

**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 LANGUAGE AND LETTERS**



**The Role of United States of
America in the Rise of Terrorism**

**Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master's Degree in English
Literature and Civilization**

Candidates:

Mr. Cheriet Okba

Mr. Gouissem Soufiane

Supervisor:

Mrs. Karima LAOUIDJI

Board of Examiners:

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Dr. Karima LAADJEL | University of M'sila | Chairperson |
| Mrs Karima LAOUIDJI | University of M'sila | Supervisor |
| Ms. Sabah FERRAH | University of M'sila | Examiner |

Academic Year: 2023 / 2024

Dedication

We dedicate this work to our families and friends

Acknowledgements

All the gratitude and deep gratefulness are attended our supervisor Mrs Karima LAOUIDJI. Without her, it would have been impossible for us to write this work. We would like to thank her for her guidance, her endless advice and her handiness in supervising. Special thanks go to Dr Imane CHERIET for her unreserved and constructive comments, advice and support.

We would like to thank the esteemed jury members, the chairperson Dr. Karima LAADJEL and the examiner Ms. Sabah Farrah for their devoted time and efforts to read and evaluate our work.

Finally, we thank all who contributed in a way or another in the realization of this project, specifically the teachers of our English department.

Abstract

The global threat of terrorism necessitates a concerted effort by the international community to comprehend its underlying motivations and dynamics. Scholarly endeavors aim to elucidate the multifaceted factors driving terrorist activities, thereby informing comprehensive strategies for prevention and mitigation on a global scale. This study contributes to this endeavor through the examination of the role of the United States in the rise of terrorism, focusing on how US foreign policy and military interventions influence on global terrorist activities. It begins by defining terrorism from psychological, ideological, and strategic perspectives, establishing a framework for understanding the link between US actions and terrorism. The analysis then explores key events such as the US invasions of Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2003, the rise of Al-Qaeda and ISIS, and US interventions in Syria and Yemen. This study argues that these actions have created instability and power vacuums, facilitating the growth of terrorist groups. Additionally, it considers other US actions that have contributed to chaos in the Third World and discusses how the rise of terrorism has, at times, served US strategic interests. By critically examining these historical events and policies, the thesis provides insights into the complex relationship between US foreign policy and the proliferation of terrorism.

Key words: United States of America, terrorism, Al-Qaeda, ISIS, The US foreign policy, Middle east.

List of Acronyms

AQI: al-Qaeda in Iraq

IS: Islamic State

ISI: the Inter-Services Intelligence

ISIS: Islamic State of Iraq and Syria

MAK: Maktab al-Khidamat

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

PTSD: post-traumatic stress disorder

SEALs : SEALs

UAVs: Unmanned Aerial Vehicles

UN: United Nations

U.S.: United States

USA: United States of America

WMD: Weapons of Mass Destruction

List of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Dedication | II |
| Acknowledgements | III |
| Abstract | IV |
| List of Acronyms..... | V |
| General Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter one :Terrorism: A Theoretical Background..... | 5 |
| Introduction..... | 6 |
| 1.1 Definition of terrorism | 6 |
| 1.2 Factors leading to Terrorism | 7 |
| 1.2.1 Psychological perspective | 7 |
| 1.2.1.1 Psychological alienation and marginalization | 8 |
| 1.2.1.2 Psychological trauma | 9 |
| 1.2.1.3 Narcissism and the quest for significance | 10 |
| 1.2.2 Sociological Perspective | 11 |
| 1.2.3 Ideological perspective..... | 12 |
| 1.2.4 Strategic perspective | 15 |
| 1.3 Forms of terrorism..... | 16 |
| 1.3.1 State-Sponsored Terrorism..... | 17 |
| 1.3.2 Religious Terrorism..... | 18 |
| 1.3.3 Political Terrorism..... | 18 |
| 1.3.4 Cyberterrorism | 19 |
| 1.3.6 Bioterrorism | 19 |
| 1.3.7Nuclear and Radiological Terrorism | 19 |
| 1.3.8 Ideological Terrorism..... | 20 |
| 1.3.9 Modern terrorism..... | 21 |
| 1.4 American Foreign Policy | 21 |
| 1.5 The American Military intervention | 23 |
| 1.5.1 American Military intervention before September 11 th | 25 |
| Conclusion..... | 28 |
| Chapter two: The role of the United States of America in the Rise of Terrorism..... | 29 |
| Introduction..... | 30 |
| 2.1 US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 | 30 |
| 2.1.1 Objectives of the invasion | 31 |
| 2.1.2 Impact of the invasion | 32 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.2 Al Qaeda Relation with the US | 34 |
| 2.2.1. The rise of Al-Qaeda | 35 |
| 2.2.2 The US role in the creation of AL-Qaeda and Benladen..... | 36 |
| 2.2.3 Osama bin Laden's assassination..... | 37 |
| 2.3 US invasion of Iraq in 2003 | 38 |
| 2.3.1 Aims of the Invasion of Iraq | 39 |
| 2.3.2 The impact of the invasion of Iraq | 39 |
| 2.3.3 Donald trump opinion on the Iraqi invasion | 41 |
| 2.4 The rise of ISIS | 42 |
| 2.4.1 Origin of ISIS | 43 |
| 2.4.2 The US Involvement with ISIS | 44 |
| 2.5 US interventions in Syria and Yemen | 45 |
| 2.5.1 Syria | 45 |
| 2.5.2 Yemen | 47 |
| 2.6 US Actions to create chaos and instability in third world..... | 48 |
| 2.7 The relationship between US foreign policy and terrorism..... | 49 |
| 2.7.1 USA Support for authoritarian regimes..... | 50 |
| 2.7.2 US Drone Strikes..... | 52 |
| 2.7.3 US Perceived Double Standards | 53 |
| 2.7.3.1 The non-proliferation of nuclear weapons | 53 |
| 2.7.3.2 The promotion of democracy | 54 |
| 2.7.3.3 Environmental Policies and the Perceived Double Standard | 55 |
| 2.8 US benefits from the rise of terrorism..... | 56 |
| Conclusion..... | 58 |
| General Conclusion..... | 59 |
| References | 62 |

General Introduction

The contemporary global landscape is marked by the pervasive threat of terrorism, a phenomenon that instills a palpable sense of apprehension and vulnerability among nations worldwide. Global efforts to comprehend the origins and motivations of terrorist organizations have often been fraught with conjecture and ideological discord. Various hypotheses have been posited, ranging from notions of conspiracy to assessments implicating authoritarian regimes in fomenting violence. Nevertheless, a nuanced understanding suggests that the origin of such entities may be rooted in objective factors such as radical ideologies and interpretations of religious and historical texts. While the motivations underpinning terrorist activities is away from singular explanations and are characterized by intricate layers, considerable attention has been directed towards the inadvertent role of the United States in facilitating the ascendance of extremist factions, a discourse that engenders robust debate and meticulous examination

Throughout its history, the United States has pursued an assertive foreign policy, often involving military interventions and regime changes in various regions of the world. While these actions have been motivated by a range of factors, including national security interests, the promotion of democracy, and the fight against perceived threats, their consequences have sometimes proven to be far-reaching and unintended. Critics argue that certain U.S. foreign policy decisions, particularly in the Middle East and other volatile regions, have created power vacuums, destabilized nations, and fueled resentment among local populations. These conditions, combined with the perceived injustices and grievances against American interventionism, have provided fertile ground for the growth of extremist ideologies and the recruitment of disaffected individuals into the ranks of terrorist organizations.

Therefore, this study is focused on this controversial issue and sought to investigate the various factors contributing to the emergence and proliferation of terrorist organizations in the modern era, including ideological influences, historical contexts, and external interventions, with a particular focus on the inadvertent role of the United States in fueling the rise of terrorism. Accordingly, the issue is attached to the following questions:

1. How did USA policy contribute to the rise of terrorism?
2. What are the true intentions and motives of the rise of terrorism by the United States?

Building upon these foundational questions, this question then explores the intricate relationship between U.S. foreign policy and the proliferation of terrorism. It scrutinizes the notion that certain American interventions, driven by geopolitical interests and security concerns, may have inadvertently created power vacuums, destabilized regions, and fueled resentment – conditions that have proven conducive to the rise of extremist ideologies and violent non-state actors.

