



PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA



FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
N°.....

DOMAIN: FOREIGN LANGUAGES
STREAM: ENGLISH LANGUAGE
OPTION: LITERATURE AND CIVILIZATION

The Rise of Partisan Extremism in Post 9/11 America

*Dissertation submitted to the Department of English in the Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master Degree*

Submitted by:

Mrs. Aissaoui Khawla

Board of Examiners

Chairperson	Mrs. Baouazib Tayeb Bennaa Youcef	University of M'sila
Supervisor	Mrs. LAOUIDJI Karima	University of M'sila
Examiner	Mrs. Aissaoui Khawla	University of M'sila

September 2020

Dedication

To my family, my husband, and my friends

Acknowledgment

First and foremost, Allah, the Almighty and Most Merciful, is praised and thanked for his incalculable benefits.

I want to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Mrs. Karima LAOUIDJI, for her advice, perceptive criticism, and ongoing support.

I would like to thank the jury members for agreeing to read, consider, and provide feedback on this study.

Abstract

The terrorist attacks that took place in September 9, 2001 on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon have radically transformed not only the foreign policy of the United States, but also affected the domestic and political prospects of the nation. In this perspective, this research highlights as well as evaluates the significance and the nature of major landmarks in the American history starting from the bombings of 9/11. This study explores the conception of terrorism, war, U.S. military and political response, and attempts to find convincing answers to raised inquiries concerning this unfortunate incident, it also provides the reader with an insight into the main alterations evoked by 9/11 assaults from various angles. In this regard, and since the present research deals mostly with historical referencing, both analytical and descriptive approaches are employed to fulfill its objectives. According to the findings of the study, 9/11 was indeed a turning point for the American population alongside the government from different aspects. In essence, military procedures have demonstrated a critical move by launching the global “War on Terror” against Afghanistan and Iraq under the supervision of President George W. Bush. Thus, the attacks have reshaped the political framework of American administration in addressing both domestic and external challenges, leaving traces and lessons that still have an impact up till the present time.

Key Words: Terrorism, 9/11 Attacks, al Qaeda, George Bush, Military Response, Political Response, War on Terror, Partisan Extremism.

List of Abbreviations

ISIL: The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant

FALN: Armed Forces of National Liberation,

USS: United States Ship

MAK: Bureau of Services/Mektab al Khidmat,

FAA: The Federal Aviation Administration

NEADS: The Northeast Air Defense Sector

NORAD: North American Aerospace Defense Command

WTC: World Trade Centre

CIA: Central Intelligence Agency

FBI: The Federal Bureau of Investigation

FAA: The Federal Aviation Administration

DHS: The Department of Homeland Security

TSA: Transportation Security Administration

USA PATRIOT Act: Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools
Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act

NSA: The National Security Agency

VCF: 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund

UN: The United Nations

UNGA: United Nations General Assembly

SC: Security Council

AUMF: The Authorization for Use of Military Force

OEF: Operation Enduring Freedom

SOF: Special Operations Soldiers

WMD: Weapons of Mass Destruction

Table of Content

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgements.....	II
Abstract.....	III
List of Abbreviations.....	IV
Table of Content.....	VI
General Introduction.....	1
1. Introduction.....	2
2. Statement of the Problem.....	3
3. Aims of the Study.....	3
4. Research Questions.....	4
5. Hypothesis.....	4
6. Structure of the Study.....	4
Chapter I: Terror Attacks and Recapitulation of 9/11 Assaults	
Introduction.....	7
1.1. The Threat of Terrorism prior 9/11 in America.....	7
1.2. The Essence of the 9/11 Attacks.....	10
1.2.1. An Inclusive Background.....	11
1.2.1.1. Al-Qaeda.....	13

1.2.1.2. Osama bin Laden.....	16
1.2.2. Comprehensive Timeline of the Attacks.....	19
1.2.3. Attacks under Investigation: Commission Report of 2004.....	22
1.3. Political Response to the Attacks (Anti-Terrorism Policies).....	27
1.3.1. George W. Bush Administration during and post 9/11 on Domestic Level.....	28
1.3.1.1. Department of Homeland Security (DHS).....	31
1.3.1.2. Transportation Security Administration (TSA).....	32
1.3.1.3. National Security Agency (NSA).....	34
1.3.1.4. USA PATRIOT Act.....	35
1.3.1.5. 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund (VCF).....	37
1.4. Aftermath of the September 11 Attacks.....	38
Conclusion.....	41
 Chapter II: Assessing the Enduring Alterations Induced by the 9/11 Attacks	
Introduction.....	44
2.1. Changes in Perceptions following 9/11 Bombards.....	44
2.1.1. The “New Normal” in the American Society.....	45
2.2. Reshaping the Foundations of the U.S. Foreign Policy.....	47
2.2.1. UN General Assembly Address of 2002 and the UN Security Council Resolution of 2002.....	49

2.3. The Military Response: Global War on Terror.....	54
2.3.1. War in Afghanistan.....	55
2.3.2. War in Iraq.....	58
2.4. Insight into the Notions of Ideology, Partisanship, Political Polarization, and Extremism.....	62
2.4.1. The Rise of Partisan Extremism Ideology in America after 9/11.....	65
2.5. Two Decades from the Attacks: Lessons, Lasting impact, and Views	68
Conclusion.....	72
General Conclusion.....	74
Bibliography.....	78
Résumé.....	86
ملخص.....	87

General Introduction

When taking a look back at the outline of the American history, it can be noted that it is filled with several prominent chapters - whether they were praiseworthy aspects or downhearted ones- that contributed in shaping and altering the United States of America on various levels. Despite the fact that this latter witnessed various breakthroughs, progresses, and achievements over the course of time, regrettably, numerous other unfortunate occurrences such as wars, conflicts, and attacks have taken place. The 9/11 attacks are one of the most heartbreaking and disconsolate incidents listed in the record of American memoir. 11 September is considered a day to remember to the American population.

Commonly known as the 9/11 attacks, were a series of airline hijackings and suicide attacks carried out in 2001 by 19 militants affiliated with the Islamic extremist organization al-Qaeda against targets in the United States, marking them as the deadliest terrorist operations in US history (Encyclopedia Britannica). In research from Smith and Zeigler, it is reported that following the 9/11 attacks, a wave of fear, chaos, bewilderment, and trauma spread across the American states. A whole brand new policies, approaches, and principally new ideologies evolved which led to define the period that began after September 11, 2001(2).

As a matter of fact, partisan extremism, political polarization, foreign policy, and many other perceptions have exhibited dramatic shifts post the attacks. Truth be told, many previous researches dealt with the 9/11 attacks and its impact on the American people, government, and laws. However, they disregarded the massive influence of such incident in reshaping the politics, foreign policy, and ideologies in modern America. 9/11 had far-reaching domestic ramifications for both partisan politics and society at large in the United States (Kandel).

Statement of the Problem:

The 9/11 attacks represent a major historical event which is marked to be a turning point in the American life; its occurrence did not only led to a severe panic crises among individuals in the short run, but also had a share in bringing radical changes to the administrative duties of the federal government under the administration of the 43rd president of the United States George W. Bush in the long run. In essence, this research seeks to solve a problem which was not given the appropriate significance in a certain way by previous researchers and scholars, hence; this study is an effort to fill this gap by addressing the issue of the rise of partisan extremism ideology in America post 9/11, mainly to analyze to what extent and what areas was such period crucial in redefining the thought and altering the perspectives of American society in terms of political and social acts, international relations, and anti-terrorism strategies.

Aims of the Study

The study is an attempt to elaborate notions like: 9/11 attacks, terrorism, counter-terrorism procedures, the “new normal” in America, long lasting impacts of terror strikes, the appearance of partisan rigidity and other effects left since the attacks. By reviewing important historic milestones that took place prior, during , and post September 2001. One of the concerns of this study is to discover whether the 9/11 plot ushered a different foreign policy to the world or not. This research also aims at exploring the efficiency as well as the authenticity of George Bush comprehensive strategies and reforms to keep America secure, also investigating if they are still employed by the American governors today to solve the national and international threats. The conducted study addresses the issue of the extremist ideology and its impact. In general, the objective of this dissertation is to evaluate the enduring

aftermath of the 9/11 attacks in altering the course of history two decades after its occurrence in the United States of America.

Research Questions

This study attempts to find answers to the following questions:

- 1- What happened on September 11, 2001?
- 2- What was life like after 9/11? Any new perspectives and ideologies surfaced?
- 3- What were the reforms introduced by George Bush post the attacks? Were they effective to protect the country?
- 4- Are they still employed by the American governors to fight any incoming threat?
- 5- Was the political aspect influenced by 9/11? if yes, to what extent?

Hypothesis

In attempting to investigate the problem of this research the following hypothesis is proposed:

If the 9/11 attacks had not occurred, America and the rest of the world would have taken other trajectories.

Structure of the Study

The dissertation is divided into two main chapters. The first chapter is devoted to reviewing the literature concerning the attacks of 9/11, following with a detailed timeline concerning that day, as well as digging into the misinterpretations surrounding the 9/11 bombings, furthermore, the reorganization of the federal government submitted by the president of that time George Bush are also presented in the first part of this research, concluding the chapter by describing the life after the brutal strike by citing the sharp

repercussions it had left. The second chapter mostly deals with evaluating the impact of the traces marked by 9/11 attacks and its legacies, by demonstrating the alterations in ideologies from both domestic as well as worldwide standpoints. The reframing of the U.S. foreign policy triggered by inaugurating the Global War on Terror against Afghanistan and Iraq post 9/11 is a key aspect which is discussed and explained. Furthermore, the notion of the rise of partisan extremism in America is analyzed in the second chapter; lastly, lessons from the attacks are listed in order to be taken into consideration and learn from them.

Chapter I

Terror Attacks and Recapitulation of

9/11 Assaults

Introduction

It is necessary to delve into the American previous eras with the aim of investigating the major factors that have contributed to each rise and fall of American civilization throughout history. In this regard, the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001, caused the most severe social and political upheaval in modern American life. These strikes are widely viewed as the worst on American territory since the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 during World War II. Such a tragic event left indelible concrete and abstract imprints that can still be recalled in the present period of time.

This chapter seeks to provide a synopsis as well as a historical frame on the history of terror and terrorists in America previous to the events of 9/11, in addition to a socio-historical backdrop for the day the attacks occurred, al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, and the real core of the attacks. Furthermore, by discussing notions from multiple perspectives, this chapter tends to go further into the issue. It focuses mostly on the military and political responses to the attacks, emphasizing President George W. Bush's anti-terrorism initiatives. Finally, the chapter concludes by exploring the new "lifestyle" that has emerged in American culture as a result of the attacks and the impact they have had.

1.1. The Threat of Terrorism prior 9/11 in America

Peace and stability were, and continue to be, one of humanity's major priorities, and are regarded as the foundation upon which the world grows and develops, providing a solid foundation for the human race's affluence. History demonstrates unequivocally that thriving communities are built on autonomy of ethos and expression. Such liberties cannot prosper in the absence of basic standards of decency and equal justice for all, but maintaining this level of stability has proven to be a difficult mission over time. The emergence of various powers has led to different sides desiring to be a part of the game and gain more control, however,

winning often leads players to take unauthorized pathways, neglecting the adverse implications as long as it gets them to their goal, using violence and spreading fear in societies through a phenomena named “ terrorism”.

Based on the article written by Jenkins, terrorism is the deliberate use of violence to create a general environment of fear in a society in order to achieve a specific political goal. Terrorism has been perpetrated by right-wing and left-wing political action committees, nationalistic and religious groups, revolutionaries, and even official agencies including militaries, intelligence services, and police. He continued to assert that definitions of terrorism are frequently difficult and contentious, and the term has evolved a tremendous stigma in its common usage because of the inherent ferocity and violence of terrorism. It was first used in the 1790s to describe the fear utilized by revolutionaries against their opponents during the French Revolution. Maximilien Robespierre's Jacobin party waged a Reign of Terror that included mass guillotine deaths. Although terrorism in this sense refers to a state's use of violence against its domestic opponents, the term has been used most commonly in the twentieth century to refer to violence directed at governments, either directly or indirectly, in order to influence policy or overturn an existing regime.

From the domestic standpoint, the current president of the United States Joe Biden declared in his speech:

Too often over the past several years, American communities have felt the wrenching pain of domestic terrorism. Black church members slaughtered during their bible study in Charleston, a synagogue in Pittsburgh targeted for supporting immigrants, a gunman spraying bullets at an El Paso Walmart to target Latinos. It goes against everything our country strives to stand for in the world, and it poses a direct challenge to America’s national security, our democracy, and our national unity. This National Strategy for Countering

Domestic Terrorism lays out a comprehensive approach to addressing the threat while safeguarding bedrock American civil rights and civil liberties – values that make us who we are as a nation. (Joseph R. Biden Jr., National Strategy for Countering Domestic Violence Statement)

From the international standpoint, some of the most radical and lethal terrorist organizations in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries had a fundamentalist religious ideology (e.g., al-Qaeda). Suicide bombing, known also as mass killing, is a method used by some groups to try to destroy a major economic, military, political, or symbolic target by detonating a bomb on their own person. The Red Army Faction, the Japanese Red Army, the Puerto Rican FALN, and other groups were among the most notable terrorist groups in the latter half of the twentieth century. The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and al-Qaeda, the Taliban uprising in Afghanistan, were the most eminent groups in the early twenty-first century (Jenkins).

Terrorism appears to be an inextricable part of politics. It has emerged as the dominating concern of international politics in the twenty-first century's first decade. Even before the September 11 attacks, there was widespread concern that terrorists might use weapons of mass destruction, to increase their destructive potential to substantially greater proportions. From this perspective, several acts of terrorism by Puerto Rican nationalists (such as the Armed Forces of National Liberation FALN), anti-abortion groups, and foreign-based organizations occurred in the United States in the late twentieth century. The World Trade Center bombardment in New York City in 1993 and the Oklahoma City bombing two years later, which killed 168 people, were two of the worst acts on American soil in the 1990s. Likewise, many major terrorist strikes on US government targets abroad occurred, including military bases in Saudi Arabia (1996) and US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania (1998). In the Yemeni city of Aden in 2000, a suicide bomber detonated a bomb that killed 17

sailors onboard a US military ship, the USS (United States Ship) Cole (Encyclopedia Britannica).

Subsequently, on September 11, 2001, the bloodiest terrorist attacks in American history eventuated. For the country, it was a terrifying, startling, and humbling experience.

1.2. The Essence of the 9/11 Attacks

In the eastern United States, Tuesday, September 11, 2001, the weather was mild and nearly cloudless. Hundreds of millions of men and women prepared for work. Some made their way to the Twin Towers, the iconic skyscrapers of New York City's World Trade Center complex. Meanwhile others went to the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia. The United States Congress was back in session across the Potomac River. People began to queue for a White House tour on the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue. President George W. Bush went for an early morning run in Sarasota, Florida. Weather conditions for people traveling to an airport could not have been more ideal for a safe and pleasurable flight (Kean & Hamilton 1).

Notwithstanding, on that exact same ordinary day, 19 terrorists, accurately, nineteen jihadists affiliated to the Islamic extremist group al-Qaeda carried out suicide attacks in the United States by boarding four American planes with the objective of slaughtering thousands of civilians on American land. Two planes attacked the World Trade Center in New York City, one hit the Pentagon, the US military's command center, and a fourth plane was on its way to the nation's capital, Washington, D.C., but crashed into a field before reaching its destination. These attacks revolutionized not just American history, but also international history. About 3000 people died as a result of this incident, some 2,750 people were killed in New York, 184 at the Pentagon, and 40 in Pennsylvania including service personnel, in other words, New York's police and fire agencies were particularly heavily hit: hundreds of cops and firefighters were slain as they hurried to the scene of the attacks, alongside the massive

destruction of property and institutions. Correspondingly, the terrorists utilized tools of global modern civilization including as the internet, high-tech jets, and open borders to target the west at home, illustrating the dark side of globalization. As a result, September 11th was unquestionably a day of unequalled shock and tragedy in American history (Dissi 20).

