street Oxford.
- Hodges, Adam (2011), "The war on Terror Narrative: Discourse and Intertextuality in the Construction and Contestation of Sociopolitical Reality; Oxford University Press, Great Clarendon Street,
- Hoffman, Bruce (1999); "Inside Terrorism"; Columbia University Press, New York.
- Huntington, Smuel P. (1996): "The clash of civilizations and the Remaking of World order. New York; Simon and Schuster.
- Huntington, Smuel P. (2002) "The Age of Muslim Wars. Newsweek, December 2001-January 2002.
- Ikenberry, John et al (2009); "The Crisis of American Foreign Policy. Wilsonianism in the Twenty-First Century" Princeton University Press, 41 Willian Street, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Jan, Abid Ullah (2006); "Afghanistan! The genesis of the final crusade" pragmatic publishing, Canada.
- Jones, Keith (2002); "Pakistan's Military Regime Rallies to Us War Coalition", IPRI Fact file Vol-IV (28) PP.5.
- Jones, Sethe. G. (2008). "The Rise of Afghanistan's Insurgency; State Failure and Jihad; international Security, Vol. 32, No.4 (Spring 2008), PP 7-40; Published by the MIT Press.

Juergensmeyer, Mark (2001); "Terror in the Mid of God": The Global Rise of Religious violence"; University of California Press, Berkely.

Keith, Jim (2003); "Mass control: Engineering Consciousness; Adventures Unlimited Press 1999, 2003. P-30.

Khan, Imran (2011); "Pakistan: A personal History"; Trans world Publishers, 61-63 Uxbridge Road, London W5 SSA, A random House Group Company, UK.

Lajuenesse, Major Gabriel C. (2008). "Winning the War of Ideas", SWJ Magazine and Small Wars Journal Published by Small Wars Journal LLC Visit www.smallwarjournal.com.

Laqueur Walter (1987). "The Age of Terrorism", Little, Brown Publisher 1987.

Laqueur, Walter (2003); "No End to War; Terrorism in the Twenty-First Century"; The continuum International Publishing Group, New York.

Madden, Thomas F.(1999): " The New Concise History of the Crusades"; Rownan and Little Field, New York, U.S.A.

Mead, Walter Russell. (2001); "Special Providence! American Foreign Policy and how it changed the World; Rutledge 5-Howick Place, London SWIPIWG, England and Wales.

Meyer, John W. et al (1997); "World Society and the Nation-states, American Journal of Sociology: 103:144-181.

Meyer, John. W (1994) et al: Rationalized Environments. Institutional Environments and Organizations: structural complexity and Individualism. SAGE Publications.PP-28-54. ISB N. 978-083956674.

Meysan, Thierry (2003); "9/11: The Big Lie" Carnot U.S.A. Books, 22 W 19th Street FL, New York, U.S.A.

Michel Brain, Jenkins and John Paul, Godges (2011); "The Long Shadow of 9/11: America's Response to terrorism"; Rand corporation: Website: www.rand.org.

Miller, Crispin Mark, (2004): "Cruel and Unusual"; W.W. Norton and Company U.S.A.

Ministry of Finance, Government of Pakistan; "Economic Survey of Pakistan, 2010-2011", http://www.finance.gov.pk/survey_1011.html

Mudd, Philip (2013); "Takedown: Inside the Hunt for Al-Qaeda"; University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia Pennsylvania.

Musharraf, Pervaiz (2006); "In the Line of fire: A memoir; Simon and Schustr, New York.

Nye Joseph (1992); "What New World Order"; Foreign Affairs, Vol-71 No-2 (Spring 1992), PP-83-96; Council on Foreign Relations.

Palmer-Fernandez Gabriel, (2005); "Terrorism, Innocence and Justice". Philosophy and Public Quarterly, Vol. 25, No.3, Summer 2005. P-24.

R.B. Fowler (1998); "The Anarchist Tradition of Political thought; the Western Political Weekly" 25(4),1972,743-744.

Ranstorpe M., (1996); "Terrorism in the name of religion" In R. Howerd and R. Sayer (eds). Terrorism and counter Terrorism; McGraw Hill, PP-121-136.

Ruppert, Michael C. (2004); "Crossing the Rubicon! The Decline of the American Empire at the End of the Age of Oil", New Society Publisher P1, P123.

Sargant William (2011); Battle for the Mind-A Physiology of Conversion and Brain-washing, A Malor Book.

Scheuer Michael (2004); "Imperial Hubris: Why the West is losing the War on Terror". Potamac Books, INC, Washington D.C. U.S.A.

Schmid, Alex P. (2011); "the Definition of Terrorism; The Routledge Handbook of Terrorism Research, Routledge P.39. ISBN 0-203-82873-9.

Scott, Trent and John Agoglia (2008); "Getting the Basic Right: Tactical Actions for Strategic Impact in Afghanistan: Small Wars Journal 2008. <http://www.smallwarsjournal.com>

Shapiro, Ian (2007); "Containment: Rebuilding a strategy against global Terror"; Princeton University press, 41- William Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

The Express Tribune, "Over 3,000 schools destroyed in military, disasters; official" http://tribune.com.pk/story/393911/over.3000-school_destroyed-in-militancy_disasters-office.

The News, "Pakistan suffered \$100bn losses in war on terror", <http://images.thenews.com.pk/03-06-2013/ethenews/t-23252.htm>.

Tony Coady et al (2002), "Terrorism and Justice! Moral Argument in a threatened World Melburue University Publishing 2002, ISBN 978-0-52285049-9, P-8 Cites Walter Laqueur, The Age of Terrorism.

Transcript of Bush's News conferences. Washigton Post. 2001-2004.

Vacirca-Quinn, Myrtle, (2008); "Reviving OSS Methodology for 21st century Military operations; small wars Journal OP-Ed; Website: www.smallwarsjournal.com

Weinberg, Leonard (2009), "Global Terrorism; the Rosen Publishing Group, 2009.

Woodward, Bob (2002); "Bush at war"; Simon and Schuster, INC, New York: U.S.A

Woodward, Bob. (2004); "Plan of attack", Simon and Schuster, New York, U.S.A.

World Bank, "Economic development indicators: 2003 - 2012",



[Http://data.worldbank.org/country/Pakistan](http://data.worldbank.org/country/Pakistan).

Zalman, Amy. (2016); "History of Terrorism Anarchism and Anarchist Terrorism; Anarchists employed "Propaganda of the Deed". Website: <http://www.thoughtco.com>