In addition, this study seeks to scrutinize other facets of U.S. foreign policy that have been criticized for exacerbating terrorism, including drone strikes, support for authoritarian regimes, and perceived double standards in the application of international norms. By shedding light on these multifaceted issues, the thesis aims to foster a deeper understanding of the complex interplay between American actions and the rise of terrorist threats. Furthermore, this study explores the potential benefits that the United States may derive from the perpetuation of terrorism, including the justification for military spending, the consolidation of political power, and the advancement of economic interests. This critical analysis seeks to unravel the intricate web of motivations and consequences that underlie the U.S. approach to countering terrorism.

Through a rigorous examination of historical events, policy decisions, and their far-reaching implications, this thesis endeavors to contribute to the ongoing discourse on terrorism and the role of nations in shaping the global security landscape. Moreover, the significance of this study lies in its comprehensive examination of the multifaceted relationship between U.S. foreign policy and the proliferation of terrorism, particularly in regions like the Middle East. By examining the un/intended consequences of American interventions, such as the creation of power vacuums and destabilization of nations, the study sheds light on the complex dynamics that contribute to the rise of extremist ideologies and violent non-state actors. Moreover, the research aims to scrutinize various aspects of U.S. foreign policy, including drone strikes and support for authoritarian regimes, to foster a deeper understanding of how these actions may inadvertently exacerbate terrorist threats.

To fully answer this study questions which lead to comprehend the dynamics at play, it is crucial to establish a comprehensive understanding of terrorism itself. Thus, Chapter one is devoted to the understanding of multidimensional nature of terrorism, exploring its psychological underpinnings, ideological motivations, and strategic objectives. By dissecting these perspectives, we can better grasp the intricate factors that contribute to the emergence and persistence of terrorist groups.

Chapter two investigates specific instances where U.S. military interventions and foreign policy decisions have been linked to the emergence or strengthening of terrorist organizations. From the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 and the subsequent rise of Al-Qaeda, to the 2003 invasion of Iraq and the birth of ISIS, the thesis meticulously examines the chain of events and their far-reaching consequences. Also, it delves into U.S. involvement in conflicts in Syria, Yemen, and other regions, exploring the intricate web of

consequences that have contributed to the spread of instability and the creation of fertile breeding grounds for extremism.

Chapter one

Terrorism: A Theoretical Background

Introduction

The first chapter of this dissertation serves as a theoretical cornerstone, elucidating the central focus of the research, namely terrorism. It provides essential theoretical groundwork essential for comprehending terrorism, encompassing definitions, various perspectives on terrorism, and the multifaceted factors contributing to its genesis and proliferation. Additionally, the chapter presents an exhaustive catalogue of events instrumental in the emergence of contemporary terrorist entities. The primary objectives of this chapter include delineating the conceptual framework of terrorism, examining its underlying causes, and contextualizing the subsequent analyses within a comprehensive theoretical framework.

1.1 Definition of terrorism

Terrorism is a complex and multifaceted concept that has been defined in various ways by different organizations, governments, and scholars. However, there are some common elements that are often included in the definition of terrorism.

Terrorism can be defined as the premeditated use or threat of violence against non-combatant targets, including civilians, with the primary intention of creating fear and advancing political, ideological, or religious goals (Borum, 2004; Schmid, 2011). It can be defined also as the calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear, with the intention of coercing or intimidating governments or societies in the pursuit of political, religious, or ideological goals (Ganor, 2002; Laqueur, 1999; Whittaker, 2007).

Furthermore, it refers to the use of violence, or the threatened use of violence, to achieve political, religious, or ideological goals, often targeting civilians to create fear and

advance specific agendas. It is a method of political violent action that operates through organized violence to compensate for asymmetries in conflicts, with a focus on psychological impact and symbolic targets to convey messages and influence large audiences (Schmid, 2011). Global terrorism, as another form of terrorism, perpetrated by individuals or groups with diverse motivations such as religious extremism, separatism, or political ideologies, poses a severe threat to societies worldwide, causing catastrophic consequences that extend beyond loss of life to economic and societal disruptions (Swarbrooke, 2022). According to Hoffman (2006) this form of terrorism encompasses a wide range of tactics, including bombings, hijackings, assassinations, and cyber-attacks, and often operates across borders, transcending national boundaries.

The definitions of terrorism provided earlier offer simplified portrayals of a complex phenomenon, failing to capture its multifaceted nature. Indeed, terrorism defies singular characterization and can be examined through multiple lenses or perspectives, each offering unique insights into its causes, dynamics, and implications.

1.2 Factors leading to Terrorism

Terrorism tendencies are influenced by a myriad of factors that can be classified in light of a number of perspectives encompassing psychological, social, ideological, and strategic dimensions. By exploring these perspectives, we aim to provide a comprehensive understanding of the complex dynamics that underpin the emergence, proliferation, and perpetuation of terrorist activities.

1.2.1 Psychological perspective

Terrorism, from a psychological perspective, involves a complex interplay of factors such as individual psychopathology, socialization, group dynamics, and ideological

influences. While there is little evidence to suggest that terrorists have abnormally high levels of mental illness or psychopathy, they are rational actors driven by deeply held convictions and perceived threats to group identity and values. Psychological motivations, alongside other factors, play a significant role in the emergence of terrorism, as seen in the examination of terrorist organizations like Al-Qaeda and ISIS, which utilize psychological warfare strategies and propaganda tools to create psychological effects. Individual terrorists may exhibit personality traits ranging from accentuations to disorders like narcissism and paranoia, contributing to their involvement in violent acts and it can have many other forms of reason that can develop this phenomenon.

1.2.1.1 Psychological alienation and marginalization

Psychological alienation and marginalization are closely linked to the phenomenon of terrorism from a psychological perspective. Many researchers and experts have identified these factors as potential contributors to the radicalization process and the embracement of extremist ideologies.

According to Kruglanski et al. (2014), individuals or groups who feel disconnected, isolated, or rejected by the broader society may experience a sense of alienation. This alienation can stem from various factors, such as social exclusion, discrimination, lack of opportunities, or perceived injustices.

Another factor is marginalization and lack of belonging, which is according to Bhui et al. (2012) lead to feelings of isolation and a lack in the sense of belonging or acceptance within the mainstream culture or society. This marginalization can result from factors such as poverty, lack of access to education or employment, or cultural and religious differences (Bhui et al., 2012). Moreover, feelings of alienation and marginalization can be exacerbated by perceived injustices, such as discrimination, oppression, or violation of

rights. These grievances can fuel resentment, anger, and a desire for retribution or change (Horgan, 2008).

Identity crisis and search for meaning is another factor. Individuals experiencing alienation and marginalization may struggle with identity issues and a lack of purpose or meaning in their lives. This vulnerability can make them more susceptible to the influence of extremist ideologies that offer a sense of belonging, significance, and a cause to fight for (Kruglanski et al., 2009).

Further factors include the psychological distress and trauma. Bhui et al. (2012) explained that marginalized individuals or groups may also experience psychological distress, trauma, or mental health issues, which can further contribute to their susceptibility to extremist ideologies and the justification of violence (Bhui et al., 2012).

1.2.1.2 Psychological trauma

Scholar confirm that Exposure to psychological trauma and victimization can shape an individual's worldview and potentially contribute to the development of extremist beliefs and a willingness to engage in violent acts, including terrorism. Traumatic experiences such as war, oppression, abuse, or personal tragedies can have profound psychological impacts, leaving individuals with feelings of anger, resentment, and a desire for retribution or justice (Victoroff, 2005). The psychological effects of trauma can include post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, anxiety, and a heightened sense of threat or vulnerability (Bhui et al., 2012).

These psychological wounds can make individuals more susceptible to extremist ideologies that offer a sense of purpose, belonging, and a means to address their

grievances, even through violent means. Additionally, individuals who have been directly victimized or witnessed the victimization of others may develop a distorted perception of the world as inherently dangerous and unjust, further fueling their embrace of extremist narratives that justify violence as a necessary response (Horgan, 2008). While trauma and victimization do not directly cause terrorism, they can create psychological vulnerabilities.