As regards to Thorn's point of view, he substantially summed up the tragic event by describing that on the wonderfully sunny morning of September 11, 2001, mass killers among humanity's sickest and most vile psychopaths started a reign of terror that would kill nearly 3,000 innocent victims. To him, Americans were exposed to an arcane, magical process as they watched these horrors unfold on television, a rite that would profoundly traumatize them and permanently reshape the country. Those who arranged this sacrificial killing delighted in the hysteria and devastation as sirens wailed, fires blazed, people shouted, and television news reporters bombarded their audiences with dread. There are terror alerts on every channel, and the death toll is rising. People wondered aloud if World War III had begun (15).

All in all, such a horrific event was a day to remember for the American society, as it brought a large number of physical casualties and massive infrastructure destruction, as well as severe psychological traumas. That is to say, the assaults were definitely a pure act of terrorism carried out in a highly organized pattern that targeted selected locations in the United States. Despite the fact that many questions about the 9/11 attacks remain unanswered, many people and politicians could readily make a guess as who was to blame for the catastrophic strikes of 9/11. Reportedly, the hijackers were Islamic terrorists from Saudi Arabia and several other Arab nations financed by the al Qaeda terrorist organization.

1.2.1. An Inclusive Background

It is worth noting that while 9/11 may have appeared to many Americans as a spontaneous act of terror, the roots of the incident had been growing for years. The tragic disaster was caused

by a confluence of variables that came together in the late 1990s. The attackers were motivated by regional conditions in the Middle East, as well as intelligence breaches and mistakes that left the United States susceptible.

On the morning of Sept. 11, as the White House was being evacuated for fear that it could be hit after the strikes against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the first top official to say “This is Al Qaeda! It’s an al Qaeda attack and they like simultaneous attacks. This may not be over” had been Richard Clarke, a national security expert, novelist, and government official at that time (reported by Gerth, New York Times, December 30, 2001).

Clarke wrote in his memoir “Against All Enemies” that as he walked across the White House from the White House Secure Videoconferencing Center, immediately off the Situation Room, to the Presidential Emergency Operations Center, he tried to collect his thoughts on what was going on around him:

“In the quiet of the walk, I caught my breath for the first time that day: This was the “Big al Qaeda Attack” we had warned was coming and it was bigger than almost anything we had imagined, short of a nuclear weapon” (Clarke 17).

It is crucial to state that Clarke had no proof at the time, and he has not provided any since.

Simply put, the multinational militant Sunni Islamic extremist network known as Al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, and 19 Muslim hijackers were promptly blamed for the atrocities. Apparently, the first mention of Osama Bin Laden and al Qaeda as culprits was brought during the day on September 11, when numerous network, broadcasting, and national television analysts and announcers began speculating that Bin Laden and al Qaeda were behind the attacks (Tarpley 14)

1.2.1.1. Al-Qaeda

The so-called "terrorist organization" Al Qaeda is better defined as a shady and complicated movement or a "network of networks" and affiliates that is constantly altering its structure, size, and content in organizational terms. Al-Qaeda does not fall within the typical terrorist organization paradigm. It varies from other terrorist organizations in terms of organizational structure, styles of thought, and behavioral characteristics. Al-Qaeda is incredibly difficult to characterize because of its intricacy and evolving nature (Bakker & Boer 7).

Apart from this, the sheer mention of al Qaeda evokes thoughts and representations of a well-oiled terrorist organization led by a ruthless criminal genius. Al Qaeda, on the other hand, is more destructive as a doctrine than as a group. Expressly, it is more of an ideology than an organization. Al Qaeda is an Arabic word that can denote "operational base" or "foundation," as well as "percept" or "procedure." The term was always understood in the latter connotation by Islamic militants. In 1987, Sheikh Abdullah Yusuf Azzam, the chief ideologue for Modern Sunni Muslim extremist activists, called for the establishment of Al Qaeda al Sulbah (a vanguard of the strong). He envisioned men who, acting alone, would serve as an instance for the remainder of the Islamic world, galvanizing the Umma (global community of believers) against oppressors (Burke 18). Besides, an intelligence component, a military committee, a financial committee, a political committee, and a committee in charge of media affairs and propaganda were all part of this organization's structure. There was also an Advisory Council (Shura) (Kean & Hamilton 56).

During the Afghan War, Al-Qaeda originated as a logistical network to assist Muslims battling the Soviet Union; recruits were enlisted from all across the Islamic world. When the Soviets left Afghanistan in 1989, the organization disbanded, but its leaders proceeded to fight what they saw as corrupt Islamic regimes and western (i.e., U.S.) involvement in Islamic

territories. The organization was based in Sudan for a while in the early 1990s before relocating to Afghanistan (c. 1996) under the sponsorship of the Taliban militia. Moreover, Al-Qaeda fused with numerous other violent Islamist groups, including Egypt's Islamic Jihad and the Islamic Group, and its leaders proclaimed holy war on the United States on several counts. The organization set up camps for Muslim insurgents from all over the world, training tens of thousands in militarized skill sets, and its operators were involved in a number of terrorist attacks, including the bombings of the US embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, in 1998, and a suicide bomb attack in the US warship Cole (USS Cole attack) in Aden, Yemen in 2000 (editors of Britannica Encyclopedia). Hence, Al-Qaeda grew out of battlefield bonds forged in the Afghan insurgency against the Soviet Union, redirected toward fighting the West.

Wedgwood reported in his article that Al Qaeda uses a variety of terrorist tactics against civilian and military targets, including suicide bombings, car bombings, roadside bombings, hijackings, and paramilitary operations. The majority of the organization's strikes are meticulously plotted and unfold over months, if not years. Multiple suicide bombings are one of Al Qaeda's most distinctive techniques; an example of this is the 9/11 assaults, which were of unparalleled size, previously only witnessed in conflict, killing thousands of people in a matter of hours. This strategy not only generates essentially more damage and casualties than a single bomb, but it also increases victim terror. In a sense, proceeded Wedgwood stating that, Al Qaeda's ultimate purpose was globalization itself, which it achieved through violent Jihad that tainted Islam's humanistic values. According to Al Qaeda's official doctrine, there are no innocent citizens in Western culture, and this principle leads to the most heinous of international crimes. Al Qaeda, on the other hand, planned to strike the World Trade Center in New York during the morning rush hour, when the office towers would be crowded. Al Qaeda

also acted as a rapacious organization that pretended to be civilians, which is illegal under international law and is considered brigandage and vandalism (329).

Interestingly, Al-Qaeda was related to more attacks in the six years after September 11 than it had been in the six years before, including strikes in Jordan, Kenya, Saudi Arabia, Indonesia, Turkey, the United Kingdom, Israel, Algeria, and elsewhere, due to this organizational shift. Simultaneously, it is significant to restate that al-Qaeda began to take advantage of the Internet as a broad platform for recruiting and communication, as well as a platform for video messages, broadcasts, and propaganda. Al-Qaeda was regarded to have attained its peak strength since the September 2001 attacks at the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century.

Al Qaeda develops new operational patterns in reaction to global counter-terrorism initiatives, which have resulted in the capture and death of several of its top leaders in past years, in order to accomplish its sole objective of imposing its vision of Islamic authority across all Muslim land. Al Qaeda now depends less on centralized operations, such as a hierarchical leadership system and recruiting facilities, in its present version. Nevertheless, much of its work is done by unaffiliated units and like-minded entities with only sporadic connections to the organization's central authority. It has also strengthened its communication and propaganda emphasis on the Internet (adl).

All things considered, Gunaratna and Oreg claimed in their research paper concerning this matter that:

“Al Qaeda is first and foremost, an infrastructural organization with a formal echelon, hierarchy, sub-departmental division, and duties distribution reflecting characteristics of a guerilla and terrorist organization.” (1051)

Today, the structure that was built in Afghanistan has now been demolished, and Al Qaeda affiliates have been dispersed, imprisoned, or executed. There is no longer a hotbed of Islamic radicalism in the region. However, Al Qaeda's philosophy, or "Al Qaedaism," is becoming more powerful by the day. Many people who are in any way connected to Al Qaeda support this radical internationalist worldview, which is fueled by anti-Western and anti-Zionist sentiment. They have the same beliefs, models, and strategies as Al Qaeda, and they primarily act in the same manner. Furthermore, it was reported that a large portion of al-Qaeda leadership is based in the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region, as well as the Indian Subcontinent. In many places of Afghanistan, there are large numbers of al-Qaeda fighters and other foreign extremist groups affiliated with the Taliban (Burke 18).

1.2.1.2. Osama bin Laden

Initially, Osama bin Laden was born in March 1957, the seventeenth child of Muhammad bin Laden, a wealthy Saudi businessman who was related to the royal family. One of the major construction enterprises in the Islamic world is owned by the Bin Laden family. Osama bin Laden received his education in the Saudi Arabian city of Jeddah. Professors having significant connections to the Muslim Brotherhood, such as Abdullah Azzam and Sayyid Qutb's brother, impacted him during university. Bin Laden's fortune and ties aided his support for the mujahedeen in Afghanistan, where they were fighting the Soviet Union and its local supporters. Abdullah Azzam, his old teacher, had traveled to Pakistan to take part in the war. After graduating from university in 1979, Osama bin Laden joined Azzam to aid the mujahedeen by establishing a guesthouse for Muslim militants in Peshawar (mainly Arabs) (Bakker & Boer 10).

In many regions of the world, including the United States, mosques, schools, and boardinghouses acted as recruiting sites. Some of these organizations were founded by

Islamic extremists or their financial sponsors. Bin Laden had a key role in this operation. He and the cleric Azzam had collaborated to form the "Bureau of Services" (Mektab al Khidmat, or MAK), which was responsible for channeling recruits into Afghanistan and for diverting funds, arms, and Muslim militants into the Afghan conflict from all over the world. Bin Laden's inherited family wealth paid for the fighters' air tickets and lodging, handled paperwork with Pakistani government, and offered other services. Bin Laden had departed from MAK by 1988 due to disagreements over strategic matters (Kean & Hamilton 55).

Kean & Hamilton resumed to express in the commission report they wrote that the Afghan jihad was victorious in April 1988. Moscow announced that its military soldiers would withdraw from Afghanistan in the next nine months. As a result, Bin Laden and Azzam founded what they labeled – as mentioned earlier- an al Qaeda base or foundation as a possible general headquarters for potential jihad. After the assassination of Azzam and his sons, Bin Laden was inextricably bound to what remained of the MAK and al Qaeda. In general, Bin Laden had a vision of himself as the leader of a multinational jihad confederation after leading a series of successful installations in creating the framework for a truly global terrorist network. In point of fact, this pattern of expansion through alliance formation also applied to the United States. Al Khifa, a Muslim organization, had a number of branches, the largest of which was in Brooklyn's Farouq mosque. Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Tucson were among the cities where al Khifa had offices. Al Khifa enlisted American Muslims to serve in Afghanistan, and some of them proceeded to take part in terrorist activities in the United States in the early 1990s, as well as al Qaeda activities around the world, notably the 1998 assaults on US embassies in East Africa (58).

On this subject, Bin Laden and his al-Qaeda group set out to create a violent agenda in the early 1990s in response to the prospect of US supremacy in the Muslim region. Bin Laden explicitly endorsed assaults on Americans carried out by other groups, including the 1993

bombing of the World Trade Center in New York. Saudi Arabia banned bin Laden's citizenship and froze his funds in 1994, requiring him to depend on foreign resources for finance while he established his organization's infrastructure in Sudan and trained Islamic militants to fight in conflicts throughout the world. Bin Laden's charisma was credited in part with the organization's rise. He was regarded as a gifted public speaker, capable of employing a range of persuasive tactics and making his message comprehensible even to the illiterate. Bin Laden was estimated to have thousands of jihadi adherents around the world by the close of the twentieth century, in areas as different as Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Libya, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chechnya, and the Philippines. As a matter of fact, he was responsible for a number of terrorist attacks against the United States as well as other Western nations, including the suicide bombing of the US warship Cole in the Yemeni port of Aden in 2000 and the September 11, 2001, attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon near Washington, D.C. (the editors of Britannica encyclopedia).

On May 2, 2011, US troops executed and killed Osama bin Laden, the alleged brain for the 9/11 atrocities, and the commander of several other terrorist attacks in the United States, he was hiding in his compound in Pakistan. A nearly decade-long international chase had been conducted for the notorious 54-year-old leader of Al Qaeda, the terrorist network of Islamic extremists. The President at the time, Barack Obama declared bin Laden's death in a televised address. Al-Qaeda issued a statement officially confirming bin Laden's death and vowed vengeance a few days after Obama's statement (history).

In a whole, and according to Rohan, more than any other terrorist figure, Osama Bin Laden fueled the current surge of worldwide terrorism. Bin Laden developed a global terror network by gathering together like-minded groups from combat areas in Asia, Africa, and the Middle east, while his own group Al Qaeda launched the most destructive assaults. Al Qaeda impacted subversive and terrorist groups both tactically and philosophically, generating a

movement that will outlast its creator and leader. Bin Laden was a key figure in the globalization of terrorism for three decades, spanning two centuries. He was the most influential figure in the Muslim world in propagating the suicide terrorist method, and carrying out mass-casualty assaults against the United States (US) (1). Despite the fact that Bin Laden is no longer alive, he has left behind a powerful ideology that will persist to politicize, radicalize, and organize a small part of the Muslim world. It was critical for US and Pakistani forces to assassinate or seize him. It was the least they could do for a terrorist commander who had brought tens of thousands of individuals and security forces personnel so much anguish and misery (3).

1.2.1. Comprehensive Timeline of the Attacks

In order to elaborate the issue of 9/11 from further dimensions, comprehending the exact display of events in the order of their occurrence in a chronological presentation is a requirement. Katherine Huiskes, a correspondent and a member of the United States Senate, provided the following authentic timeline concerning that day:

5:45 AM - Two of the supposed hijackers, Mohamed Atta and Abdul Aziz al-Omari, walk through security at the Portland International Jetport in Maine. They fly to Boston Logan International Airport on a commuter flight before boarding American Airlines Flight 11.

7:59 AM - Flight 11 departs Boston on its way to Los Angeles, California. On board, there are 76 passengers, 11 staff members, and 5 hijackers.

8:15 AM - United Airlines Flight 175 leaves Boston flying to Los Angeles. On the plane exists 51 passengers, 9 crew members, and 5 hijackers.

8:19 AM - Betty Ann Ong, a flight attendant on Flight 11, informs base crews that a hijacking is taking place and that the cabin is inaccessible. The FBI is notified by American Airlines.

8:20 AM - With 64 passengers on board, divided as 53 passengers, 6 crew members, and 5 hijackers. American Airlines Flight 77 takes off from Dulles International Airport outside of Washington, D.C. for Los Angeles.

8:24 AM - Accidentally, Mohamed Atta, a hijacker on Flight 11, warns Boston air authorities to the threat. He either attempted to contact the plane's cabin or he intended to press the button that permitted him to communicate with the passengers on his flight.

8:37 AM - The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) warns the Northeast Air Defense Sector (NEADS) of the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) of the potential hijacking of Flight 11. After listening to Atta's broadcast. In consequence, NEADS set up at the Otis Air National Guard Base on Cape Cod to track and follow the plane.

8:42 AM - Due to usual traffic, there was a delay. Airlines Flight 93 departs from Newark, New Jersey's International Airport on its way to San Francisco, California. On board are 33 passengers, 7 crew members, and 4 hijackers.

8:46 AM - Mohammed Atta and the other hijackers on American Airlines Flight 11 crash the plane into floors 93-99 of the World Trade Center's North Tower, killing everyone on board as well as hundreds of people inside the building. Many employees were stranded on the 91st floor.

9:03 AM - Jihadists crash United Airlines Flight 175 into floors 75-85 of the South Tower of the World Trade Center, killing everyone on board as well as hundreds of people inside.