Psychological trauma plays a significant role in the creation and perpetuation of terrorism, as it can serve as a catalyst for radicalization and extremist ideologies. Individuals who have experienced trauma, such as violence, oppression, or marginalization, may develop a sense of grievance and resentment towards perceived oppressors or societal injustices. This sense of alienation and disillusionment can make them susceptible to the manipulation and indoctrination tactics of terrorist organizations seeking to exploit these vulnerabilities for recruitment purposes (Victoroff, 2005). Moreover, trauma can disrupt individuals' psychological well-being, leading to feelings of powerlessness, identity crisis, and a search for meaning and belonging, which extremist groups often exploit by offering a sense of purpose, camaraderie, and empowerment through violent action (Horgan, 2008). Consequently, addressing the underlying psychological trauma and social determinants is essential for preventing radicalization and countering the allure of terrorism among vulnerable populations.

1.2.1.3 Narcissism and the quest for significance

This factor has been proposed as potential psychological factors contributing to an individual's susceptibility to terrorist recruitment and participation. Some researchers suggest that a desire for recognition, fame, or a sense of purpose and significance may drive certain individuals toward extremist ideologies and terrorist activities (Kruglanski et al., 2009). Individuals with narcissistic tendencies, characterized by an inflated sense of

self-importance and a need for admiration, may be attracted to the notoriety and perceived heroism associated with terrorist causes (Victoroff, 2005).

The quest for significance, particularly among those who feel marginalized or lack a sense of meaning in their lives, can make the promise of joining a celebrated cause and achieving martyrdom or infamy through violence appealing (Kruglanski et al., 2014). Additionally, the narcissistic traits of grandiose self-perception and a sense of entitlement can contribute to the rationalization of violence and the dehumanization of perceived enemies, further perpetuating extremist ideologies and terrorist activities (Webber et al., 2018). While narcissism and the quest for significance are not the sole determinants of terrorism, they can interact with other psychological, social, and ideological factors to increase an individual's vulnerability to radicalization and involvement in terrorist organizations or acts.

1.2.2 Sociological Perspective

The sociological perspective of terrorism examines how social structures, institutions, and processes contribute to the emergence and perpetuation of terrorist activities. It focuses on understanding the socio-economic, political, and cultural factors that shape individuals' involvement in terrorist groups and their decision to resort to violence. This perspective highlights the role of social inequality, marginalization, identity politics, and collective grievances in fueling radicalization and recruitment into terrorist organizations.

It plays a crucial role in the radicalization process and the embrace of terrorist ideologies and activities. The influence of peer groups, social networks, and charismatic leaders can have a powerful impact on an individual's beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors (Sageman, 2004). Within extremist groups, strong in-group loyalties, conformity pressures,

and the diffusion of radical ideologies can reinforce extremist beliefs and justify violent acts. Individuals may be drawn to terrorist organizations due to a sense of belonging, shared grievances, and the influence of persuasive and charismatic leaders who can exploit psychological vulnerabilities (Kruglanski et al., 2014).

The group dynamics within these organizations can foster an "us versus them" mentality, dehumanization of perceived enemies, and a collective identity centered around the cause, further reinforcing commitment to violent extremism. Moreover, the social networks and relationships within these groups can provide emotional support, validation, and a sense of purpose that can be difficult for individuals to find elsewhere, particularly if they feel marginalized or alienated from mainstream society (Horgan, 2008). While group dynamics and social influence are not the sole determinants of terrorism, they can create a powerful psychological force that contributes to the radicalization process and the perpetuation of terrorist activities.

1.2.3 Ideological perspective

The ideological perspective views terrorism as a means of advancing specific political, religious, or ideological beliefs and goals through violence (Crenshaw, 1981; Hoffman, 2006; Rapoport, 2004). Ideology serves as a powerful motivating force that drives individuals and groups to engage in terrorist activities. Terrorist groups develop and propagate specific ideological narratives and worldviews that frame their cause as legitimate and necessary, often portraying themselves as victims or underdogs fighting against oppression or injustice (Crenshaw, 1981; Schmid, 2013). These ideologies provide moral and religious justifications for the use of violence, often by dehumanizing or demonizing the enemy and portraying violence as a sacred duty or act of martyrdom (Hoffman, 2006; Juergensmeyer, 2003).

Moreover, ideologies offer utopian visions of a radically transformed society or the establishment of a new order, promising rewards and a sense of purpose to those who embrace and fight for the cause (Crenshaw, 1981; Schmid, 2013). Terrorist groups actively indoctrinate and recruit new members by appealing to their ideological beliefs, often targeting individuals who feel marginalized, disenfranchised, or seeking purpose and meaning (Hoffman, 2006; Sageman, 2004). Ideologies also foster a strong sense of collective identity and solidarity among group members, reinforcing their commitment to the cause and willingness to engage in violence (Crenshaw, 1981; Schmid, 2013).

Terrorist groups heavily rely on moral and religious justifications to motivate their members and legitimize their violent actions. These ideologies provide a framework that portrays violence as a sacred duty or act of martyrdom in the name of a greater cause (Hoffman, 2006; Juergensmeyer, 2003). By dehumanizing or demonizing their perceived enemies, terrorist narratives justify the use of force against civilian targets as a necessary means to achieve their goals (Crenshaw, 1981). Religious extremist groups, in particular, exploit sacred texts and teachings to sanction violence, often depicting their struggles as defensive holy wars against oppressors or infidels (Juergensmeyer, 2003; Schmid, 2013). The promise of divine rewards, such as martyrdom and paradise, further reinforces the moral imperative to engage in violence for the ideological cause (Hoffman, 2006). These moral and religious justifications resonate with individuals seeking purpose and meaning, making them more susceptible to indoctrination and recruitment by terrorist organizations (Sageman, 2004).

Terrorist groups often leverage utopian visions and promises to recruit members and justify their violent actions. Their ideologies portray a radically transformed society or the establishment of a new order as an achievable goal, promising a better future for those who embrace and fight for the cause (Crenshaw, 1981; Schmid, 2013). These utopian visions

offer a sense of purpose and the prospect of rewards, both tangible and intangible, for those willing to make sacrifices in the pursuit of the group's objectives. The promised rewards may include political power, material gains, or spiritual salvation, depending on the group's ideological leanings (Hoffman, 2006). By presenting their cause as a noble struggle against oppression or injustice, terrorist narratives appeal to individuals seeking meaning and the opportunity to be part of something greater than themselves (Sageman, 2004). The promise of creating a better world, coupled with the glorification of violence as a means to achieve it, serves as a powerful motivating force that drives individuals to embrace extremist ideologies and engage in terrorist activities (Crenshaw, 1981; Schmid, 2013).

Ideologies play a crucial role in fostering a strong sense of collective identity and solidarity among members of terrorist groups. These belief systems create a "us vs. them" mentality, reinforcing the idea that the group is engaged in a righteous struggle against a common enemy (Crenshaw, 1981; Schmid, 2013). By promoting a shared worldview and set of values, ideologies help to forge a cohesive collective identity that transcends individual differences and binds members together. This sense of belonging and camaraderie motivates individuals to remain committed to the cause and increases their willingness to engage in violence on behalf of the group (Hoffman, 2006). In the other side, terrorist narratives often glorify martyrdom and sacrifice, creating a sense of moral obligation and peer pressure to prove one's dedication to the ideology and the collective (Sageman, 2004). This collective identity and solidarity serve as a powerful motivating force, sustaining the group's cohesion and ensuring the continued pursuit of its violent agenda (Crenshaw, 1981; Schmid, 2013).

Cognitive biases and distortions play a significant role in shaping the worldviews and belief systems that underlie terrorist ideologies and activities. Terrorist ideologies often involve cognitive distortions such as black-and-white thinking, oversimplification of

complex issues, and the dehumanization of perceived enemies (Borum, 2004). These distorted thought patterns can reinforce extremist beliefs, justify the use of violence, and perpetuate a cycle of conflict and retaliation. Additionally, cognitive biases like confirmation bias, where individuals selectively seek and interpret information that aligns with their existing beliefs, can further entrench radical ideologies and make individuals resistant to contradictory information or alternative perspectives (Hafez & Mullins, 2015).

The us-versus-them mentality fostered by terrorist groups can also contribute to attribution biases, where negative events are attributed to the malicious intent of out groups, while positive events are attributed to the virtues of the in group (Crenshaw, 1981). These cognitive biases and distortions can create a distorted perception of reality, amplify grievances, and provide a psychological justification for violent acts in the pursuit of ideological or political goals. While cognitive biases are common to all individuals, their influence can be particularly potent in the context of extremist ideologies and terrorist activities.

1.2.4 Strategic perspective

The strategic perspective views terrorism as a deliberate and calculated strategy employed by groups to achieve specific political, social, or ideological objectives (Crenshaw, 1981; Hoffman, 2006; Kydd & Walter, 2006). The strategic perspective views terrorist groups as rational actors who engage in a calculated cost-benefit analysis when choosing terrorism as a strategy.

This approach suggests that groups weigh the potential benefits of their violent actions against the risks and costs involved, opting for terrorism when other means of achieving their goals are perceived as ineffective or too costly (Crenshaw, 1981; Kydd & Walter, 2006). From this perspective, terrorism is a deliberate and rational choice, selected

based on the group's assessment of its chances of success, the expected payoffs, and the potential consequences of failure (Hoffman, 2006). Terrorist organizations are seen as making strategic decisions about targets, tactics, and timing to maximize their chances of achieving their objectives while minimizing potential losses or retaliation (Kydd & Walter, 2006). This rational choice approach suggests that counterterrorism efforts should focus on increasing the costs and reducing the perceived benefits of terrorism to dissuade groups from employing such tactics (Crenshaw, 1981).

The strategic perspective recognizes terrorism as a form of asymmetric warfare, where weaker groups employ violence against civilian targets to offset their relative weakness compared to stronger opponents, such as nation-states (Hoffman, 2006; Kydd & Walter, 2006). By targeting civilian populations and exploiting the vulnerabilities of more powerful adversaries, terrorist groups aim to undermine the resolve and legitimacy of their enemies (Crenshaw, 1981). This asymmetric approach allows terrorist organizations to engage in protracted conflicts despite their inferior military capabilities and resources. Through acts of terrorism, they can inflict disproportionate psychological, economic, and political costs on their opponents, compensating for their lack of conventional strength (Kydd & Walter, 2006), the use of asymmetric tactics, such as suicide bombings or hostage-taking, can generate widespread media attention and publicity, amplifying the impact of their actions beyond the immediate victims (Hoffman, 2006). This strategic perspective highlights how terrorism enables weaker actors to wage unconventional warfare and pursue their objectives through unconventional means.

1.3 Forms of terrorism

Terrorism, in its various forms, has become a pervasive and complex global threat, impacting societies and governments across the world. This critical phenomenon manifests

in diverse ways, each with distinct motivations, tactics, and targets. From state-sponsored terrorism, where governments support terrorist activities, to religious terrorism driven by ideological fervour, each type presents unique challenges.

1.3.1 State-Sponsored Terrorism

State-sponsored terrorism refers to acts of terrorism that are directly or indirectly supported by governments. These states provide financial resources, logistical support, training, weapons, and safe havens to terrorist groups to further their own political, military, or ideological goals. Unlike independent terrorist organizations, state-sponsored terrorists benefit from the significant resources and protection that a nation-state can provide. (Reeves & Jeremy , 2011).

In this regard, Martin (2016) stated that this form of terrorism is typically “committed by governments against perceived enemies. State terrorism can be directed externally against adversaries in the international domain or internally against domestic enemies” (p.32). Additionally, governments may use state-sponsored terrorism as a tool of foreign policy, aiming to destabilize rival nations, suppress domestic opposition, or extend their influence globally without engaging in direct military conflict. This type of terrorism is particularly insidious because it involves the complicity of national governments, making it more challenging to combat through conventional counter-terrorism measures.

Furthermore, the involvement of state actors can also complicate international relations, as holding a government accountable for its support of terrorism can lead to diplomatic crises, economic sanctions, or even military confrontation. State-sponsored terrorism thus poses a severe threat to global security and stability.

1.3.2 Religious Terrorism

Religious terrorism is driven by spiritual or religious motivations, where perpetrators believe their acts are divinely sanctioned. This form of terrorism often involves groups seeking to impose their religious beliefs on others or reacting violently against perceived threats to their faith. Notable examples include the ISIS. (Martin, 2016).

However, these groups may hide their true intentions and political affiliations under the banner of religion. They often appear as religious terrorist organizations, and most likely operate to advance political agendas or gain power and influence under the guise of religious motives. By exploiting religious sentiments, they tend to manipulate followers, justify their actions, and garner support, all while pursuing objectives that are more political than spiritual. This deceptive approach not only threatens global security but also distorts and damages the image of the religion they claim to represent, creating further divisions and misunderstandings among communities

1.3.3 Political Terrorism

Political terrorism involves the use of violence and intimidation to achieve political objectives. These groups often engage in acts designed to create fear, disrupt societies, and coerce governments into meeting their demands. Unlike other forms of terrorism, their primary focus is on political change, whether through overthrowing governments, instigating political reforms, or promoting ideological agendas. Political terrorists may employ various tactics, including bombings, assassinations, kidnappings, and cyber-attacks, to destabilize political systems and draw attention to their causes. Their actions can lead to significant loss of life, widespread fear, and profound impacts on national and international political landscapes (Jenkins, 2024)

1.3.4 Cyberterrorism

Cyberterrorism refers to the use of internet-based attacks in terrorist activities, often involving politically motivated hacking, to cause disruption, fear, or damage to digital infrastructure, systems, and data. These attacks can include activities such as hacking into government or corporate networks, spreading viruses, or launching denial-of-service attacks to cripple websites and services. The goal of cyberterrorism is to intimidate or coerce societies or governments, undermine economic stability, and disrupt critical services and infrastructure. The anonymity and global reach of the internet make cyberterrorism an attractive tool for terrorists, posing significant challenges for national and international security efforts (Rollins et al., 2007)

1.3.6 Bioterrorism

Bioterrorism involves the intentional release or dissemination of biological agents—such as bacteria, viruses, or toxins—with the intent to cause illness, fear, and death among people, animals, or plants. These biological agents can be naturally occurring or genetically modified to increase their virulence, resistance to medications, or ability to spread in the environment. Bioterrorist attacks aim to destabilize societies, create mass casualties, disrupt economies, and exert psychological terror. The covert nature of biological agents and the potential for widespread impact make bioterrorism a significant concern for national and global security. Preparedness and response strategies include surveillance, rapid detection, public health infrastructure, and coordinated emergency responses.

1.3.7 Nuclear and Radiological Terrorism

Nuclear and radiological terrorism is defined as Bernard Anet (2001):

“The use of radioactive materials or even nuclear explosives as well as any terrorist actions against nuclear facilities by individuals or groups outside state control in order to create fear or terror with a credible threat...” (p,411)

Nuclear and radiological terrorism involves the use of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons and materials to cause harm, instil fear, and disrupt societies. Nuclear terrorism typically refers to the detonation of a nuclear bomb, while radiological terrorism involves dispersing radioactive materials using conventional explosives to create a "dirty bomb." Both forms aim to cause mass casualties, environmental contamination, and long-term psychological and economic impacts.

1.3.8 Ideological Terrorism

Cameron (1999) claimed that Ideological terrorism is that type of “*Vigilante violence*” which can be used by:

“groups and individuals who believe that they and their rights are not being adequately defended by the government from 'dangerous' sections of society. Consequently, they choose to protect themselves. They also rarely see themselves in conflict with the established authorities. Rather, they are simply enforcing justice and the law in self-defence” (p.100).

Additionally, Ideological terrorism involves the use of violence by individuals or groups motivated by a set of beliefs or ideologies. These ideologies can span across political, religious, or social spectrums and often aim to provoke change or influence governmental policies, societal norms, or public opinions. The actions are typically driven by a belief system that justifies the use of terror as a means to achieve a perceived greater good or to combat perceived injustices. The ideology may be rooted in extreme

nationalism, religious fundamentalism, anarchism, or other radical beliefs (Drake, 1998, Martin, 2017)

1.3.9 Modern terrorism

Modern terrorism refers to the contemporary manifestation of politically motivated violence characterized by non-state actors using unconventional tactics to achieve their objectives. Unlike traditional forms of terrorism which primarily targeted state institutions, modern terrorism often targets civilian populations, infrastructure, and symbolic landmarks to maximize psychological impact and generate widespread fear. It is marked by the use of advanced technologies, including social media and encrypted communication channels, for recruitment, propaganda dissemination, and coordination of attacks, making it increasingly difficult for law enforcement and intelligence agencies to detect and prevent such acts (Ilić, 2021)

Moreover, modern terrorism is distinguished by its global reach and transnational nature, with extremist groups exploiting porous borders and exploiting grievances across different regions to further their agendas. This form of terrorism often stems from complex socio-political factors such as ethnic tensions, religious extremism, economic disparities, and geopolitical rivalries (Zafirovski, 2013).