9:05 AM - President George W. Bush is visiting an elementary school in Sarasota, Florida when White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card informs him that an airplane has hit the World Trade Center. In the president's ear, he murmurs the terrifying news.

9:28 AM - Hijackers attack on Flight 93.

9:37 AM - Hijackers on Flight 77 crash the plane into the Pentagon's western façade in Washington, D.C., killing all 59 passengers and 125 military and civilian employees on board right away.

9:45 AM - The White House and the United States Capitol building have been evacuated amid growing fears of other threats (along with numerous other high-profile buildings, landmarks and public spaces). In the meantime, Operation Yellow Ribbon has closed down US airspace. All civilian planes have been instructed to land at the nearest airport.

9:59 AM - The South Tower of the World Trade Center collapses.

10:02 AM - In Shanksville, Pennsylvania, Flight 93 collapses into an abandoned field area. Even though the exact location of its final destination is uncertain, it was most likely headed for the White House or the US Capitol.

10:18 AM - Any non-grounded flights can be shot down, according to President Bush. All four hijacked planes had already fallen at the time, but the president's crew believed Flight 93 was still in the air.

10:28 AM - The North Tower of the World Trade Center collapses 102 minutes after Flight 11 hit it.

11:45AM - Air Force 1 arrives at Barksdale Air Force Base near Shreveport, Louisiana

12:15 PM - All commercial and private flights are prohibited from entering US airspace.

1:00 PM - President Bush states that US armed personnel are on high alert across the world at Barksdale Air Force Base in Louisiana.

2:30 PM - The mayor of New York City, Rudy Giuliani, pays a visit at the World Trade Center's fallen Twin Towers, at what becomes called as Ground Zero.

3:00 PM - When Air Force 1 lands in Nebraska's Offutt Air Force Base, President Bush is whisked away to a safe bunker capable of withstanding a nuclear attack.

4:30 PM - Air Force 1 departs Offutt and returns to Andrews Air Force Base, which is located near Washington, DC.

5:20 PM - The 47-story Seven World Trade Center falls after hours of fire; the building had been evacuated earlier in the day, and no one is harmed, however rescue personnel are forced to run for their life. The last of the Twin Towers to fall is this one.

8:30 PM - President George W. Bush delivers a speech to the nation, condemning the assaults "evil, despicable acts of terror" and vowing that America, its friends, and allies will "stand together to win the war against terrorism." (University of Virginia/ Miller Center)

1.2.2. Attacks under Investigation: Commission Report of 2004

The WTC buildings collapsed after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, ending the life of 2,749 people, including 400 emergency responders, making it one of the worst building catastrophes in US history. Many Americans continue to seek total accountability for the September terrorist atrocities. As a result, a thorough investigation is required to ascertain the facts, as well as a deep and comprehensive probe to answer disturbing interrogations such as: Why did 9/11 happen?, Was 9/11 allowed to happen?/ Was 9/11 an inside or an outside job ? To be clear, due to lack of evidences, there were various theories concerning the real originator of the attacks, some believe that it was a pure Bin Laden and Al Qaeda conspiracy; while others assume that the US is involved in a way in programming such assaults.

It is essential to define the 9/11 report before initiating the investigation and analysis of the strikes. The 9/11 Commission Report, properly known as the Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, is the official account of the events

that led up to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. (also known as the "9/11 Commission" or the "Kean/Hamilton Commission") in response to President George W. Bush's and Congress's requests, The commission was formed on November 27, 2002, 442 days after the attack, and its final report was released on July 22, 2004. Over 1,200 people were interviewed in ten countries, and over two and a half million pages of papers were analyzed, including several highly secret national security documents (Riedel).

The report detailed the planning and execution of the al-Qaeda attacks, it also reported that the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) underestimated the threat of Al Qaeda and did not take the required actions to impede its plotting. The report not only identified failures in both intelligence and policy communities before to the attacks, but it also presented proof of the following: The hijackers were captured on camera as they passed through airport security. Samples from the flight data recorder of United Airlines Flight 93 captured the noises of the hijackers in the cockpit as well as the passengers' struggles to restore control. Passengers narrated their own final moments to family members and authorities on air phones and cell phones from the cabins of fatal planes, according to eyewitness evidence. The commission also determined that 15 of the 19 hijackers were Saudi Arabians, but "found no evidence that the Saudi government as an institution or senior Saudi officials individually sponsored the organization" to collude in the attacks. Mohamed Atta, the mastermind behind the attacks, was Egyptian. Two of the hijackers were from the UAE, while one was from Lebanon. According to the commission, all 19 hijackers were members of Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda terrorist group. Furthermore, despite discussions between al-Qaeda representatives and Iraqi government officials, the panel found no convincing evidence that Saddam Hussein, as rumors said, aided al-Qaeda in planning or carrying out the 9/11 attacks .New evidence of increased contact between Iran and al-Qaeda was also presented in the commission's final report. The paper details how "at least

eight" of the 9/11 hijackers went through Iran, including the fact that entrance stamps were not placed in their passports by Iranian officials. However, there is no indication that Iran was notified of the actual 9/11 conspiracy, according to the research. The commission findings decided to accuse the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for the inability to alert the military, In addition to its conclusions, the report included a long list of recommendations that may be implemented to assist avoid a similar incident (Kean & Hamilton 9/11 Report).

To begin with, no one in the Bush administration had any notion as who the masterminds of the September 11th attacks were, what their goals were, or who they were targeting. Contrary to this popular belief, there is overwhelming evidence that the US intelligence agency had substantial forewarning of the attacks on New York and Washington on September 11, 2001. Further evidence reveals that the attacks may have been carried out in the interests of specific Bush administration officials (Ahmed & Leonard 81).

Tarpley sees 9/11 as a case of state-sponsored, false-flag, synthetic terrorism, which will be referred to as synthetic terrorism from now on. His thesis is that the 9/11 events were planned and managed by a rogue network of high-ranking US government and military personnel, with some participation from British and Israeli intelligence agencies, and more general support from spy agencies from other Echelon governments (Australia, New Zealand, Canada). Furthermore, he resumed explaining his theory by expressing that financiers, top-level bureaucrats, flag-rank military officers, top intelligence officials, and technical specialists were among the September felons; the central emphasis of their operations was almost certainly a series of private sector locations, in which confidentiality could be best guaranteed by excluding elements devoted to the constitution (6).

Plenty of well- established facts and timelines relevant to 9/11 have been distorted and damaged, according to Tarpley, who repeatedly and explicitly criticized the commission report written by Kean and Hamilton. The 9/11 commission has done considerably more to

mislead and confound public understanding of the core facts of 9/11 than it has to clarify them. For academics, it is a certainty that some of the most revealing information on a cataclysmic event like 9/11 may be found in media reports in the immediate aftermath of the incident. The 9/11 commission, he claims, symbolizes the supremacy of oligarchical scholasticism, the pickling of what had been a vivid catastrophe into a smoothed-over textbook narrative from which practically all of the reality has been extracted. As a result, this book frequently prioritizes items created shortly after 9/11, before the regime's mind-control line became completely hegemonic (7).

Similarly, Griffin and Falk agree with Tarpley, who remarked that there were worrisome forces at work that prevent us from learning the truth about 9/11. Since 9/11, the mainstream media has collaborated with the government to create a climate of patriotic fervor, making any displays of doubt about the country's official leadership equal to treachery. This mind-numbing conflation of patriotism and unquestioning approval of the current administration's policies has aided those presidential advisers who see 9/11 not as a national crisis, but as "a blessing in disguise," as Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld put it in a TV interview with Jim Lehrer on the second anniversary of the attacks(3).

Despite the fact that the vast majority agrees that 9/11 was a watershed moment in history, there has been little public investigation of the event itself. On the first anniversary of the attacks, Pulitzer Prize-winning American journalist Jim Dwyer wrote an article for the New York Times declaring that:

No inquiry remotely similar in scope , energy or transparency (concerning the fast findings on the sinking of the Titanic) has examined the attacks of last Sept. 11, the devastating collapse of two of the world's tallest structures, the deaths at the Pentagon or on United Airlines Flight 93 in Pennsylvania. A handful of tightly focused reviews have taken place mostly in secret, conducted by private consultants, or by

Congressional committees. One year later, the public knows less about the circumstances of 2,801 deaths at the foot of Manhattan in broad daylight than people in 1912 knew within weeks about the Titanic, which sank in the middle of an ocean in the dead of night.

From this standpoint, Griffin and Falk provided a set of what they called as “possible views” that are related to the investigation. One possible interpretation is that, despite the fact that US officials had no role in facilitating the attacks and did not anticipate them, they concocted an untrue description of what happened in order to safeguard national security, conceal potentially embarrassing facts, exploit the attacks to extend their agenda, or for some other reason. Although this is the least serious charge, it is significant enough to warrant impeachment, especially if the president lied about 9/11 for personal gain or to forward a pre-determined purpose, such as bombing Afghanistan and Iraq. Another possibility is that, while the White House had no early knowledge of the assaults, it expected them to happen and was complicit in their facilitation, at least in the sense of not ordering them to be prevented. On a different level, there is a strong case to be made that the White House had precise foreknowledge of the targets and the time of the assaults. Another point of view is that the Pentagon, along with the White House, actively participated in the attack preparations (8).

Thus, According to Clarke, the US intelligence community was certain that an Al-Qaeda terrorist strike on US territory was inevitable around ten weeks before September 11th. All domestic US security agencies were told seven to eight weeks before the 11th September assaults of an approaching Al-Qaeda attack on the United States, which would most likely happen in a few weeks. By the beginning of July 2001, it was clear that all US intelligence agencies were fully prepared for a potential Al-Qaeda attack. The CIA acquired precise knowledge about an attack on US soil around four weeks before September 11th (Ahmed & Leonard 87-88).

Since the attacks of 9/11 have often been compared with the attacks on Pearl Harbor, before going to bed in the White House, Bush scribbled a note to himself: "The Pearl Harbor of the 21st century took place today. We think it is Osama Bin Laden." (Bamford 92) The FBI released its infamous list of nineteen hijackers on September 14. The death rate among the alleged kamikazes was less than 100%, with at least seven of the identified suspects turning up alive and well just days after the list was published. Only Bush's address to a joint session of Congress on September 20 definitively identified Osama Bin Laden and al Qaeda as the perpetrators of the crime (Tarpley 15-16).

All things considered, the country needed to figure out what had gone wrong. One of the world's largest structures had collapsed, resulting in a tremendous loss of life. Those in command had shrugged off warnings of peril. Many people perished as a result of communication breakdowns, a lack of cooperation, and a failure to prepare during the rescue effort. However, no element of the US government has provided a compelling, cohesive, and comprehensive explanation of the events of that day. The official account of 9/11, the layers of unexplained facts, and the various attempts by those in authority to obstruct independent investigation, is thoroughly unconvincing. Finally, it is worthwhile to note that the entire question of 9/11 remains taboo in American politics.

1.3. Political Response to the Attacks (Anti-Terrorism Policies)

As noted already, the terrorist attacks of 9/11 were performed by an organization identified across the world as Al-Qaeda, with Osama Bin Laden as its infamous commander. The operations on the United States were the result of an ongoing fight and power struggle between the major groups in the Middle East. The terrorist attacks had a profound impact on the American people, and many individuals argued that the government should be more involved in ensuring the country's security and tranquility. These attacks had a significant

effect on American politics. It is understandable that this act of terrorism exposed the country to a new era of vulnerability and to serious security dangers. Just following 9/11, the United States realized that immediate and initial military and political responses were necessary to be made for the purpose of mitigating any potential near and future threats.

At the evening of the same day the terroristic atrocities took place, and in a televised address, President George W. Bush gave a statement to the country, labeling the attacks as wicked, terrible acts of violence, and declaring that America and its allies will unite to defeat terrorism. He boldly vowed a global war. The president was swift to reply to millions of Americans who were concerned about the country's welfare in the long term. The speech was highly emotive, and it could be claimed that it was written with the intention of emotionally preparing Americans for a punitive reaction in terms of freedom and security. Correspondingly, the president activated the government's emergency response measures instantly after the first hit, claiming that the military is capable and equipped. Concurrently, the president cautioned the rest of the world that there is no space for impartiality in the battle against terror, and that all sides should be either with or against the US. This warning could be interpreted as a plea for the development of a global anti-terrorism alliance, particularly against Al Qaeda (Dissi 21).

1.3.1. George W. Bush Administration during and post 9/11 on the Domestic Level

As a matter of fact, the attacks of 9/11 marked the beginning of the United States' substantial engagement in the fight against terrorism under the presidency of George Bush. Therefore, it is relevant to underline the role of the president George Bush during the tragic state the American nation was facing during and post the 9/11, for doing so; an introductory paragraph on the legacy of Bush seems to be significant.

Firstly, Bush graduated from Yale, went to Harvard for a business degree, and then returned to Midland to work in the oil industry. At the age of 54, George W. Bush was elected as the 43rd President of the United States in January 2001. He was the son of George H. W. Bush, the 41st president, who claimed he was shocked when the eldest of his six children became involved in politics and went on to become governor of Texas, then president of the United States. In the 2004 election, Bush was re-elected with 51 percent of the vote to 48 percent for a second term. President Bush has strived to expand freedom, opportunity, and security both at home and abroad since his election to the presidency. What is more, on September 11, 2001, the most momentous incident in President Bush's tenure occurred. Plenty of Bush's ambitions and plans were put on hold as a result of the attacks, and his father, George H.W. Bush, testified that his son "faced the greatest challenge of any president since Abraham Lincoln." Consequently, President Bush replied by laying out a detailed plan to safeguard the American people (Fiedel & Sidey).

George Bush attended a reading session at Emma E. Booker elementary school in Sarasota, Florida, the morning, of the attacks, as part of an essential pillar of his domestic agenda: education. He was warned by the White House Chief of Staff Andy Card whilst listening to second graders that "America is under attack." In this aspect, President Bush surveyed the harm in Washington and New York in the days following September 11th, oversaw military and civilian response activities, praised the work of first responders, and consoled a mourning nation. President Bush highlighted that the attacks were carried out by radical terrorists and did not represent the Islamic religion as the nation moved from sorrow to outrage in the days post 9/11 (George W. Bush Library).

In reaction to the terrorist acts of September 11, 2001, the Bush administration strengthened his presidential authority in national security affairs. Bush went from being a President whose legitimacy was doubted and who was elected in a disputed election to

wielding vast presidential emergency powers, identifying the threat, and striking the enemy. Bush's leadership became a unifying element for the country after 9/11. Because they trusted in his abilities to keep them secure, the American people were predisposed to trust him. In the weeks following the attack, Bush's support rate soared to 90%, the highest in US presidential history. Along the same lines and in the days after the attack, Bush agreed on three objectives: 1. Prevent the terrorists from attacking again; 2. Make it apparent to the country and the rest of the world that the US had entered a new sort of war; 3. Assist the damaged regions in their recovery and ensure that the terrorists did not accomplish in closing down the economy or splitting community (Gregg).

Gregg, who is a Professor at the University of Louisville, proceeded narrating that on September 11, Vice President Dick Cheney, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, Chief of Staff Andy Card, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and Secretary of State Colin Powell hastily established a war council. In the wake of 9/11, the primary goal of US military intelligence was to locate and eliminate the origin of the assaults. Al Qaeda and its commander, Osama bin Laden, were promptly detected thanks to George Tenet, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). It is worthwhile to point out that before the September 11th attacks, the rebel leader had been regarded as a threat, and the CIA devised a plan to covertly assassinate bin Laden, but it was never undertaken because bin Laden was not deemed a danger to national security.

In terms of Bush's administration and specifically from the foreign relations point of view, the president formed worldwide coalitions to depose violent regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq that posed a danger to the United States. Similarly, he acknowledged that freedom and hope are the ideal responses to the terrorists' fanatical doctrine. Domestically, George Bush supervised the most fundamental restructuring of the federal government since the Cold War, in order to prevent another 9/11. The Bush administration and Congress strengthened federal

law enforcement's capabilities to identify and prosecute terrorists, boosted US counter-terrorism intelligence expenditures, stationed thousands of National Guard troops at airports, and escalated the use of military air marshals on domestic flights (Roots 503).