1.4 American Foreign Policy

American foreign policy involves set of strategies, principles, and actions undertaken by the United States government to interact with other nations and navigate global affairs. It is a reflection of the nation's values, interests, and objectives on the international stage, encompassing diplomatic relations, military interventions, economic engagements, and multilateral cooperation. From its origins as a fledgling republic seeking to avoid

entanglement in European conflicts to its emergence as a global superpower with responsibilities and interests spanning the globe, the United States has pursued a several approaches to advancing its interests and promoting stability and prosperity worldwide. These approaches have ranged from isolationism to interventionism, from containment to diplomacy

Accordingly, American foreign policy has undergone numerous shifts and transformations throughout its history. As outlined by scholars such as Walter LaFeber (1994) and George C. Herring (2008), early American foreign policy was marked by a desire to avoid entanglement in European conflicts, as evidenced by President George Washington's Farewell Address in 1796. However, this isolationist stance gradually gave way to a more interventionist approach, particularly in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as the U.S. expanded its influence in the Western Hemisphere and beyond (LaFeber, 1994).

The aftermath of World War II saw the emergence of the United States as a global superpower, leading to the formulation of the containment policy against Soviet expansionism, as articulated by Kennan (1947). This policy shaped American foreign relations for much of the Cold War era, influencing interventions in Korea, Vietnam, and various other regions (Herring, 2008). Additionally, the establishment of institutions such as the United Nations (UN) and NATO reflected America's commitment to maintaining stability and promoting democracy on the world stage (LaFeber, 1994).

The end of the Cold War led to a period of uncertainty and reevaluation of American foreign policy objectives. Scholars like Fukuyama (1989) even suggested that the collapse of the Soviet Union heralded the "end of history," with liberal democracy emerging as the dominant ideology. However, subsequent events such as the September 11 attacks and the

wars in Afghanistan and Iraq prompted a reexamination of U.S. foreign policy priorities, with debates raging over the efficacy of military intervention and nation-building efforts (Herring, 2008).

In recent years, the rise of China as a global economic and military power has once again shifted the focus of American foreign policy. The concept of a "pivot to Asia," advocated by the Obama administration, underscored the importance of engaging with the Asia-Pacific region to counterbalance China's influence (Green, 2013). Meanwhile, the Trump administration pursued a more unilateral and transactional approach to foreign affairs, characterized by initiatives such as renegotiating trade deals and withdrawing from international agreements like the Paris Climate Accord (Ikenberry, 2020).

Generally, American foreign policy is a multifaceted and constantly evolving field, shaped by a combination of historical precedent, geopolitical realities, and domestic politics. Understanding its complexities requires careful analysis of both academic scholarship and contemporary developments.

1.5 The American Military intervention

The American military intervention refers to the deployment of military forces by the United States to intervene in the affairs of another country or region. This intervention can take various forms, including combat operations, peacekeeping missions, humanitarian assistance, and enforcing international agreements or norms (Jones & Brown, 2016).

American military interventions typically occur in response to perceived threats to national security, humanitarian crises, violations of international law, or to advance strategic interests (Johnson, 2020). They may be conducted unilaterally or as part of

multinational coalitions, often with authorization from international organizations such as the United Nations or NATO, or based on bilateral agreements with host countries (Miller et al., 2019).

The objectives of American military interventions can vary widely depending on the specific circumstances and motivations behind the intervention. These objectives may include deterrence, counterterrorism, humanitarian assistance, regime change, and stabilization and peacekeeping (Brown & White, 2018).

It is worth highlighting that American military interventions are a key aspect of U.S. foreign policy and exert a significant influence on global affairs (Adams, 2020), shaping relationships between states, influencing domestic politics in affected countries, and impacting the lives of millions of people worldwide (Wilson, 2016). This military intervention can have significant implications for the countries involved, as well as for regional and global security dynamics. They often spark debates about the legality, morality, and effectiveness of using military force to address complex international challenges (Clark, 2019).

The costs of American military interventions are inevitable, encompassing financial, human, and geopolitical dimensions. Financially, these interventions often incur substantial expenses, with estimates varying depending on the scope and duration of the operation. For instance, the Iraq and Afghanistan wars have collectively cost trillions of dollars. According to the Congressional Research Service, as of 2020, the total estimated cost of the Iraq War alone was approximately \$1.922 trillion (Congressional Research Service, 2020). Similarly, the Afghanistan War has cost over \$2 trillion, according to a study by Brown University's Costs of War Project (Brown University, n.d.). These vast expenditures

strain the national budget, diverting funds from other critical areas such as education, healthcare, and infrastructure.

Moreover, the human costs of military interventions are profound, with thousands of American soldiers and civilians losing their lives and many more suffering from physical and psychological injuries. The Department of Defense reports that, as of 2021, over 7,000 U.S. service members have died in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, with tens of thousands more wounded (U.S. Department of Defense, 2021). Beyond American casualties, countless civilians in the conflict zones have also perished or been displaced, exacerbating humanitarian crises. Additionally, the geopolitical ramifications of military interventions can be far-reaching, affecting regional stability and fueling anti-American sentiment. These interventions often have unintended consequences, including the destabilization of entire regions and the empowerment of hostile actors, as evidenced by the rise of extremist groups like ISIS in the aftermath of the Iraq War.

1.5.1 American Military intervention before September 11th

Before September 11, 2001, American military interventions were claimed to be carried out for various reasons, reflecting the United States' strategic interests, international obligations, and responses to emerging threats.

The most prominent reason of the US military interventions is to safeguard its strategic interests, such as protecting access to key resources, ensuring regional stability, and containing the spread of communism during the Cold War (Jones & Smith, 1998). Further reasons explaining these interventions include addressing humanitarian crises, such as famine, civil wars, or ethnic violence. Operations like those in Somalia and Haiti sought to provide humanitarian assistance and restore order (Brown, 1995). The US intervened

militarily to enforce international law and norms, such as in the Gulf War, where it responded to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait with a coalition to liberate Kuwait and uphold the principle of territorial integrity (Johnson & Miller, 1993). Moreover, American military interventions often involved supporting allies or defending treaty obligations, such as in the Balkans, where U.S. forces participated in peacekeeping missions to end conflicts and enforce peace agreements (Robinson, 1999).

Furthermore, before September 11th, the U.S. conducted military operations against terrorist threats. For instance, airstrikes were launched against suspected terrorist targets, such as the 1998 strikes on terrorist camps in Afghanistan and Sudan in response to embassy bombings (Taylor & Wilson, 2000).

Before September 11th US military interventions represented a selection of significant U.S. military involvements in many countries including:

- **Korea:** during the Korean war (1950-1953), the US intervened against invasion by North Korea. The conflict began when North Korean forces invaded South Korea on June 25, 1950. The United States, along with a United Nations coalition, intervened to prevent the spread of communism. This intervention marked one of the first major military actions of the Cold War era
- **Vietnam:** The U.S. got involved in the Vietnam War (1955-1975) to prevent the spread of communism. This war was a prolonged conflict that saw significant American military involvement, including ground troops, airstrikes, and other operations. The war ended with the fall of Saigon on April 30, 1975, marking the conclusion of American involvement
- **Grenada:** Operation Urgent Fury (1983) was a military invasion of the Caribbean island nation of Grenada, undertaken by the U.S. and several Caribbean allies. The

invasion aimed to restore order and democracy after a coup d'état led by the Marxist-Leninist People's Revolutionary Government

- **Panama:** The U.S. launched Operation Just Cause (1989-1990) to depose Panamanian leader Manuel Noriega and establish democratic governance. The operation involved a large-scale military intervention aimed at protecting American citizens, restoring democratic governance, and safeguarding the Panama Canal
- **Somalia:** Operation Restore Hope (1992-1995) aimed to provide humanitarian aid and stabilize Somalia amidst civil unrest and famine. The operation, initiated by the United Nations and supported by the U.S., sought to alleviate suffering and restore order in the war-torn country.
- **Bosnia:** U.S. forces participated in NATO-led operations, including airstrikes and peacekeeping efforts, during the Bosnian War (1995-1996). The intervention aimed to end ethnic violence, support peace agreements, and facilitate humanitarian relief efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina
- **Haiti:** Operation Uphold Democracy (1994-1995) aimed to restore Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power and promote stability in Haiti. The intervention, led by the U.S. and supported by the United Nations, aimed to restore democratic governance and prevent a humanitarian crisis in Haiti

These interventions varied in their scope, duration, and outcomes, but collectively they reflected the United States' role as a global superpower and its willingness to use military force to achieve strategic objectives, uphold international norms, and respond to crises.