For doing so, Bush's governance aimed particularly at reshaping the intelligence community, and establishing new institutions and laws such as the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Transportation Security Administration (TSA), the USA PATRIOT Act, the National Security Agency (NSA), in addition to 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund (VCF).

1.3.2.1. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

In April 2002, White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card convened a meeting of Bush Administration officials to compile a set of government entities that would be appropriate for a new executive agency tasked with avoiding a repeated 9/11. President Bush revealed the organization chart less than two months afterwards (Greenberg 216).

The Department of Homeland Security is the United States' federal executive department in charge of public security, and it seeks to enhance the nation's safety. Customs, border, and immigration enforcement, emergency response to natural and man-made catastrophes, anti-terrorism operations, and cyber security are all part of the Department's responsibilities. In the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, it was intended as a way to bring together domestic national security tasks that had previously been dispersed over 40 federal departments under a single Cabinet-level agency. The department was established by the Homeland Security Act of 2002 and came into existence on January 24, 2003, and is administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Homeland Security, with almost 240,000 employees (Merriam Webstar).

As previously stated, DHS's over 200,000 workers have possibly the most broad range of requirements of any government agency. Securing US seaports, airports, and land entry

points; officiating citizenship applications; responding to hurricanes and other environmental catastrophes; safeguarding the President and visiting heads of state; and defending government buildings are among them. The Implementing 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007 (9/11 Commission Act) ordered the Department of Homeland Security to screen all US-bound cargo-shipping containers for radioactive substances at their ports of origin. Many DHS programs collect data with the complete knowledge and consent of the targets or the owners of the targets. Cross-referencing collected data with data kept in computer databases is a common part of DHS's research (Greenberg 219).

Greenberg concluded his article by assessing the legacy of DHS, he wrote that The Department of Homeland Security has built its reputation on high-risk, high-reward programs that rely largely on cutting-edge technology to collect and disseminate intelligence and homeland security data. DHS works similarly to an intelligence agency, planning, gathering, processing, analyzing, and disseminating information. It is customized to a specific aim - preventing and deterring terrorist attacks by lowering risk (233).

Briefly, The Department of Homeland Security is in charge of coordinating the nation's security efforts. It will protect against and react to risks and hazards to the nation, as well as detect and restrain terrorist attacks. The Department will maintain secure and safe frontiers, welcome legitimate immigrants and visitors, and encourage free trade.

1.3.2.2. Transportation Security Administration (TSA)

In the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States founded an organization tasked with establishing and administering regulations to protect the safety of the country's transportation infrastructure. The Aviation and Transportation Security Act approved by Congress and signed into law by President George W. Bush on November 19, 2001. The formation of a massive new federal agency, the Transportation Security

Administration (TSA), to undertake security checks at US commercial airports was by far the most significant measure. Basically, The TSA's main objectives, and possibly the most notorious to the public at large, are airport security and discourage aircraft hijacking. At airports, armed transportation security agents search people and luggage for illegal items. Others operate behind the scenes, such as analyzing passenger lists and matching them to profiles of names thought to be a security concern or at risk of becoming one. They then determine who has to be screened further or who should not be allowed to board a plane. Moreover, cargo carriers going through the country's roads, cargo approaching U.S. harbors and traveling on U.S. waterways, and freight moved via pipelines are all covered by the TSA. As part of its responsibility to maintain the country's transportation systems secure, the TSA hires various professionals such as behavior detection officers, federal air marshals, explosives specialists, and canine teams in addition to transportation security employees. Originally part of the United States Department of Transportation, the TSA was transferred to the newly formed Department of Homeland Security in 2003 (The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica).

Nevertheless, Edwards considers that after more than a decade of experience, it is evident that the TSA's formation and federal control of airport security was a miscalculation. TSA screening efficiency was no better, and potentially worse, than private screening, according to inspectors. TSA has a reputation for misdirection, questionable spending, and security flaws. Last year, former TSA Administrator Kip Hawley stated that the agency is "hopelessly bureaucratic." TSA has also been chastised in recent congressional investigations for having "expensive, contradictory, and poorly executed" policies as well as a "immense, rigid, and disorganized bureaucracy." He kept on expressing his point of view by suggesting that TSA should be repealed by Congress. TSA initiatives that have not yielded significant results should be phased out. Passenger and luggage scanning, which accounts for around

two-thirds of the TSA's budget, should be transferred to airports and put up for competitive private bidding. TSA's residual functions, such as intelligence and analysis, should be handed to other government departments (1).

1.3.2.3. National Security Agency (NSA)

The communications-security and intelligence-gathering efforts of the United States are carried out by a Defense Department organization. The NSA monitors specific communications channels and administers a federal cyber security center on behalf of its security mandate, in addition to dispensing and regulating some security methods and guidelines for the US government and performing certain foreign intelligence missions. NSA is considered as the US intelligence body that runs one of the largest surveillance operations in the world (NSA).

Interception of terrorist communications by the National Security Agency frequently raises red flags elsewhere in the government. Its wiretaps are occasionally decisive pieces of the analyst's puzzle piece. Engineers at the National Security Agency develop technical strategies to decrypt ciphers and make logical sense of today's complicated communications environment. Its analysts listen in on talks between foreigners that aren't supposed to be heard by them. They also conduct "traffic analysis," which entails looking into technical communication networks and protocols, as well as foreign organizational structures, such as those of terrorist groups. What is more, the legislation mandates that the NSA to not gather information on U.S. inhabitants or individuals in the United States without permission based on foreign intelligence needs. In addition, the NSA was expected to notify the FBI of any signs of criminal activity, espionage, or "terrorist enterprise" so that the FBI could acquire the needed warrant (Kean & Hamilton 87).

Alex Sinha, a law professor at Quinnipiac School of Law who is known that his research focuses on race and inequality, freedom of expression, legal and ethical theory, national security law, and law and technology, published an article in 2013 in which he wrote that the National Security Agency (NSA) has been accumulating huge amounts of information on American inhabitants and legal residents since shortly after 9/11, if not before, presumably in order to prevent future terrorist attacks. Besides, the New York Times revealed in December 2005 that President Bush had allowed the National Security Agency (NSA) to eavesdrop on domestic phone calls and collect confidential emails without court approval. For this reason, the New York Times piece has provoked outrage among some who believe the NSA program is illegal (864-65). Furthermore, considering the NSA program's evident extent, the number of violations of the human right to privacy might well reach the millions, billions, or perhaps trillions. Hence, the program's vast and deliberate structure could lead to the conclusion that the US is breaching the human right to confidentiality on a massive scale within its boundaries (367).

1.3.2.4. USA PATRIOT Act

Historically speaking, post the September 11 bombings, the Bush administration sent a draft bill to Congress that would give the federal government the ability to monitor, prosecute, and jail suspected terrorists. On October 11, the Senate measure, the Uniting and Strengthening America (USA) Act, was passed (96–1). On October 12, the House of Representatives passed the Uniting and Strengthening America (USA) Act (337–79), which featured much of the wording of the Senate's USA Act. On October 23, the House submitted the USA PATRIOT Act, a compromise bill that was enacted (357–66) the next day. On October 25, the Senate approved the House bill (98–1) without alteration, and Bush signed it into law the next day (Duignan).

Duignan went on by defining the act, the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001, also known as the USA PATRIOT Act, was implemented by Congress as a reaction to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and initialed into law by President George W. Bush in October 2001. It massively boosted the browsing and domestic spying forces of federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies. The USA PATRIOT Act, as revised and re-registered since 2003, introduced various modifications to current regulations concerning the privacy of telephone and telecommunications equipment, the functioning of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, money laundering, immigration, and other topics. It also outlined a slew of new offenses while simultaneously toughening up on old ones.

On one hand, the Act's key feature is that it has been a divisive national security program since President George W. Bush passed it into law. Anti-terrorism measures, according to proponents, have become more cohesive, convenient, and practical as a result of the Act. When monitoring overseas terrorists, federal agents utilize roving wiretaps to escape detection by rapidly shifting sites and communication equipment. A fair latency in alerting terrorist perpetrators of a search warrant allows law enforcement to locate the criminal's accomplices, neutralize imminent community dangers, and organize arrests without initially turning off the culprits. In other words, investigating officers can respond fast before a suspected attack is finished because law enforcement has more unity thanks to many communication routes. Surveillance is made easier by the fact that companies have a clear definition of who is responsible for investigating terrorist activity. Suspicious activity is investigated more quickly, bolstering terrorism prevention. Increased wiretapping allows investigators to listen in on potentially dangerous talks (Investopedia).

On the other hand, Opponents of the Act believe that it basically allows the US government to probe whomever it deems appropriate, thus contradicting one of America's

most deeply held ideals: the right to privacy. When restricted funds are used to trace American residents, particularly those traveling abroad, questions of wasting government funding emerge. It is questionable what the federal government intends to do with information gleaned via public records surveillance, prompting worries about the agency's sovereignty and authority. Alleged terrorists have been held without explanation or legal counsel at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and other locations, infringing on their right to due process; some of the detainees have since been found to have no ties to terrorism (Investopedia).

Conclusively, the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Washington resulted in significant changes in US foreign and defense policy, internal security practices, and organizational structures for national security, including substantial adjustments in the US Intelligence Community's structure and processes during the administration of George Bush. In a word, it is vital to mention that the United States has not been targeted in the more than two decades since the assaults.

1.3.2.5. 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund (VCF)

The September 11th Victim Compensation Fund ("VCF") was established to compensate any person (or an individual representative of a deceased person) who was physically injured or killed as a result of terrorist-related plane crashes on September 11, 2001, or the wreckage extraction endeavors that followed those collapses. As the skyscrapers burned and crumbled, thousands of first rescuers and those working and living in lower Manhattan near Ground Zero were subjected to poisonous gases and particulates. By 2018, 10,000 people have been diagnosed with cancer linked to 9/11. Families of 9/11 victims and the 2,680 individuals wounded in the strikes received over \$7 billion in compensation from 2001 to 2004. When President Barack Obama signed The James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act into law on January 2, 2011, funding was extended. The bill continued

health monitoring and compensation for 9/11 first responders and survivors, and was named after James Zadroga, a New York City Police officer who perished of a respiratory ailment he developed after rescuing victims from the rubble at Ground Zero. The funding for treating 9/11-related illnesses was extended for another five years in 2015, totaling \$7.4 billion. Finally, On July 29, 2019, President Donald Trump approved legislation extending assistance for the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund until 2092 (History).

1.4. Aftermath of the September 11 Attacks

“Time is passing. Yet, for the United States of America, there will be no forgetting September the 11th. We will remember every rescuer who died in honor. We will remember every family that lives in grief. We will remember the fire and ash, the last phone calls, the funerals of the children.” George W. Bush

The emotional toll of the assaults, especially the collapse of the twin towers, New York City's most prominent icon, was enormous. The World Trade Center, unlike the comparatively secluded location of the 1941 Pearl Harbor attack, to which the September 11 events were quickly likened, was situated in the core of one of the world's greatest cities. Hundreds of thousands of people observed the attacks firsthand (many bystanders photographed or videotaped the events), and millions more viewed the catastrophe evolve on television. Not only that but also the footage of the attacks, as well as visuals of hordes of grieving individuals gathered at "Ground Zero," some with photographs of missing dear relatives, searching some sign of their fate, were aired in the media countless times in the days that followed September 11 (Bergen).

Furthermore, global marketplaces were severely rocked. The buildings were in the center of New York's financial area, and infrastructure ruin in Lower Manhattan, along with worries of stock market hysteria, forced New York markets to shut for four trading days.

Following that, the stock market saw historic declines. Tens of thousands of travelers were stranded across the United States as a result of the attacks, as U.S. airspace was blocked to commercial aircraft until September 13, and regular service, with more stringent security procedures, did not return for many days.

Bergen stated also that Al-Qaeda scored a huge strategic victory with the September 11 attacks. The assaults were well-coordinated and struck many sites deep within the enemy's heartland, and they were amplified by being televised worldwide to an audience of unfathomable millions. The "propaganda of the deed" on September 11 occurred in the world's media capital, ensuring that the incident received the broadest possible publicity. If al-Qaeda was a relatively unknown group before to September 11, it became a household name in the days following the attacks. Many memorials and ceremonies were held around the world in the aftermath of the assault, with many nations, including the United States, designating a national day of sorrow. Allies flocked to aid the US, possibly best exemplified by the headline in the French newspaper *Le Monde*, "We are all Americans now." Thousands congregated in Tehran, Iran's capital, for a candlelight memorial, and around 200,000 Germans marched in Berlin to express their support for America. Meanwhile, safety precautions in the United States have been significantly increased, particularly at airports, government buildings, and sporting events.

Certainly, the Bush government's actions in the aftermath of September 11th appear to have been targeted to guarantee that the potentially deadly breaches in international order that had begun to develop both at home and abroad before September 11th did not reappear (Ahmed & Leonard 295). Globally, in the aftermath of the events on September 11th, the Bush administration launched a destructive bombing campaign in Afghanistan, killing up to 5,000 Afghan civilians—nearly twice as many as were killed in the World Trade Center and Pentagon atrocities. The Taliban administration was destroyed as a result of the heavy

bombardment, paving the way for the creation of a new, temporary government (Ahmed & Leonard 17).

From a different scope, and in the aftermath of the strikes, the terrorist attacks had a huge impact on the American people, and the fear of terror and death contributed to a fear of anything associated with these groups, including Islam and Muslims, which is known as Islamophobia. That is to say, Hate crimes against Muslims increased around the world despite policymakers and police departments repetitively stating that Islam is a religion of peace whose genuine precepts have been distorted by terrorist extremists, numerous citizens in the United States and around the world continued to associate the 9/11 attacks with Islam and decided to seek retaliation on whoever found Muslim. Statistically speaking, only 12 anti-Muslim crimes were recorded to the FBI in the year 2000. In 2001, the proportion had risen to 93. Hate crimes against Muslims kept going even as civil liberties activists chastised the TSA and law enforcement for racial profiling of Arab and Muslim men. Since 9/11, 107 individuals have been killed in domestic terrorism actions by Americans influenced by jihadist doctrine. In the wake of 9/11, security procedures seem to have thwarted or deterred another major attempt by foreign agents on American soil. However, Jenkins claims that the country has been subjected to an "endless" War on Terror that has irreversibly damaged the foundation of American life (History).

All in all, there is no denying that September 11, 2001 affected everyone's life; it was a pivotal moment in American society. People's focus was drawn to the bombardments in the days and weeks that followed. It also brought 24/7 media coverage to what has come to be regarded as a "collective trauma," with the horrific scenes of that day being broadcast across the country and, indeed, around the world in a matter of seconds.

Conclusion

On September 11, 2001, the world gasped as two commercial jets smashed into the World Trade Center in New York City and another slammed into the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia. While a fourth plane's passengers attempted to take back command, but it crashed in a field outside of Shanksville, Pennsylvania. The hijackers were all from the Middle East, with 15 of them hailing from Saudi Arabia alone. All were recruited in Afghanistan, with four of them attending US aviation schools, as part of an al-Qaeda operation planned, organized, and carried out by Osama bin Laden's terrorist organization. By the course of the day, 2,977 men, women, and children had been murdered, with over 6,000 injured. The majority of those killed were Americans, although people from over a hundred other nations also perished. Many people believed that 9/11 had heralded a new era of worldwide terrorism. In this regard, the core al-Qaeda group never targeted the United States again. And bin Laden, the group's leader, was tracked down and executed a decade after the attacks in an effective covert mission.