Conclusion

This chapter provided a theoretical background that would serve in understanding the links between American US foreign policy and plans in the creating chaos in other countries and the rise of terrorism. It is essential to consider the broader context of US foreign policy actions and their intended objectives. While there have been instances where US interventions have had unintended consequences or been criticized for exacerbating conflicts, it is generally inaccurate to assert that the US actively seeks to benefit from terrorism or chaos in third world countries.

In conclusion, while it is vital to critically analyze and question US foreign policy actions, it is essential to base assessments on evidence and facts rather than unfounded claims or conspiracy theories. The relationship between US foreign policy and terrorism is intricate and multifaceted, requiring a nuance and critical approach for a comprehensive understanding. The second chapter is intended to shed light on this relationship through the examinations of instances and evidence provided from the events and actions accumulated in the period before and after the rise of terrorism.

Chapter two:

**The role of the United States of
America in the Rise of Terrorism**

Introduction

The second chapter of the present dissertation is devoted to the analysis of the US potential role in the rise of terrorism. It seeks to understand the relationship between US foreign policy and terrorism through shedding lights on the contribution of US military interventions in third world countries like Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq and Yemen in creating instability and breeding resentment among local populations, which in turn has fueled the rise of terrorism. Moreover, this chapter reflects on the rise of Al-Qaeda and ISIS.

2.1 US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001

The United States invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, also known as Operation Enduring Freedom, was a military response to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States. The primary objectives were to overthrow the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, which had provided sanctuary to al-Qaeda, the terrorist organization responsible for the 9/11 attacks, and to capture or eliminate Osama bin Laden, the leader of al-Qaeda. After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the United States demanded that the Taliban government in Afghanistan hand over Osama bin Laden and expel al-Qaeda from the country. When the Taliban refused, the US launched Operation Enduring Freedom to overthrow the Taliban regime and deny al-Qaeda a safe haven in Afghanistan (Woodward, 2002).

The invasion began on October 7, 2001, with airstrikes targeting Taliban and al-Qaeda forces, as well as their infrastructure and training camps (Woodward, 2002). Following the initial air campaign, ground forces, primarily comprised of the United States and allied forces, along with the Northern Alliance (an Afghan opposition group), launched a ground offensive against the Taliban (Rashid, 2008)

The Clinton administration had launched missile strikes against al-Qaeda camps in Afghanistan in 1998 in retaliation for the bombings of US embassies in Africa (Woodward, 2002). However, the Taliban continued to allow al-Qaeda to operate training camps and plan attacks from Afghan territory. This stance, combined with their human rights abuses and oppression of women and minorities, led to the country's isolation from the international community (Rashid, 2000).

By December 2001, the Taliban had been largely defeated, and their regime had collapsed, allowing for the establishment of the interim Afghan government (Rashid, 2008). However, the conflict continued as Taliban and al-Qaeda fighters regrouped and launched an insurgency against the new Afghan government and the coalition forces (Woodward, 2010).

2.1.1 Objectives of the invasion

The main aim of the US was to overthrow the Taliban regime that had taken control of most of Afghanistan by 1996. The Taliban had provided safe place to al-Qaeda and its leader, Osama bin Laden, who was responsible for orchestrating the 9/11 attacks (Woodward, 2002). By removing the Taliban from power, the U.S. sought to deny al-Qaeda a base of operations and sanctuary within Afghanistan.

Furthermore, another key objective was to capture or eliminate Osama bin Laden and other senior leaders of al-Qaeda terrorist organization. Bin Laden, the founder of al-Qaeda, was the mastermind behind the 9/11 attacks and had been a long-standing target for the U.S. (Rashid, 2008). Eliminating al-Qaeda leadership was seen as crucial to disrupting the organization's ability to plan and execute future attacks.

In addition to targeting the leadership, the U.S. sought to dismantle al-Qaeda's extensive support infrastructure within Afghanistan. This included eliminating the terrorist group's training camps, facilities, and financial networks that had been established and allowed to flourish under the Taliban's protection (Woodward, 2010). By destroying these support systems, the U.S. aimed to cripple al-Qaeda's operational capabilities and prevent Afghanistan from being used as a staging ground for future terrorist attacks against the U.S. and its allies.

Furthermore, the invasion was intended to pave the way for the establishment of a stable and democratic government in Afghanistan. The U.S. and its allies recognized that the lack of a functioning and legitimate government had created a power vacuum that allowed terrorist organizations like al-Qaeda to thrive (Rashid, 2008). By supporting the formation of a new Afghan government, the U.S. hoped to promote security, prevent the resurgence of terrorist groups, and foster democratic values and human rights in the country.

Overall, the objectives of the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan were multifaceted, ranging from the immediate need to dismantle al-Qaeda and its support networks to the long-term goal of establishing a stable and democratic government that could prevent Afghanistan from becoming a safe haven for terrorists once again (Woodward, 2010).

2.1.2 Impact of the invasion

The US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 had far-reaching consequences that shaped the course of events in the region for nearly two decades. While the initial objectives were largely achieved, the long-term outcomes proved to be more complex and challenging.

Initially, the invasion demonstrated the United States' ability to project military power globally and its willingness to use force against regimes that harbored terrorist organizations (Woodward, 2002). Furthermore, the establishment of a friendly government in Afghanistan provided the United States with increased influence in the region, albeit temporarily, and a potential strategic foothold in Central Asia (Rashid, 2008).

The US enormous benefits from the invasion are countless. Economically, Afghanistan's natural resources, including minerals, oil, and gas reserves, presented precious opportunities for US companies, although the instability and conflict limited their exploitation (Rashid, 2008). US companies benefited from reconstruction contracts as part of the nation-building (Rashid, 2008). The invasion raised hopes for increased regional trade and investment opportunities, particularly in energy and infrastructure projects involving Afghanistan and its neighbors (Rashid, 2008).

The U.S. invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 had both strategic and economic implications for the region. In the wake of the Taliban's collapse, the Bonn Agreement was signed in December 2001, paving the way for the formation of an interim government in Afghanistan, led by Hamid Karzai (Woodward, 2010). This was a critical step toward establishing a stable and democratic political system in the country, albeit one that would face significant challenges in the years to come.

However, one of the most notable failures of the invasion was the inability to capture or eliminate Osama bin Laden, the leader of al-Qaeda and the mastermind behind the 9/11 attacks. Despite extensive efforts, bin Laden managed to escape from the Tora Bora region in December 2001 and remained at large until his eventual killing in Pakistan in 2011 (Berntsen & Pezzullo, 2005).

While the Taliban regime was toppled, remnants of the group and other insurgent forces, including al-Qaeda, regrouped and launched a prolonged insurgency against the new Afghan government and international forces (Rashid, 2008). This led to years of conflict, instability, and nation-building challenges in Afghanistan, as the US and its allies undertook extensive efforts to train and equip Afghan security forces, support democratic institutions, and invest in infrastructure and development projects (Woodward, 2010). However, these efforts were hindered by the ongoing insurgency and allegations of corruption within the Afghan government.

The US maintained a significant military presence in Afghanistan for nearly two decades after the initial invasion, with the aim of supporting the Afghan government and combating insurgent groups (Woodward, 2010). However, the withdrawal of US forces in 2021 led to the eventual collapse of the Afghan government and the Taliban's return to power, marking a significant setback for the nation-building efforts undertaken over the previous two decades.

In retrospect, while the US invasion of Afghanistan achieved its immediate objectives of overthrowing the Taliban regime and dismantling al-Qaeda's primary sanctuary, the long-term goals of establishing a stable and democratic Afghanistan proved elusive. The invasion and its aftermath were marked by ongoing insurgency, instability, and the challenges of nation-building in a complex and volatile region.

2.2 Al Qaeda Relation with the US

While the U.S. did not directly create al-Qaeda, its involvement in the Soviet-Afghan War in the 1980s inadvertently contributed to the rise of the organization and its radical Islamist ideology.

2.2.1. The rise of Al-Qaeda

Al-Qaeda is a militant Sunni Islamist multi-national organization founded in 1988 by Osama bin Laden and several other Islamic militants. The roots of al-Qaeda can be traced back to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, which prompted a widespread resistance movement among Afghan Muslims known as the Mujahideen. This resistance was supported by the United States, Pakistan, and other countries, who provided funding, weapons, and training to the Mujahideen fighters (Coll, 2004).

Among the foreign volunteers who joined the Afghan resistance was Osama bin Laden, a wealthy Saudi Arabian born in 1957. Bin Laden was deeply influenced by the Muslim Brotherhood's ideology and the teachings of Palestinian scholar Abdullah Azzam, who called for a global jihad against non-Muslim forces (Wright, 2006).

In 1984, bin Laden and Azzam established the Maktab al-Khidamat (MAK) or "Services Office" in Peshawar, Pakistan, to recruit and train foreign fighters for the Afghan resistance. The MAK served as a precursor to al-Qaeda, providing a base for bin Laden to forge connections with various Mujahideen groups and establish a network of fighters from across the Muslim world (Scheuer, 2011).

After the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989, bin Laden and Azzam had a falling out over the future direction of their movement. Azzam wanted to shift the focus to Palestine, while bin Laden sought to continue the broader jihad against Western influence in Muslim lands (Wright, 2006).

In 1988, bin Laden formed al-Qaeda (meaning "the base" in Arabic) as a more organized and structured offshoot of the MAK, with the goal of establishing a pan-Islamic caliphate and expelling Western forces from Muslim countries (Gerges, 2005). The

organization drew its initial members from the experienced Afghan Arab fighters, who had developed strong bonds during the Soviet-Afghan war (Burke, 2004).

2.2.2 The US role in the creation of AL-Qaeda and Benladen

During the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, the U.S. provided substantial covert military and financial support to the Afghan Mujahideen resistance fighters through Operation Cyclone (Coll, 2004). This aid was primarily channeled through Pakistan's intelligence agency, the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), which played a significant role in training and equipping the Mujahideen (Rashid, 2000).

Among the foreign volunteers who joined the Afghan resistance were Arab fighters, including Osama bin Laden, who gained valuable combat experience and established networks that would later form the basis of al-Qaeda (Wright, 2006). The U.S. did not directly fund or train bin Laden's group, but its support for the broader Mujahideen effort helped create an environment that enabled the growth of radical Islamist movements (Kepel, 2002).

After the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989, the U.S. largely disengaged from the region, leaving a power vacuum that allowed various Mujahideen factions, including bin Laden's al-Qaeda, to gain influence and pursue their own agendas (Coll, 2004). While the U.S. did not intend to create al-Qaeda, its policy decisions during the Soviet-Afghan War, combined with the lack of a coherent post-war strategy, contributed to the rise of radical Islamist groups like al-Qaeda, which would later become a significant threat to U.S. national security (Riedel, 2008).

2.2.3 Osama bin Laden's assassination

The killing of Osama bin Laden, the founder and leader of the terrorist organization Al-Qaeda, was a significant event in the global war on terror. It took place on May 2, 2011, during a covert operation by United States Navy SEALs in Abbottabad, Pakistan. This operation, known as Operation Neptune Spear, had far-reaching consequences both domestically and internationally.

Osama bin Laden was responsible for several major terrorist attacks, most notably the September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States. He had been on the FBI's Most Wanted list for over a decade, with intelligence agencies worldwide actively searching for him (Bergen, 2012). The operation to kill bin Laden was the result of years of intelligence gathering, which included tracking bin Laden's couriers and identifying his compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan. On May 2, 2011, a team of Navy SEALs, along with CIA operatives, carried out a raid on bin Laden's compound. The operation lasted approximately 40 minutes and resulted in the death of bin Laden (Schmidle, 2011; Owen, 2012). Bin Laden's body was taken to Afghanistan for identification and then buried at sea to prevent his grave from becoming a shrine (Obama, 2011).

President Barack Obama announced bin Laden's death, leading to widespread celebration and a sense of closure for many Americans affected by the 9/11 attacks (Obama, 2011). International responses varied, with many allies expressing relief and support, while some countries and groups condemned the US actions or questioned the legality of the raid (Shah, 2011).

Bin Laden's death dealt a significant blow to Al-Qaeda, both operationally and symbolically. It led to a power vacuum and subsequent leadership struggles within the organization (Bergen, 2012). The success of the operation was a major boost to US

counterterrorism efforts, demonstrating the capabilities and reach of US military and intelligence agencies (Coll, 2018).

The raid strained relations between the US and Pakistan, as the US had not informed Pakistani authorities about the operation, raising questions about Pakistan's role in harboring terrorists (Shah, 2011). The operation sparked debates about the legality of conducting such a raid in a sovereign country without its consent, as well as discussions on the ethics of targeted killings (White House, 2011).

2.3 US invasion of Iraq in 2003

The U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, codenamed Operation Iraqi Freedom, was a major military operation launched by the United States, aided by British forces and a coalition of other allied nations. The stated reasons for the invasion were to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction, to end Saddam Hussein's support for terrorism

In the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the Bush administration began making a case for taking action against Iraq and its leader Saddam Hussein (Bamford, 2005). Despite uncertainties about Iraq's weapons programs, the administration argued that Saddam posed a grave threat to U.S. security interests and could potentially supply terrorists with weapons of mass destruction (Woodward, 2004).

As diplomatic efforts at the UN Security Council stalled, the U.S. began deploying troops to the Persian Gulf region in late 2002. On March 17, 2003, President Bush issued an ultimatum to Saddam to leave Iraq within 48 hours or face war (Schmitt & Shanker, 2003). When Saddam refused, Operation Iraqi Freedom began on March 20th with airstrikes targeting Iraqi leadership (Schmitt, 2003).

The invasion's legal justification rested on claims Iraq had failed to comply with UN disarmament resolutions and the assertion of the right to pre-emptive self-defense against gathering threats (Byers, 2005). However, the true motivations were debated, with some viewing it as an opportunistic attempt to restructure the Middle East (Clarke, 2004).

2.3.1 Aims of the Invasion of Iraq

The primary goals of the invasion, as stated by the Bush administration, were to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The administration claimed that Iraq possessed active programs for developing nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons in violation of UN resolutions. President Bush argued that Iraq's WMD posed a grave threat to the U.S. and the world (Bush, 2003).

Another objectives if to end Saddam Hussein's support for terrorism, and to free the Iraqi people (Woodward, 2004).The administration accused Saddam Hussein of harboring and supporting terrorist groups, including al-Qaeda, and argued that he could potentially provide them with WMD (Woodward, 2004). They sought to end this alleged support for terrorism by removing Saddam from power.

Further, US claims involved the aim of freeing the Iraqi People from Saddam Hussein's oppressive rule and bring democracy to Iraq (Bush, 2003). They claimed that overthrowing Saddam would make the region and the world safer.

2.3.2 The impact of the invasion of Iraq

The United States' invasion of Iraq in 2003, officially known as Operation Iraqi Freedom, was a significant event that had far-reaching consequences. The primary stated objective of the invasion was to disarm Iraq of its alleged weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and to end Saddam Hussein's regime, which the Bush administration claimed

posed a threat to the United States and its allies (Cordesman & Khazai, 2003). The administration also accused the Iraqi government of harboring and supporting terrorists, including members of al-Qaeda, although no direct links were found (Byman, 2008).

The invasion began on March 20, 2003, with a combined force of U.S., British, and other coalition troops. The initial phase, known as the "shock and awe" campaign, involved massive air strikes and ground operations aimed at swiftly defeating Iraqi forces (Freedman, 2005). Despite the rapid overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime, the occupation of Iraq faced significant challenges, including insurgency, sectarian violence, and the failure to find any stockpiles of WMD (Cordesman, 2008).

The aftermath of the invasion was marked by political instability, a prolonged insurgency, and significant human and economic costs for both Iraq and the United States. Estimates suggest that the war and occupation resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Iraqis and over 4,000 U.S. military personnel (Burnham et al., 2006; Belasco, 2014). The financial cost of the war to the United States alone exceeded \$1.9 trillion, according to some estimates (Bilmes, 2013).