However, it is argued that the incidents of 9/11 was the culmination of a system of insiders inside the US government and intelligence agencies, backed up by covert action teams of trained professionals, all with the goal of inciting a war of civilizations as a means of bolstering Anglo-American world superiority (Tarpley42). In this matter, and as a response to the assaults, it can be asserted that emergencies frequently necessitate severe and costly policy changes. Following this pattern, US politicians responded to the terrorist suicide hijacking on September 11, 2001, with the most expansive expansion of government authorities and the most indiscriminate new spending of public funds under the administration of president George Bush, such response can be exemplified in passing new laws and creating new institutions to protect the American land (USA PATRIOT act, DHS, NSA, TSA) (Roots 503).

Briefly, The epochal events of September 11, 2001, became the pivot around which all of latest American heritage would swivels, rewriting international coalitions, reorganizing the United States government, and even shifting the sense of everyday life as security checkpoints and gyroscopes propagated inside buildings and shielded bollards germinated along America's streets.

Chapter II

Assessing the Enduring Alterations Induced by the 9/11 Attacks

Introduction

“After the 9/11 attacks, the combination of fear and a recognition of various intelligence failures led to a range of policy changes that included restrictions on immigration, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, and the expansion of the ‘no fly list’ from a very small number of people to thousands,” declared David Sterman, a senior policy analyst at New America who studies terrorism and violent extremism (Roos).

The tragedy and the horror of September 11th did not last just a few days or weeks. The attacks left an enduring imprint on American culture that the country has yet to totally shake off. The strike of this magnitude on American territory, which was formerly improbable and almost unfathomable, has now been publicly regarded. At this level, the fact that can be stated without any question is that the 9/11 assaults have significantly contributed in creating a lasting impact on the USA, that is to say, there was life before the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and there is life after them.

September 11, 2001 is viewed as an inflection point through which America turned to its leaders for guidance as it struggled with dread, grief, and indignation. To combat terrorism both domestically and overseas, Congress and the White House responded with an unprecedented escalation of military, law enforcement, and intelligence powers. Briefly, the attacks of September 11, 2001, irreparably transformed U.S. intelligence and counterterrorism practices, started two major wars, altered Americans' daily lives, affected the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy, and provided the country with a number of invaluable lessons.

2.1. Changes in Perceptions following 9/11 Bombards

First off, it is beneficial to point out that The September 11 attacks presented Americans with tremendous political, social, and logistical hurdles. They also posed a narrative burden for the news media, which had to clarify what at first seemed incomprehensible. The first

several weeks following the accident, however, saw the emergence of a set of motifs that helped Americans "understand" what had occurred. These subjects were bravery, giving up one's rights, faith, and patriotism. They came into being as part of a cultural story that was told in classrooms, churches, workplaces, and town meetings (Kitch 213).

After dealing with the narrative, there existed a wave of changes in terms of perceptions. Concurringly, the terror events that took place in the United States have erased previous understandings and concepts and replaced them with newly produced visions and insights that eventually led to the establishment of a different and safe America. As far as the notion of new perceptions is concerned, it is consequential to emphasize on the various prospects the attacks have revolutionized both domestically and internationally.

2.1.1. The “New Normal” in the American Society

A formerly unknown or uncommon circumstance that has become ordinary, usual, or anticipated is referred to as "the new normal" To put it another way, it refers to the changes that have occurred in terms of workplace, home, and social life. Simply expressed, a new normal is the phase in which an economy, society, lifestyle, or other aspect of life settles after a crisis, it differs from the scenario that existed before the crisis began. The term has been used to describe World War I, the Great Depression, and the September 11 assaults, among other events.

Indeed, the American soil witnessed the most dramatic and radical alterations, as noted above, the 9/11 attacks were amongst the major incidents that led to the emergence of the concept of the “new normal”. As a matter of fact, pre- 9/11 America and post 9/11 America are not the same, social life wise. People had to adopt and accustom to a slew new upgrades in the purpose of protecting the nation. In this respect, an intensified sense of security became the new normal.

As long as this issue is concerned, the testimony of a number of American residents was featured in a video broadcast on YouTube by the History channel, in which they detailed how life transformed for them after 9/11 and how the concept of the new normal spread in their lives. Dan Rather was the first to speak, claiming that he disliked the phrase "new normal" since it implied that things cannot and will not be the same again, and that the resonances and historical repercussions of 9/11 would linger for a long period of time. Heather Penney believes that 9/11 did not end for anyone, and that it never will; she goes on to assert that America has changed since the bombings. The fundamental historical lesson of 9/11, according to Douglas Brinkley, was that a piece of freedom was lost on that day. Aaron Brown reflected on his trip to LaGuardia Airport. When he was at the airport on Thanksgiving morning in 2001, he spotted soldiers carrying AK-47s (gas-operated assault rifle), and how it was a "new normal" to him. Lastly, Tom Brokaw expressly indicated that:

“the new normal was that when you went to an airport you just didn’t breeze through, for one thing we had to go through a very rigid security process that wasn’t part of it. “”If you see something, say something”” those posters were all over the country” (“After 9/11: The New Normal | History” 03:15–05:21)

Previously, airport security entailed taking stray coins from pockets. Because of the length of time it takes to get through security lines today, they may be a huge source of frustration. The majority of people are required to remove their shoes and belts, walk through full body scanners, and are frequently patted down by security officials. These inspectors also inspect bags with high-tech scanners. Following 9/11, large fluids like as shampoos and body cleansers, as well as blades, were prohibited from airplanes, and friends and families are no longer permitted to greet travelers at arrival entrance (Barndollar).

To conclude, on September 11, 2001, several facets of American life were permanently impacted. People are unlikely to question those adjustments because they have been the "new

normal” for the past 20 years. Therefore, passengers could wander freely throughout airport lobbies without tickets prior to the 9/11 terrorist attacks, which forever changed the country's trajectory. Before boarding planes, most ticket takers did not bother to check passenger IDs. That would be unimaginable nowadays.

2.2. Reshaping the Foundations of the U.S. Foreign Policy

President George W. Bush addressed Congress one week after the terrorist attacks and said, “Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.” The Bush Doctrine is the idea put forth by President Bush that both terrorists and those who support them are enemies of the United States. At first, the doctrine appeared to signal a significant change in American foreign policy. In his inaugural speech, Bush talked more extensively about US goals, saying, "We'll stand up for both our interests and our allies. We'll demonstrate intent without seeming haughty. Aggression and bad faith shall be met with strength and resolution" (Bose 620).

As it was previously tackled in chapter one, the response to the attacks under the administration of George Bush was known for the creation of various acts and agencies to protect the country such as: DHS, TSA, NSA, PATRIOT act. These acts and laws had a share in reshaping and readjusting the foreign policy. At this level, it is evident that the attacks had a tremendous impact on changing the foundation of international relations in addition to the domestic affairs of the United States. Additionally, the attacks forced the American government to reconsider and plan the next move in terms of foreign policy initiatives.

The columnists and contributors to the Foreign Policy website were invited to comment on how 9/11 did change U.S. foreign and domestic policy. The 9/11 attacks irreversibly

altered the U.S. relationship with the Arab and Muslim world and have characterized it for the past 20 years, according to Mina Al-Oraibi, FP columnist and editor in chief of the National. After the tragic events of September 11, 2001, ties that had previously been based on energy security, mutual concerns, and the preservation of Israel's military superiority became primarily focused on the fight against Islamist terrorism.

Another commentator, Steven A. Cook, FP columnist and the Eni Enrico Mattei senior fellow for Middle East and Africa Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, narrated that:

It seems self-evident that much has changed about U.S. foreign and domestic policy because of the 9/11 attacks. To my mind, U.S. political discourse suffered some of the greatest collateral damage. In the days, weeks, and months after the twin towers fell and the fires were extinguished at the Pentagon, Americans were bombarded with analysis about the Middle East, thus, the misinformation disseminated about Islam and Arabs, as well as the politics, history, and culture of the Middle East, was harmful.

He, therefore, explained that Muslims and Arabs as a result—or individuals misidentified as either—were also harassed at airports and other public areas. As a result, it is difficult to overlook how the discourse following 9/11 has affected modern nationalism and white supremacy.

Lastly, Peter Feaver, a professor of political science and public policy at Duke University, where he directs the Program in American Grand Strategy, also submitted his view regarding this matter. Feaver claimed that the way American politicians converted potential U.S. might into operational force outside of the military sphere may have been the most significant change brought about by the 9/11 attacks. According to conventional knowledge, the militarization of American foreign policy was sparked by the attacks. The

consensus view, in fact, conceals more than it illuminates, failing to recognize how policymakers enlarged peacekeeping aspects of state power and used them to further American foreign policy. Moreover, policymakers came up with unusual ways to utilize the U.S. economy to advance their foreign policy objectives.

2.2.1. UN General Assembly Address of 2002 and the UN Security Council Resolution of 2002

After the Second World War, a group was established whose major goal was to bring nations together through stimulating discussions in order to stop and prevent war. This organization, which was once known as the League of Nations, was established to oppose the Japanese and Nazi empires during World War II. The United Nations is the name of this institution today. In essence, the UN works to alleviate poverty and has programs aimed at improving the lives of all world citizens. It also works to prevent wars between big nations. In order to carry out its mandate in various parts of the world, the UN has a wide range of diverse sub organizations. The General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Secretariat, the International Court of Justice, and the UN Trusteeship Council are the six UN bodies that are most crucial to its operation. The UN's two primary bodies are the UN General Assembly and the UN Secretary Council. It's crucial to talk about and about these two organs, and their relation to the 9/11 attacks as well as their role in reforming the foreign policy of the U.S.

On one hand, the UN General Assembly is arguably the most fundamental forum for discussing international politics; by offering a setting for international debate, a stage for war, and a further location for diplomacy and the promotion of transnational issues, it has both evidenced and enhanced the shifting dynamics of international politics. Like other political institutions, the General Assembly is molded by its founders, is influenced by its present

members' conduct, and is rebuilt by their actions. They are therefore human inventions that resemble "social facts," existing as individual realities independent of each member but subject to change as the larger political backdrop shifts or as the purposeful and unintended effects of its members' decisions and interactions mount (Peterson 2).

That is to say, The UNGA, which is the UN's primary deliberative, policymaking, and representative body, is in charge of setting the organization's budget, selecting the secretary-general and non-permanent members of the Security Council, hearing reports from other UN agencies, and formulating resolutions. Annual sessions of the General Assembly are held there under the direction of the UN secretary-general or its president. Until all issues are addressed, the primary portion of these discussions typically lasts from September through a portion of January. The 51 founding countries were represented at the first session, which was held on January 10 in London's Methodist Central Hall (United Nations).

On the other hand, the upkeep of global peace and security is primarily the duty of the Security Council. Each of its fifteen members has one vote. According to the United Nations Charter, all Members are required to abide with Council resolutions. When evaluating whether there is an aggression or threat to the peace, the Security Council is in charge. It suggests ways of adjusting the terms of settlement and encourages parties to a conflict to settle it peacefully, in addition to authorizing military action. The Security Council occasionally has the option of using penalties or even approving the use of force in order to preserve or regain global peace and security. The SC consists of fifteen members, of which the US, UK, China, France, and Russia are five permanent members; also there are 125 additional non-permanent members with terms of just two years. If SC members disagree with the members' suggestion, they also have the right to veto it. It held its first session on 17 January 1946 (United Nations).

According to Peterson, insular Americans view the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon as the beginning of a new phase, fostered by the second Bush administration. However, individuals in other nations have long been aware that terrorist organizations with a global reach constituted a serious risk to public safety. The topic of international terrorism had been discussed by the Security Council and the General Assembly for more than 20 years, with the tempo of discussion picking up in the 1990s as a greater variety of transnational terrorist organizations came into the public eye. There was substantial debate on how to address this threat, despite widespread agreement that these groups' ability to take use of globalization's transportation, communications, and money-transfer opportunities did offer a fundamentally new potential danger (37).

The attacks of September 11, 2001, added a fresh angle to the issue of terrorism. Nearly every country in the world recognized immediately following the attacks that Al Qaeda and other transnational terrorist organizations represented a common threat. The Security Council thus approved the US government's argument that its invasion of Afghanistan was a measure of self-defense after the Taliban government in Afghanistan declined to demand the shutdown of Al Qaeda bases there and hand over Osama bin Laden and other Al Qaeda officials to the US for prosecution. Growing teamwork among national law intelligence authorities and their efforts to weaken terrorist groups resulted from the same collaborative mindset, by stopping their money laundering operations, locating and detaining specific members when they might be prosecuted with crimes, and creating alerts for when terrorist action (Peterson 38).

In its session fifty-seventh session, President Bush addressed the United Nations General Assembly in New York City in September 2002; here it is the opening of his speech:

We meet one year and one day after a terrorist attack brought grief to my country and brought grief to many citizens of our world. Yesterday we

remembered the innocent lives taken that terrible morning. Today we turn to the urgent duty of protecting other lives, without illusion and without fear. We've accomplished much in the last year in Afghanistan and beyond. We have much yet to do in Afghanistan and beyond. Many nations represented here have joined in the fight against global terror, and the people of the United States are grateful. Above all, our principles and our security are challenged today by outlaw groups and regimes that accept no law of morality and have no limit to their violent ambitions. In the attacks on America a year ago, we saw the destructive intentions of our enemies. This threat hides within many nations, including my own. In cells and camps, terrorists are plotting further destruction and building new bases for their war against civilization. And our greatest fear is that terrorists will find a shortcut to their mad ambitions when an outlaw regime supplies them with the technologies to kill on a massive scale (George W. Bush: The American Presidency Project – ProfGP YouTube channel).

Subsequently, he brought up Iraq and handled key points by referring to its long history and background through various angles including Iraq's invading Kuwait, Iraq's regime, Saddam Hussein "dictatorship", Iraq's repression and violation of human rights towards its own people, Iraq breaking promises made with the UN Security Council and UN inspectors, Iraq's assassination attempts of Amir of Kuwait and a former American president, Iraq's government openly praising the strikes of September the 11th, Iraq hiding Al Qaeda terrorists who fled from Afghanistan, Iraq's possession of a nuclear weapon, and Iraq's refusal to release crucial details regarding its nuclear program, weapon designs, purchase logs, and experiment data. What is more, Bush, one more time, talked about being "more than patient" with Saddam Hussein's ongoing efforts to generate weapons of mass destruction. The

president indicated that the United States has no issue or disagreement with the Iraqi citizens and that they have endured too much quiet confinement, as well as the Iraqi regime being a threat to the sovereignty of the United Nations and a threat to peace. To hold Iraq accountable, the world needs to act thoughtfully and forcefully, he pledged to cooperate with the U.N. Security Council to achieve the required resolutions. He said the September 11th attacks would be a forerunner to much worse atrocities if an invigorated regime provided these weapons to terrorist allies (The American Presidency Project). All in all, his address was all about Iraq, mainly to “legalize” its invasion later.

The Security Council, at its 4667th meeting on December 13th, 2002, The International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and the Safety of Civil Aviation was reinforced, as were the objectives and tenets of the United Nations Charter and its pertinent resolutions. Reiterating the necessity to utilize all available methods to address threats to international peace and security brought on by terrorist activities in conformity with the United Nations Charter. Therefore, at its 4678th meeting, on 20 December 2002, the Security Council came up with a set of resolutions in which the conference reaffirmed as well as expressed its commitment for global initiatives to combat terrorism in conformity with the United Nations Charter (United Nations Security Council).

Furthermore, it is important to draw attention to the fact that the atmosphere of cooperation was disrupted in 2002–2003 when the Bush administration attempted to legitimize its invasion of Iraq by asserting, among other deceptive justifications, that the Saddam Hussein government had been collaborating with terrorist organizations. Even after failing to convince the Security Council to support an invasion of Iraq, the Bush administration went on with the invasion. There was a lot of criticism from foreign governments, and there were significant anti-war protests worldwide. The military war came

to an end rapidly, so quickly that any plans to call a special meeting of the General Assembly were abandoned (see War on Iraq page 58) (Peterson 38).

In a broader context, Bush signs a joint resolution of Congress granting the president the authority to use "all necessary and appropriate force" against those who "planned, ordered, executed, or helped" the 9/11 attacks or who provided shelter to those who did. The Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF), first used by the Bush administration to target al-Qaeda and the Taliban allies there, eventually broadened its purview to cover all groups or individuals "affiliated" with al-Qaeda wherever in the globe. Bush characterized the United States' extensive military response to the 9/11 attacks and its new, comprehensive domestic counterterrorism procedures as a global, open-ended "war on terror", such war considered to be the turning point in reshaping the foreign policy (McBride).

2.3. The Military Response: Global War on Terror

Right to the point, the phrase "war on terror" is used to characterize the American-led worldwide counterterrorism initiative that was started in response to the September 11, 2001 terrorist strikes. The war on terrorism was equivalent to the Cold War in terms of its size, cost, and influence on foreign policy; it was meant to mark the beginning of a new epoch in world politics and has had significant ramifications for security, human rights, international law, cooperation, and governance (Jackson).

The nation's most influential elites experienced fright in the days that followed September 11th. In an atmosphere of complete confusion and panic, drastic decisions regarding how to fight terrorism and boost national security were made. In this respect, on September 20, 2001, President George W. Bush spoke to Congress and the country and argued for a radical form of military response—one that involved a broad worldwide War on

Terror rather than a targeted airstrike on a particular training center or munitions basement (Roos).

The fight against terrorism was an all-encompassing, multifaceted effort. Major wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, clandestine missions in Yemen and other countries, extensive military support schemes for friendly regimes, and substantial boosts in military expenditure were all part of its military component. A global program to apprehend terrorist suspects and detain them at Guantánamo Bay, increased cooperation with foreign intelligence agencies, the tracking and intercepting of terrorist funding, organizational restructuring, and significant rises in funding for America's intelligence capacities were all included in its intelligence component. In terms of diplomacy, it continued to build and sustain a global coalition of partner nations and organizations and launched a major public diplomacy campaign to combat anti-American sentiment in the Middle East (Jackson).

Following similar lines, and in his speech, President George Bush announced:

“Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there, it will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated.” (roos).

2.3.1. War in Afghanistan

The Bush government devised a national agenda in the wake of the terrorist attacks to direct America's reaction to the atrocities. Its main objective was to track down the culprits and prosecute them. By doing this, the United States would dismantle the Afghan-based terrorist group and stop them from launching more attacks on the country. President Bush extended the strategy in his first speech on television after the attacks to encompass not only the terrorists themselves but also the countries that harbor them. In essence, his doctrine regarded the destruction of terrorist havens and support networks as equally crucial to the

killing of terrorists themselves. In addition to residing there, a number of top al Qaeda figures have also planned operations against the United States from inside Afghanistan. The administration chose to go after other terrorist groups later even though they posed a threat to the United States (Herring 162).

Less than a month after September 11th, American forces penetrated Afghanistan, beginning the longest-running military conflict in American history. In this matter, the US launched Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and invaded Afghanistan. Local Afghan allies were aided by US Special Operations Soldiers (SOF), intelligence resources, and airpower in a campaign that decisively defeated the Taliban's armed units and toppled their regime. It is vital to remark on the emerge of the so called hybrid conflicts, which are described as quarrels in which opponents use a variety of tactics including conventional combat, insurgency, terrorism, information operations, and criminal activities to accomplish their purposes, have evolved as one of the main tactical concerns of the modern era. The multi-variant risks in hybrid conflicts demand a military to address several very distinct problems at once. The US military's first hybrid conflict challenge would be the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan (Salt 99).

In a general sense, Griff Witte, the Democracy Editor for The Washington Post, also highlighted that there were three stages to the Afghan war. The first phase, which consisted of overthrowing the Taliban (an ultraconservative political and religious group that dominated Afghanistan and served as a haven for al-Qaeda, the group responsible for the September 11 attacks), lasted only two months. The second phase, which spanned from 2002 to 2008, was characterized by a U.S. approach of militarily subduing the Taliban while reestablishing the foundational institutions of the Afghan state. Beginning in 2008, the third phase—a shift to traditional counterinsurgency doctrine—began to gain momentum in 2009 after U.S.

President Barack Obama decided to temporarily expand the number of American troops stationed in Afghanistan.

In a specific sense, A number of strategic goals were created by the administration for Afghan operations. The main goal was to dismantle and, if possible, eradicate the al Qaeda network there. In 1996, Osama bin Laden and many of his top members moved from Sudan to Afghanistan. They set up offices and training facilities there, then started planning operations from those locations. After the September 11 attacks, the administration devised military activities that would cause the terrorists serious harm and dismantle the al Qaeda network, at least in Afghanistan. Additionally, the Bush administration aimed to show that neither the Afghan people nor Islam were at war with the United States. Hence, in order to narrowly define the battle in terms of terrorism, the administration tried to deliberately characterize the struggle in terms of terrorism and focus it on al Qaeda and its Taliban backers. In doing so, it intended to dispel any notions that the US had started a crusade against Islam or was fighting defenseless Afghans. The goal of increasing worldwide support for the war in Afghanistan was also part of the strategy. According to the Bush administration, the war would require widespread international support. Assistance from Afghanistan's neighbors in the area, particularly, would give the US the bases, access, and airspace it needs to conduct a military operation in Afghanistan. Cooperation from other countries would lend the conflict more legitimacy and maybe lighten the United States' role in the conflict. As a result, the government worked to include as many countries as it could (Herring 163).

Likewise, Herring wrote that in order to achieve the previously stated strategic goals, the United States used a number of tactics. Its primary goal was to dismantle or eradicate the al Qaeda network in Afghanistan. In effect, the president sought to kill bin Laden and his top lieutenants and demolish the foundation of terrorism in Afghanistan, including al Qaeda training facilities, safe houses, and gathering locations. In order to deny the terrorists the

resources they required to finance their activities, the United States also attempted to freeze the financial assets of the terror network. In addition, the United States tried to learn more about al Qaeda while carrying out operations against it (164).

The majority of the fighting took place in the air, with only the Central Intelligence Agency and Army Special Forces personnel engaged in ground warfare alongside local anti-Taliban forces. The Taliban had been routed and removed from power by the end of November. However, the Taliban were able to reassemble and launch a guerilla insurgency that became more and more successful after 2005 because the new American sponsored administration was unable to expand its rule over significant portions of the nation (Jacobson 586).

All in all, using the larger troop, a policy of defending the populace against Taliban assaults and assisting with insurgent reintegration into Afghan community was put into action. The plan included a timeline for the departure of foreign troops from Afghanistan; starting in 2011, Afghan military and police would gradually assume control of security matters. The new strategy mostly fell short of its objectives. While the number of insurgent attacks and civilian deaths persisted inexplicably high, many of the Afghan military and police forces taking up security responsibilities seemed ill-equipped to repel the Taliban. The 13-year Afghanistan War, which officially ended in December 2014, was the longest conflict the United States had ever engaged in (Witte).

2.3.1. War in Iraq

The frailty of the United States post the September 11 attacks of 2001, along with Iraq's purported ongoing ownership and production of mass destruction weapons (an allegation that was afterward proven to be false), and its endorse for terrorist organizations, including, according to the Bush administration, al-Qaeda, the aggressors of the September 11 bombings, made disarming Iraq a reinvigorated primary focus in 2002, based on the U.S. president, George W. Bush. On November 8, 2002, the UN Security Council adopted a

negotiated settlement requiring Iraq to accept inspections and abide by all former measures. Although Iraq first seemed to be in compliance with the resolution, President Bush and British Prime Minister Tony Blair claimed that Iraq was still obstructing UN inspections and still had prohibited armaments in early 2003. On March 17, Bush signaled the termination of diplomacy and gave Saddam 48 hours to depart Iraq, saying that he would not be seeking any more UN resolutions and that the Security Council's continued diplomatic attempts were pointless. The presidents of France, Germany, Russia, and other nations disapproved of this march toward conflict (*Britannica*).

With over a year afterwards, in March 2003, Iraq was invaded. The Bush administration chose to impose "regime change" despite the inadequacy of evidence linking Saddam Hussein to 9/11, largely on the grounds that Iraq was pursuing WMD (Weapons of Mass Destruction), including nuclear weapons, which could one day be deployed to target or threaten the United States and its allies or be transferred to terrorists. The size of the military operation in Iraq was greater than in Afghanistan. In less than three weeks, the United States and its alliance with Great Britain—this provided the majority of assistance—defeated Saddam Hussein's military forces without difficulty. However, Hussein's downfall sparked massive robbery, criminal violence, and the start of an insurrection that over the following few years became more deadly. Furthermore, despite persistent searches for months, the purported WMD remained undiscovered. After that, the government devised a new justification for the war in Iraq, claiming that it was now the focal point of the global struggle against terrorism and that victory would hasten the spread of democracy throughout the Middle East (Jacobson 586).

According to the editors of Britannica Encyclopedia, in the early fighting of 2003, there had been few coalition fatalities; by May 1, there had been roughly 150 losses. After then, however, American army fatalities skyrocketed, hitting 1,000 by the November 2004 presidential election and topping 3,000 by early 2007. Several hundred soldiers from other

coalition nations have also died. Uncertainty surrounds the number of Iraqis who perished in the fighting. Although several other reported estimates put the figures during the same period at between 40,000 and 50,000, one estimate from late 2006 estimated the overall number at more than 650,000 between the U.S.-led intervention and October 2006.

However, as the bloodshed increased and the number of fatalities rose, more Americans—including some who had originally backed the war—started to fault the Bush administration for what they saw as its careless management of the invasion of Iraq. Images of American soldiers torturing Iraqis at the Abu Ghraib jail, west of Baghdad, surfaced in the news, further damaging the country's reputation. Additionally, a U.S. bipartisan commission set up to look into the September 11 attacks concluded in July 2004 that there was no proof of a "collaborative operational relationship" between al-Qaeda and the Baathist administration (a socialist party in Iraq), which is a straightforward opposition to one of the primary motivations for the war offered by the U.S. authorities.

As a matter of fact, former U.S. secretary of state James A. Baker III and former congressman Lee Hamilton cochaired the independent, bipartisan Iraq Study Group, which published a report in late 2006 concluding that the condition in Iraq is "grave and deteriorating." The study promoted diplomatic measures to end the crisis on a regional scale. A U.S.-Iraqi deal that revised the legal parameters for American military involvement in Iraq and established a timeline for their complete withdrawal was ratified by the Iraqi parliament in November 2008. U.S. forces were expected to depart the cities by the middle of 2009, and the country's departure was expected to be finished by the end of that year, according to the accord, which was struck during the Bush administration's last months after nearly a year of negotiations. Barack Obama, the newly elected president of the United States, declared in February 2009 that American military troops will leave Iraq by August 31, 2010. A

transitional army of 50,000 American soldiers stayed in Iraq after the final battle unit left on August 18, 2010.

On an additional note, Gary C. Jacobson, a professor of political science at the University of California presented an outlined comparison of both wars in terms of intensity, scale, and salience. In a brief context, he assumed that:

During the Bush administration, far fewer American military personnel were deployed in Afghanistan than in Iraq. After 2009, the numbers converged as the Obama administration continued to draw down forces in Iraq while ordering reinforcements to Afghanistan in February and December 2009; by May 2010, U.S. forces in Afghanistan outnumbered those in Iraq. The Iraq invasion immediately put a much larger number of U.S. military personnel in harm's way and led to far higher casualties than the Afghanistan conflict. Since late 2007, however, American casualties in Iraq have fallen sharply, while those in Afghanistan have increased. Since June 2009, Afghanistan has been considerably more dangerous than Iraq (587).

Likewise, Jacobson summed up his article by citing that the two wars' respective global relations also varied significantly. While major U.S. partners like France and Germany were skeptical of the urgency or morality of attacking Iraq and were unable to assist with the severe repercussions, while the Afghan war became a NATO endeavor (591).

In short, on September 11, 2001, four American jetliners were hijacked and crashed, drawing immediate attention to Afghanistan. Al-Qaeda had planned the scheme, and some of the 19 hijackers had received training there. After the attacks, President George W. Bush's administration came together around a plot to first drive the Taliban out of Afghanistan and destroy al-Qaeda. Some considered taking action in Iraq, including long-standing plots to

topple President Saddam Hussein. Mullah Mohammed Omar, the head of the Taliban, was ordered by Bush to "give to [the] United States authorities all the leaders of al-Qaeda who hide in your land." When Omar refused, American officials started executing a war blueprint (Witte).

2.4. Insight into the Notions of Ideology, Partisanship, Political Polarization, and Extremism

After all the tragic occurrences the United States has seen (terrorist attacks and wars), ideologies have started to propagate in some way. Before diving into the subject, it is necessary to define and explain terms like ideology, partisanship, political polarization, and extremism in order to gain a complete understanding of the birth of a concept named partisan extremism.

Firstly, ideology is seen as a type of social or political philosophy in which theoretical and practical components coexist prominently. It is a set of concepts that aims to both understand and transform the world. In order to describe his "science of ideas," the French author Antoine-Louis-Claude, Comte Destutt de Tracy (b. 1754—d. 1836), invented the phrase in 1796. He demonstrated that ideologies frequently share certain traits, such as a more or less thorough theory of society, a political agenda, the expectation of a fight to carry out that program (therefore necessitating devoted adherents), and intellectual leadership. Because it is uncommon for power to be used without some ideas or beliefs that sustain it, ideology is essential (Cranston). Note that an ideology's name ends all the time with –isms.

In the same scope, John Gerring collected a number of interpretations regarding the concept of ideology, here are some selected definitions:

“It is an organization of opinions, attitudes, and values --way of thinking about man and society. We may speak of an individual's total ideology or of his

ideology with respect to different areas of social life; politics, economics, religion, minority groups, and so forth" (Adorno et al. 2).

"A consistent integrated pattern of thoughts and beliefs explaining man's attitude towards life and his existence in society, and advocating a conduct and action pattern responsive to and commensurate with such thoughts and beliefs" (Loewenstein 52).

"Systems of belief that are elaborate, integrated, and coherent, that justify the exercise of power, explain and judge historical events, identify political right and wrong, set forth the interconnections (causal and moral) between politics and other spheres of activity" (McClosky 362) (QTD in Gerring 958).

Next is the concept of partisanship; according to the American philosopher Brian Duignan, Partisanship is, in democratic politics and administration, a strong allegiance, dedication, or loyalty to a political party—or to an ideology or agenda connected with a political party—and is frequently associated with a disapproving attitude toward the opposition. In other words, the term refers to people who vehemently defend the ideals of their party and are unwilling to make concessions to political rivals. In essence, even if its effects on cognition and affect are not immediately apparent, partisanship has the power to influence how an individual engages with and experiences the environment. Partisanship involves more than just supporting the candidate or party that best represents one's views on the salient topics of the day. Instead, party loyalists frequently follow party line and support their "team," even though party policies may go against their proclaimed values (Clark 15).

Along the same line, political polarization is the shift of political opinions from the middle and toward ideological extremes. The majority of political science debates of polarization take political parties and democratic forms of government into account. Political

polarization in two-party systems typically manifests as the conflict between its opposing political philosophies and partisan identities. However, other political scientists claim that current polarization is less dependent on left-right policy differences and more dependent on other divisions, such as those between religion and secularism, nationalism and globalism, tradition and modernity, and rural and urban areas. As reported by McCarty, scholars, journalists, and elected officials have all expressed serious concerns about the polarization of American politics. Additionally, he described polarization as the rise in support for extreme political viewpoints relative to that of the center or the middle, accordingly, political polarization, as the name suggests, is the phenomenon of the American populace congregating at the extremes of the political continuum. (2).

Parenthetically, it is eminent to clear the lack of understanding surrounding the two concepts of partisanship and polarization. McCarty said that although the phrases polarization and partisanship are occasionally used interchangeably, there are actually some significant differences between the two. In contrast to political polarization, which may refer to these distinctions among members of different parties, polarization often refers to differences on policy concerns, ideological orientations, or value systems. However, partisanship can be more all-encompassing in that it can relate to any bias one feels for their own party, regardless of whether the origin is polarized beliefs and views. Numerous academics have argued in recent years that the growth in partisan conflict is better understood as an increase in general partisanship unconnected to the development in ideological or policy division. Others contend that mass partisanship is less motivated by objective factors and is instead derived on deep psychological ties and social identity. According to this viewpoint, the escalating political tension in the United States is a result of the growth of "in-group" allegiances and "out-group" enmities (12).

Lastly, - the concept of extremism - The definitions of extreme phenomena used by scientists, political leaders, and prospective extremists typically differ greatly. The term itself is influenced by a variety of elements, including the political system's (non)democracy, the dominant political culture, the system of values, ideology, political objectives, individual traits and experiences, and ethnocentrism. In terms of terrorism, racism, xenophobia, interethnic and interreligious hatred, left- or right-wing political radicalism, and religious fundamentalism, extremism is primarily a political term that refers to actions that are morally, ideologically, or politically contrary to written (legal and constitutional) and non-written state norms; that are wholly intolerant of others; and that deny democracy as a form of government and a method of problem-solving (Sotlar 1).

When looking at extremism from a political angle, one must deal with at least two of its aspects. First of all, there is invariably a wide and varied political area (political context) in which a specific tendency or activity is sensed, viewed, characterized, and witnessed; secondly, in such a political environment, there are consistently a sizable number of political movements and parties that function on the periphery (extremes) of the dominant political society and frequently provide a "sanctuary" for various extremist ideologies (Sotlar 2).

2.4.1. The Rise of Partisan Extremism Ideology in America after 9/11

It is relevant to indicate that political extremism is distinguished from partisanship by claiming that the latter is not the exact reverse of the former but rather the absence of the kind of accommodative democratic norms that partisans hold. Extremists "distaste cooperation" and do not care about the results. They embrace stances in politics that are completely unwavering. Partisans, on the other hand, are seen as being more prone to inclusivity, compromise, and trying to convince the majority of the validity of their position. Extremism is characterized as self-centered, immoral, authoritarian, and dictatorial field (Farrell).

The attacks on the Pentagon and World Trade Center on September 11 had a massive effect on both domestic and foreign policy in the United States, highlighting the necessity for measures to stop a similar incident from happening again. Following the attacks, both Republicans and Democrats approved a number of antiterrorism laws. For instance, the Patriot Act was authorized by all parties in Congress and passed by a vote of 98 to 1 in the Senate and 357 to 66 in the House. Similar to that, the House voted 420 to 1 and the Senate 98 to 0 to approve the use of military force against terrorists. Additionally, 83% of Americans backed military action against a nation sheltering terrorists, and 86% supported expanded electronic surveillance in public places (Malhotra & Popp 34).

Due to a strengthened link between the psychological requirement for certitude and extreme partisan identity, partisan rigidity (or affective polarization) has become much more prevalent. Partisan extremists are significant political actors who exert disproportionate sway on the American political process. The strength of American democracy and the ability of American voters to make informed decisions are both negatively impacted by this growth in political rigidity. According to his theoretical argument, Lutting believed that the association between the psychological demand for certainty and partisan identity polarization has grown stronger as a result of elite polarization. He described the result as a more extreme mass partisanship. He defined partisan extremism as a syndrome of connected perceptions and habits that people who are psychologically closed-minded and totally opposed to uncertainty adopt because they lessen complexity and lessen ambiguity. These attitudes and behaviors include in-group favoritism, out-group derogation, and conformity to group leaders. He stated that people today who have a certainty-seeking or closed-minded psychological orientation find both parties appealing because polarized elites provide them with sure data and opinions. Therefore, he contended that in today's environment where party leaders are polarized, basic psychological needs connected to an abhorrence to uncertainty—traits that cause people to be

"group-centric" commonly a significant amount of interpretative force over variation in partisan strength, extreme partisan thoughts, and hatred of the partisan out-group. Due to a deeper connection between the psychological need for certainty and excessive partisan identity, Lutting suggested that partisan rigidity (or affective polarization) has become much more prevalent as political elites have gotten more divided (4).

According to Lutting, the dogmatic partisans who are unconditionally extremist, opinionated, and bigoted are becoming a larger portion of the American vote. In actuality, Republicans and Democrats are more ideologically split than they have ever been, and partisan animosity is both more intense and widespread. There are numerous ways in which these trends show up in both politics and daily life. These results confirm what is often believed to be true about modern American politics: the left and right are sharply divided and polarized, and this split feeds the vitriol and inaction of American politics (the Pew Research Center Report QTD in Lutting). Moreover, he explained that most people concur that this depiction of political elites is realistic. In terms of both ideological differences and general partisan friction, there is a considerably deeper and more enduring division among elected politicians than there was in the recent past. The degree of polarization in the American population is still hotly contested. There is conflicting data regarding whether the American people has become more ideologically extremist when ideology is the subject of analysis. However, research demonstrates that Americans have at least sorted, or matched, their party identity with their (perhaps still moderate) policy views (1).

Democrats and Republicans are growing to loathe one another more and more due to their differing ideologies. Policy preferences, on the other hand, play a much smaller function in partisan rigidity than psychological factors that are less strongly influenced by ideology. Partisan extremism among both Democrats and Republicans is exacerbated by the epistemological demand for conclusion and totalitarianism. The research clarified that the

strength of American democracy and the competency of American voters are both negatively impacted by the development of partisan extremism. According to findings, affective polarization is comparable to out-group bias in broad in terms of its causes and type. Democrats and Republicans are split on the basis of a non-substantive, "us" vs. "them" worldview, not only because of opposing ideological viewpoints or psychological worldviews (5-6).

In short, affective polarization (Partisan extremism) is an elite-driven phenomenon. Elite polarization encourages a blind and unquestioning partisan allegiance because partisanship grows more enticing psychologically as elites become more divided. Thus, the events of September 11, 2001, founded a new era that is, in the field of politics, dramatically dissimilar from what has gone before.

2.5. Two Decades from the Attacks: Lessons, Lasting impact, and Views

September 11th will stand out as a date from the year 2001. Live on international television, a number of thousand New Yorkers were massacred. This September marks the 21st anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, a calamity that altered both the United States and the world. By any standard, the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon threw the issue of global terrorism into sharp relief. Likewise, despite the fact that the fight against the constantly evolving dynamics of international terrorism is still ongoing, numerous lessons have been acquired, and several effects have been assessed more than twenty years later after 9/11.

To begin with, just after the attacks, it was understandable that the country's law enforcement and intelligence agency immediately shifted its attention to global terrorism, and particularly Islamist extremist terrorism. Twenty years of counterterrorism strategy have demonstrated the value of using measures like law enforcement investigations and

prosecution in terrorism prevention plans. Research has also demonstrated that persons who sense singled out because of their color, ethnicity, or religion may come to distrust the police as a result of the use of these tactics. Investigations and convictions also do not address the fundamental issues that make people susceptible to the allure of violent extremism. Attempts to incorporate domestic terrorist prevention measures into the national counterterrorism program would encounter a backlash. For instance, allocating funds to help inquiries would be encouraged by labeling overseas white supremacist extremist groups as FTO (Foreign Terrorist Organization). This accusation has frequently come under fire for being improperly utilized to harm Muslim populations. Some people in those communities would prefer to see the existing counterterrorism legal framework eliminated than to have new foreign designations and legislation added that may treat white supremacist extremists and Islamist extremists equally. That in and of itself is a key lesson from 9/11. It implies that some people will continue to view counterterrorism investigations and prosecutions with mistrust. And it signifies that the idea of "counterterrorism" as a strategy to counter the threat posed by white supremacy will probably continue to draw criticism (McCord 165).

When Michael Oppenheimer, Clinical Professor and Director of the IR Futures Concentration, NYU SPS Center for Global Affairs, in the online conference held in September 9th, 2021. In which scholars discussed the lasting impact & lessons learned from the war on terror. When he was asked that if the American reaction to the attacks was a failure, Oppenheimer responded by agreeing to the question, he expressed that it indeed was an overreaction, and as a result, more issues were created than resolved. In terms of the U.S. capability to safeguard and defeat significant, intricate, worldwide terrorist operations conducted from other countries, he claimed that the country is safer today. On the one hand, it must be confirmed that many of the measures taken to protect the populace were necessary, creative, and successful. These measures included better intelligence, more secure borders,

increased vigilance among the populace, extensive cooperation from the American Muslim community, and the use of technology to track down terrorist cells oversea.

On the other hand, he claimed that all of those things could be done without resorting to the massive, geographically undifferentiated, and resource-unlimited concept of the "global war on terror," which is what destroyed the nation's democratic institutions. According to Openheimer, none of the previously listed methods call for this form of "inflation" of threat. He continued by saying that whatever the United States had done as part of this overarching strategic notion of the war on terror had been extremely detrimental to both national security and global security. The U.S. invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan's 20-year war, which started as a completely authorized operation against the Taliban and al Qaeda but evolved into a nation-building effort that is now recognized as having been for "nothing," were given as examples by the professor to support his claim. Therefore, this inflation came at a high cost to the nation, its democratic institutions, and its ability to influence other countries. Additionally, the invasion of Iraq contributed to the disarray in the Middle East, allowed Iran, the region's main foe, the chance to expand its power, and gave rise to ISIS, in which he said: "it's impossible to imagine ISIS without the American invasion of Iraq." So in that sense, he concluded his discourse by noting that the United States is still struggling with the negative effects of the Bush administration's botched war on terror today and will do so for some time to come.

("20 Years After 9/11: The Lasting Impact and Lessons Learned From the War on Terror"
08:24 – 11: 37).

Another long-term consequence of the attack is that the funding levels for organizations involved in defense increased dramatically after 9/11. For example, the discretionary spending for Homeland Security increased from around \$16 billion in 2002 to more than \$43 billion in 2011. The budgets of the Border Patrol, Transportation Security Administration, and Coast Guard have all increased significantly since 2001. Millions of young American soldiers have

served overseas over the past 20 years, many have died, and many have returned home with severe physical and mental wounds (KQED).

The New York Times posted a video on YouTube through which it asked residents reflect on the answer to the question, "What did you learn from 9/11?", below are some selected responses it received:

“Since 9/11 we haven’t really learned anything, I remember sitting there in shock and thinking about ‘is what’s like to be at war?’” Cornelia Maxine.

“I learned that actually the American people get stronger because of their diversity”
Yim Kwong.

“We’re just as paranoid, if not more. And there is now this new face to put our paranoia and fear into a Muslim population or a Muslim community. I just think we don’t really know how to deal in a constructive and healthy way to tragic events like this” David Freeman.

“Come to find out who was behind it, I thought that the nationality of people could no longer be trusted” Leroy Mckoy.

“I think it made us more aware that this could happen anywhere, and that America and us are as vulnerable as anybody else” Marjorie Singer.

“I learned that we, as Americans, have got to be remember how to be humble” Tina Atterburg.

(“9/11: Lessons Learned | the New York Times” 0:13 – 04:03).

To sum up, the United States and the world were shaken by the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Twenty years later, the attacks and the reactions to them still influence how the public views terrorism and foreign and domestic and foreign policy. That is to say, the traces of the assaults of 9/11 are still impacting how Americans see the world at the present time, the long term

effects contributed in forming an opinion about not only about a certain category but also taught people plenty of lessons. Simply put, the time since 9/11 is behind us now: A generation has grown up in the last 20 years with just a communal recollection of the assaults, and the US has since left Afghanistan. However, some changes were long-term.

Conclusion

By the end of the second chapter, it can be summed up that in the wake of 9/11; American community in a whole witnessed a surge of perception-related adjustments. Parallel to this, the terrorist attacks that occurred in the United States removed previously held beliefs and notions and substituted them with fresh perspectives on individuals, nations, governments, and policies that ultimately resulted in the creation of a new America. Following the bombings, the nation has undergone a transformation both domestically and globally.

After 9/11, a tendency of increased airport security that has come to be described as the "new normal" began to take hold. The Bush Doctrine, as it relates to American foreign policy, is the viewpoint that terrorists and those who support them are both enemies of the country. The doctrine first gave the impression that American foreign policy had undergone a dramatic transformation. In addition, the assaults triggered a militarization of American foreign policy. In essence, officials expanded state power's role in maintaining peace and exploited it to advance American foreign policy. Additionally, decision-makers devised novel strategies to use the American economy to further their foreign policy goals.

The events of September 11, 2001 gave the topic of terrorism a new perspective. In the initial aftermath of the attacks, nearly every government in the world acknowledged that Al Qaeda and other transnational terrorist organizations posed a common threat. As a result, the Security Council agreed with the US government's claim that the invasion of Afghanistan was

necessary for self-defense and marked the start of the global war against terrorism. In his speech to the General Assembly during its fifty-seventh session, President Bush promised to work with the U.N. Security Council to pass the necessary regulations, or to put it another way, to "authorize" his invasion of Iraq.

From a political point of view, Partisan extremism is a notion that was created as a result of 9/11. People who are mentally closed-minded and completely averse to uncertainty tend to embrace this syndrome of interconnected perceptions and habits in an effort to reduce intricacy and confusion. In this sense, the American electorate is increasingly being dominated by dogmatic partisans who are unrelentingly radical, opinionated, and intolerant. Republicans and Democrats are actually more ideologically divided than they have ever been, and partisan hostility is both stronger and more pervasive.

General Conclusion

A scholar of American historical background may instantly observe how chaotic and upsetting it was at times. Such occurrences, whether favorable or unfavorable, have shaped history, are having an effect on the present, and will surely influence the future. Since history replicates again, no nation in the world can proceed forward in the present without referencing and reflecting on the past. The social, national, and political effects of the 9/11 attacks, as well as the changes they brought, were an essential and engaging subject to investigate. The following are the main notions that emerged from conducting a research on the issue.

Americans woke up on September 12, 2001, to a world that seemed irrevocably changed. The previous morning marked the first time since Pearl Harbor that the United States had experienced an attack on its own territory. In an effort to address the situation, George Bush, the president at the time, took swift domestic and international action. On the domestic level, as a first, the president addressed the country in a highly emotional speech that might have been designed with the objective of mentally preparing the populace for a harsh response in terms of freedom and security. As a result, as soon as the first strike occurred, the president launched the government's emergency backlash protocols.

Bush's administration focused on restructuring the intelligence community and creating new agencies and regulations, including Department of Homeland Security (DHS) which is the federal executive agency in responsibility of civilian security in the United States, and it works to improve safety throughout the country. Compliance of the ports, frontier, and immigration laws, emergency preparedness for natural and man-made disasters, counterterrorism operations, and cyber security are all duties of the Department. Next is the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), It safeguards the security of the nation's transportation system. Airport security and preventing aircraft hijacking are its primary goals. It mostly conducts security checks at US commercial airports. Also the USA PATRIOT Act, proposed a number of changes to the rules governing the use of the Foreign Intelligence

Surveillance Court, the privacy of phones and telecommunications devices, money laundering, immigration, and other issues. It also described a number of new infractions while tightening up on others. In addition to National Security Agency (NSA), as part of its security responsibility, the NSA examines particular transmission routes, runs a federal cyber security center, prescribes and oversees various security practices and policies for the US government, and carries out some foreign intelligence operations. One of the world's top monitoring activities is claimed to be carried out by the US intelligence agency known as NSA. Lastly, the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund (VCF) was created to provide compensation for any individual who suffered physical harm or died in a plane disaster caused by terrorism on September 11, 2001.

On the International level, by any standard, the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon threw the issue of global terrorism into high focus. George W. Bush declared a "war on terror" in a matter of days. After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, America launched the War on Terror, which caused a significant shift in the country's perceptions and worries about confidentiality, security, and vigilance. U.S. forces attacked Afghanistan less than a month after 9/11 in an endeavor to eliminate al-Qaeda, the terrorist organization that claimed responsibility for the attacks, and to overthrow the Taliban regime that was harboring it. The United States attacked Iraq two years later, in March 2003, and removed President Saddam Hussein. Hussein was accused of creating weapons of mass destruction, although not being explicitly involved to the terrorist acts (no evidence was ever found). Under President George W. Bush's supervision, the invasion played a significant role in America's War on Terror, as well as affected its foreign policy.

From a political standpoint, the 9/11 attacks paved the way to the rise of the idea of partisan extremism. This phenomenon of interwoven conceptions and behaviors is frequently embraced by people who are cognitively locked off and wholly hostile to ambiguity in an

effort to lessen complexity and complication. In this way, fanatical partisans who are relentlessly radical, outspoken, and intolerable are becoming more and more dominant in the American electorate. The doctrinal gulf between Republicans and Democrats is actually wider than it has ever been, and partisan animosity is both more intense and prevalent.

Last but not least, no matter what kind of encounter people face, both individuals and the government should learn from it in order to apply the appropriate strategies when necessary. Additionally, the strike taught the government to work harder on defending the country regardless of the outcomes even if it meant launching a global war. The 9/11 attacks, with all its lasting personal, emotional, social, political, and national long term impact, taught Americans that they must prepare themselves for the unforeseen.

In a conclusion, more than 20 years have passed since the terrorist assaults on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and Flight 93, which may only have been avoided by the bravery of the crew and passengers. Most people who can recall it say that it is a day they will never forget. The events of 9/11 fundamentally altered how Americans view conflict, peace, their own safety, and their fellow citizens.

Bibliography

- “9/11: Lessons Learned | The New York Times.” *YouTube*, uploaded by New York Times, 6 Sept. 2011, www.youtube.com/watch?v=zS0qENVESv0.
- “9/11: The Steel of American Resolve.” George W. Bush Library, www.georgewbushlibrary.gov/explore/exhibits/911-steel-american-resolve. Accessed 16 Apr. 2022.
- “20 Years After 9/11: The Lasting Impact and Lessons Learned From the War on Terror.” *YouTube*, uploaded by The NYU School of Professional Studies Center for Global Affairs, 10 Sept. 2021, www.youtube.com/watch?v=UOvo4UkGJso.
- “Address to the United Nations General Assembly in New York City | the American Presidency Project.” <https://www.Presidency.Ucsb.Edu/>, www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/address-the-united-nations-general-assembly-new-york-city-1. Accessed 27 Aug. 2022.
- “After 9/11: The New Normal | History.” YouTube, uploaded by History, 8 Sept. 2016, www.youtube.com/watch?v=VxD7aq4Oj8.
- Ahmed, Nafeez Mosaddeq, and John Leonard. *The War on Freedom: How and Why America Was Attacked, September 11, 2001*. 3rd ed., Progressive Press, 2002.
- “Al Qaeda.” Anti-Defamation League, www.adl.org/resources/profiles/al-qaeda. Accessed 8 Apr. 2022.
- “Al-Qaeda | History, Meaning, Terrorist Attacks, and Facts.” Encyclopedia Britannica, www.britannica.com/topic/al-Qaeda. Accessed 8 Apr. 2022.
- Bakker, Edwin, and Leen Boer. “Al-Qaeda.” *The Evolution of Al-Qaedaism: Ideology, Terrorists, and Appeal*, Clingendael Institute, 2007, pp. 7–24, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep05450.5>. Accessed 25 Apr. 2022.
- Barndollar, Hadley. “Airports, IDs, Privacy: Here’s What Changed After 9/11 That Probably Now Seems Normal.” *Providence Journal*, 2021. USA Today Network,

www.providencejournal.com/in-depth/news/2021/09/01/september-11-changed-america-tsa-real-id-privacy-afghanistan-war-airport-security/7942428002.

- Bamford, James. *A Pretext for War: 9/11, Iraq, and the Abuse of America's Intelligence Agencies*. New York: Doubleday, 2004.
- Bergen, Peter L. "September 11 attacks". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1 Apr. 2022, <https://www.britannica.com/event/September-11-attacks>. Accessed 25 April 2022.
- Biden, Jr. Joseph R. Statement on the National Strategy for Countering Domestic Terrorism, June 15, 2021. Washington Dc, the Executive Office of the President. The White House. Accessed 04 Apr. 2022
- BOSE, MEENA. "Comment: Defining U.S. Foreign Policy in the Post-9/11 World." *Diplomatic History*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2002, pp. 619–26. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24914281>. Accessed 26 Aug. 2022.
- Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Iraq War". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11 Mar. 2022, <https://www.britannica.com/event/Iraq-War>. Accessed 25 August 2022.
- Britannica, the Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Transportation Security Administration". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 17 Dec. 2018, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Transportation-Security-Administration>. Accessed 19 April 2022.
- Burke, Jason. "Al Qaeda." *Foreign Policy*, no. 142, 2004, p. 18. Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.2307/4147572>.
- Clark, Christopher. *Student Partisan Identity and Online Discussion*. 2017, PhD Dissertation. *The University Digital Conservancy*. <https://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/190454>.
- Clarke, Richard. *Against All Enemies*. New York: The Free Press, 2004.

- “Department of Homeland Security (DHS).” The Merriam-Webster.Com Dictionary, www.merriam-webster.com/legal/Department%20of%20Homeland%20Security. Accessed 18 Apr. 2022.
- Cranston, Maurice. "Ideology". Encyclopedia Britannica, 27 Oct. 2020, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/ideology-society>. Accessed 28 August 2022.
- Dissi, Nour El Houda. The Algerian American Cooperation in the Transnational War on Terror. 2020, Master Dissertation. Dspace, <http://dspace.univ-msila.dz:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/21954>
- Duignan, Brian. "USA PATRIOT Act". Encyclopedia Britannica, 17 Oct. 2021, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/USA-PATRIOT-Act>. Accessed 20 April 2022
- Dwyer, Jim. “THREATS AND RESPONSES: NEWS ANALYSIS; Investigating 9/11: An Unimaginable Calamity, Still Largely Unexamined.” New York Times, 11Sept. 2002, p. 14.
- Edwards, Chris. Privatizing the Transportation Security Administration. Cato Institute, 2013, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep04932>. Accessed 19 Apr. 2022.
- Farrell, Henry. “Partisanship and Extremism.” *Cato Unbound*, 6 Feb. 2009, www.cato-unbound.org/2009/02/06/henry-farrell/partisanship-extremism.
- Fiedel, Frank, and Hugh Sidey. The Presidents of the United States of America. The White House Historical Association, 2006.
- “George W. Bush: The American Presidency Project.” *YouTube*, uploaded by ProfGP, 10 Apr. 2013, www.youtube.com/watch?v=KnfLfOfuDig.
- Gerring, John. “Ideology: A Definitional Analysis.” *Political Research Quarterly*, vol. 50, no. 4, 1997, pp. 957–94. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/448995>. Accessed 28 Aug. 2022.

- Gerth, Jeff. “A NATION CHALLENGED: THE RESPONSE; Planning for Terror but Failing to Act”, *New York Times*, 30 Dec. 2001.
- Greenberg, Harold M. “Is the Department of Homeland Security an Intelligence Agency?” *Intelligence and National Security*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2009, pp. 216–35. Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02684520902819644>.
- Gregg, Gary, II. “George W. Bush: Foreign Affairs.” Miller Center, 4 Oct. 2016, millercenter.org/president/gwbush/foreign-affairs.
- Griffin, David Ray, and Richard Falk. *The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11*. Van Haren Publishing, 2004.
- Gunaratna, Rohan, and Aviv Oreg. “Al Qaeda’s Organizational Structure and Its Evolution.” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, vol. 33, no. 12, 2010, pp. 1043–78. Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610x.2010.523860>.
- Herring, G. K. “THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN: A STRATEGIC ANALYSIS.” *NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES FOR THE 21st CENTURY*, edited by Williamson Murray, Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, 2003, pp. 161–86. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep12022.9>. Accessed 24 Aug. 2022.
- History.com Editors. “September 11 Attacks.” *HISTORY*, 22 Sept. 2021, www.history.com/topics/21st-century/9-11-attacks#section_10.
- “How 9/11 Changed America: Four Major Lasting Impacts (with Lesson Plan) - The Lowdown.” *KQED*, 8 Sept. 2017, www.kqed.org/lowdown/14066/13-years-later-four-major-lasting-impacts-of-911.
- “How 9/11 Changed U.S.” *Foreign Policy*, 8 Sept. 2021, foreignpolicy.com/2021/09/08/september-11-generation-change-afghanistan-iraq.
- Huiskes, Katherine. “The September 11 Terrorist Attacks.” Miller Center, 11 Aug. 2020, millercenter.org/remembering-september-11/september-11-terrorist-

attacks?fbclid=IwAR0kOQAsySCSbEhFbtHrbBoGumgXrxBkrQ57QV3R2LgeA8jK
MA8T5HjWhk0.

- Jackson, Richard. "war on terrorism". Encyclopedia Britannica, 12 May. 2020,
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/war-on-terrorism>. Accessed 23 August 2022.
- JACOBSON, GARY C. "A Tale of Two Wars: Public Opinion on the U.S. Military Interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 4, 2010, pp. 585–610. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23044842>. Accessed 24 Aug. 2022.
- Jenkins, John Philip."Terrorism". Encyclopedia Britannica, 27 Jul. 2020,
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/terrorism>. Accessed 3 April 2022
- Kean, Thomas, and Lee Hamilton. The 9/11 commission report: Final report of the national commission on terrorist attacks upon the United States. Vol. 3. Government Printing Office, 2004.
- KITCH, CAROLYN. "'Mourning in America': Ritual, Redemption, and Recovery in News Narrative after September 11." *Journalism Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2003, pp. 213–24. *Crossref*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670032000074801>.
- Luttig, Matthew D. The Rise of Partisan Rigidity: The Nature and Origins of Partisan Extremism in American Politics. Diss. University of Minnesota, 2016.
- Malhotra, Neil, and Elizabeth Popp. "Bridging Partisan Divisions over Antiterrorism Policies: The Role of Threat Perceptions." *Political Research Quarterly*, vol. 65, no. 1, 2012, pp. 34–47. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23209558>. Accessed 29 Aug. 2022.
- McBride, James. "How 9/11 Reshaped Foreign Policy." *Council on Foreign Relations*, 30 Aug. 2021, www.cfr.org/timeline/how-911-reshaped-foreign-policy.

- McCarty, Nolan. *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know*®. Oxford University Press, 2019.
- McCord, Mary B. "Lessons for Countering the Domestic Terrorism Threat 20 Years After 9/11." *J. Nat'l Sec. L. & Pol'y* 12 (2021): 161.
- National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States. *The 9/11 Commission Report. Executive Summary*. [Washington, DC]: [National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States], 2004.
- Riedel, Bruce. "9-11 Commission". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 2 Jan. 2019, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/9-11-Commission>. Accessed 15 April 2022.
- Roos, Dave. "5 Ways September 11 Changed America." *HISTORY*, 22 Sept. 2021, www.history.com/news/september-11-changes-america.
- Roots, Roger. "Terrorized into Absurdity: The Creation of the Transportation Security Administration." *The Independent Review*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2003, pp. 503–17, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24562556>. Accessed 19 Apr. 2022.
- Salt, Alexander. "Transformation and the War in Afghanistan." *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2018, pp. 98–126. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26333879>. Accessed 23 Aug. 2022.
- Sinha, Alex. "NSA Surveillance Since 9/11 and the Human Right to Privacy", vol. 59, 2013." Pp.864-867. *Loyola Law Review*
- Sotlar, Andrej. "Some Problems with a Definition and Perception of Extremism within a Society." *Policing in central and Eastern Europe: Dilemmas of contemporary criminal justice* (2004).
- Tarpley, Webster Griffin. *9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA*, First Edition. Progressive Press, 2004.
- Thorn, Victor. *Made in Israel*. First, Sisyphus Press, 2011.

- Peterson, M. *The UN General Assembly (Global Institutions)*. 1st ed., Routledge, 2005.
- United Nations. "Chapter of the United Nations: Chapter IV." *United Nations*, www.un.org/aboutun/charter/chapter4.htm. Accessed 27 Aug. 2022.
- *United Nations Security Council*, www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/resolutions-adopted-security-council-2002. Accessed 28 Aug. 2022.
- "USA Patriot Act." Investopedia, 31 Oct. 2021, www.investopedia.com/terms/p/patriotact.asp.
- Wedgwood, Ruth. "Al Qaeda, Terrorism, and Military Commissions." *American Journal of International Law*, vol. 96, no. 2, 2002, pp. 328–37. Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2693927>.
- Witte, Griff. "Afghanistan War". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 16 Aug. 2021, <https://www.britannica.com/event/Afghanistan-War>. Accessed 24 August 2022.

Résumé

Les attaques terroristes qui ont eu lieu le 9 septembre 2001 sur le World Trade Center et le Pentagone ont radicalement transformé non seulement la politique étrangère des États-Unis, mais ont également affecté les perspectives intérieures et politiques de la nation. Dans cette perspective, cette recherche met en lumière ainsi qu'évalue la signification et la nature des repères majeurs de l'histoire américaine à partir des attentats du 11 septembre. Cette étude explore la conception du terrorisme, de la guerre, de la réponse militaire et politique des États-Unis, et tente de trouver des réponses convaincantes aux questions soulevées concernant ce malheureux incident, elle fournit également au lecteur un aperçu des principaux changements évoqués par les assauts du 11 septembre sous différents angles. À cet égard, et puisque la présente recherche traite principalement de références historiques, des approches analytiques et descriptives sont utilisées pour atteindre ses objectifs. Selon les résultats de l'étude, le 11 septembre a effectivement été un tournant pour la population américaine et le gouvernement sous différents aspects. En substance, les procédures militaires ont fait preuve d'un mouvement critique en lançant la "guerre contre la terreur" mondiale contre l'Afghanistan et l'Irak sous la supervision du président George W. Bush. Ainsi, les attaques ont remodelé le cadre politique de l'administration américaine en abordant les défis intérieurs et extérieurs, laissant des traces et des leçons qui ont encore un impact jusqu'à aujourd'hui.

Mots clés : Terrorisme, attentats du 11 septembre, Al-Qaïda, George Bush, réponse militaire, réponse politique, guerre contre le terrorisme, extrémisme partisan.

ملخص

إن الهجمات الإرهابية التي وقعت في 9 أيلول/سبتمبر 2001 على مركز التجارة العالمي والبنيتاجون قد حولت بشكل جذري ليس فقط السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة، بل أثرت أيضا على الآفاق المحلية والسياسية للأمة. ومن هذا المنظور، يبرز هذا البحث أيضا أهمية وطبيعة المعالم الرئيسية في التاريخ الأمريكي بدءا من تفجيرات 11/9. تستكشف هذه الدراسة مفهوم الإرهاب والحرب والرد العسكري والسياسي الأمريكي، وتحاول إيجاد إجابات مقنعة للاستفسارات المثارة حول هذا الحادث المؤسف، كما تزود القارئ برؤية واضحة للتبديلات الرئيسية التي أثارها هجمات 11/9 من زوايا مختلفة. وفي هذا الصدد، وبما أن البحوث الحالية تتناول في معظمها الاحالة التاريخية، فإن كلا من النهج التحليلية والوصفية تستخدم لتحقيق أهدافها. ووفقا لنتائج الدراسة، فإن عام 11/9 كان في الواقع نقطة تحول بالنسبة للسكان الأميركيين جنبا إلى جنب مع الحكومة من جوانب مختلفة. في جوهر الأمر، أثبتت الإجراءات العسكرية تحركا حاسما من خلال شن "الحرب العالمية ضد الإرهاب" ضد أفغانستان والعراق تحت إشراف الرئيس جورج بوش. وهكذا، فإن الهجمات أعادت تشكيل الإطار السياسي للإدارة الأمريكية في معالجة التحديات الداخلية والخارجية على حد سواء، مخلفة آثارا ودروس لا تزال لها تأثير حتى الوقت الحاضر.

كلمات مفتاحية: الإرهاب، هجمات 11/9، القاعدة، جورج بوش، رد عسكري، رد سياسي، حرب على الإرهاب، تطرف حزبي.