The invasion and occupation of Iraq were highly controversial and divisive, both within the United States and internationally. Critics argued that the justification for the war was based on faulty intelligence and questioned the legality of the preemptive strike (Herring & Rangwala, 2005). The failure to find WMD stockpiles and the subsequent chaos and violence in Iraq further eroded public support for the war (Enders & Olson, 2012).

The invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq by the United States and its coalition partners had a profound and devastating impact on the Iraqi people and country. The impact does not only result in an enormous loss of civilian lives in Iraq, and displacement

of millions of Iraqis, both internally and as refugees in neighboring countries. (UNHCR, 2015), but also in the destruction and loss of invaluable cultural heritage sites and artifacts, representing a significant blow to Iraq's rich history and cultural identity (Rothfield, 2009).

The invasion and subsequent insurgency caused significant damage to Iraq's infrastructure, including water and sanitation systems, electricity grids, and healthcare facilities. This had severe consequences for the daily lives and well-being of Iraqi citizens (Cordesman, 2008). The conflict and instability severely impacted Iraq's economy, leading to widespread unemployment, poverty, and a significant decline in living standards for many Iraqis (Looney, 2006).

Prominently, the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime and the ensuing power vacuum led to sectarian violence, civil unrest, and political instability that persisted for years, causing further suffering and displacement for Iraqi citizens (Herring & Rangwala, 2005). This period of turmoil also created fertile ground for the emergence of extremist groups, exacerbating regional security challenges and contributing to ongoing conflicts in the Middle East.

2.3.3 Donald trump opinion on the Iraqi invasion

Donald Trump, both before and after becoming President, has been critical of the decision to invade Iraq in 2003. Prior to the invasion, in an interview with Howard Stern in 2002, Trump expressed skepticism about the rationale for war, stating, "Yeah, I guess so. You know, I wish it were done negotiated way" (Trump & Stern, 2002).

After the invasion, Trump became increasingly vocal in his opposition to the war. In his book "Trump: How to Get Rich" published in 2004, he wrote, "There's only so much you can do in bombing. If they thought there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq,

one thing they knew is that they weren't on the front door. I don't think anybody ever dreamed they'd get bogged down there" (Trump, 2004, p. 142).

During his 2016 presidential campaign, Trump frequently criticized the Iraq War as a costly mistake, stating, "We spent \$6 trillion in the Middle East, we can't even muster \$1 trillion for our own country's infrastructure, our roads, our tunnels, our bridges" (Trump, 2016). After becoming President, Trump continued to voice his opposition to the Iraq invasion. In an interview with Piers Morgan in 2018, he said, "I think it was the single worst decision ever made. It started us down a tremendous path of difficulty and trillions of dollars in addition to lives" (Trump & Morgan, 2018).

2.4 The rise of ISIS

ISIS, also known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, is a terrorist organization that gained global notoriety for its brutal tactics and extremist ideology. The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) emerged amidst the power vacuum and sectarian conflict that erupted following the 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq. The overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime and subsequent de-Baathification policies alienated many former Iraqi military and intelligence personnel, some of whom went on to join the insurgency (Rizvi, 2017). This instability provided fertile ground for the rise of groups like ISIS's predecessor organizations.

The Syrian Civil War, which began in 2011, further enabled ISIS's territorial gains and recruitment of fighters opposed to the Assad regime (Hashim, 2014). At the same time, the Iraqi government's violent crackdown on Sunni protest camps in late 2012 and 2013 drove more Sunni support for ISIS as they positioned themselves as defenders of Sunni rights against the Shia-led government (Rizvi, 2017).

ISIS also benefited from prison raids in Iraq, where numerous future leaders and operatives like Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi were among the Sunni insurgents released from U.S. detention facilities like Camp Bucca (Mapping Militant Organizations, 2019). Additionally, the group's image as a powerful jihadist organization attracted thousands of foreign fighters from over 100 countries to join their cause in Iraq and Syria (Neumann, 2016).

By capitalizing on these regional instabilities and grievances, ISIS was able to make shocking territorial gains, culminating in their declaration of an Islamic caliphate in June 2014 after seizing large swaths of Iraq and Syria (Hashim, 2014).

2.4.1 Origin of ISIS

ISIS emerged out of the Iraqi insurgency that followed the 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq. Its origins can be traced back to Jama'at al-Tawhid wal-Jihad, a group formed in 1999 by Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, a Jordanian militant who had traveled to Afghanistan to join the Taliban (Hashim, 2014).

In late 2004, Zarqawi pledged allegiance to Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda, and his group became known as al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI). AQI gained notoriety for its violent tactics, including beheadings, suicide bombings against Shia civilians, and attacks on U.S. forces (Mapping Militant Organizations, 2019).

After Zarqawi's death in 2006, AQI created a series of umbrella organizations in an attempt to put an Iraqi face on its foreign-led movement. In 2006 it joined other Sunni insurgent groups to establish the Mujahideen Shura Council, which then proclaimed the Islamic State of Iraq (ISI) (Mapping Militant Organizations, 2019).

ISIS lost ground due to the U.S. troop surge and Sunni tribal groups turning against it. But it was revived after the U.S. withdrew in 2011 amid growing sectarian tensions and the Syrian uprising against Bashar al-Assad (Hashim, 2014).

In April 2013, ISI leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi announced the group was operating in Syria and changing its name to the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS or ISIL). This prompted a split with al-Qaeda, which didn't endorse ISIS's brutal tactics or its plans to establish an Islamic caliphate across Iraq and Syria (Mapping Militant Organizations, 2019).

ISIS made shocking military gains in 2014, seizing Mosul and other Iraqi cities and towns. In June 2014, it declared its caliphate and became known as the Islamic State (IS). At its peak in late 2014, IS held about a third of Syria and 40% of Iraqi territory (Hashim, 2014).

2.4.2 The US Involvement with ISIS

Some analysts argue that certain U.S. policy decisions and actions in Iraq inadvertently contributed to creating conditions that enabled the rise of ISIS. Disbanding the Iraqi Army After the 2003 invasion, the U.S. disbanded the Iraqi army, leaving hundreds of thousands of armed Sunni men disenfranchised, unemployed, and sympathetic to insurgent groups like ISIS's predecessors (Rizvi, 2017).

Moreover, The U.S. policy of de-Baathification, which removed members of Saddam Hussein's Baath party from positions of power, marginalized many Sunnis and depleted the Iraqi government of experienced civilian leaders (Ahram, 2015).

Furthermore, Detention Policies U.S. detention facilities in Iraq like Camp Bucca became recruiting grounds for extremist groups. Future ISIS leaders like Baghdadi were

held and radicalized in these camps (Mapping Militant Organizations, 2019). Another aspect is the Sectarian Policies. Some argue the U.S. failure to mitigate sectarian tensions between Sunnis and Shias and to establish an inclusive government in Iraq after 2003 fueled Sunni resentment toward the Shia-led government, providing ISIS a pool of supporters (Rizvi, 2017).

most analysts suggest that while U.S. mistakes created a window of opportunity, more direct factors like the Syrian civil war and ex-Baathist Iraqi leaders enabled the specific rise of ISIS in 2014 (Ahram, 2015).

2.5 US interventions in Syria and Yemen

2.5.1 Syria

After anti-government protests erupted in Syria in 2011, the U.S. called for President Bashar al-Assad to step down and provided non-lethal aid to rebel groups. In 2014, the U.S. began air strikes in Syria against ISIS targets (Lister, 2016). While the stated goal was to degrade and destroy ISIS, critics argued this intervention undermined efforts to topple Assad and caused a power vacuum that allowed groups like ISIS and al-Qaeda affiliates to thrive (Phillips, 2016).

In 2018, the U.S., UK and France launched airstrikes against Syrian government targets in response to an alleged chemical attack, drawing condemnation from Syria's allies Russia and Iran (Sanger et al., 2018). Air strikes against ISIS (2014-2019)

- In September 2014, the U.S. began air strikes in Syria against ISIS targets as part of Operation Inherent Resolve (Lister, 2016)

- Over 14,000 strikes were carried out by U.S. aircraft targeting ISIS fighters, equipment, and oil infrastructure in Syria (Lafree et al., 2021)
- Critics argued these strikes unintentionally aided the Assad regime by degrading one of its major opponents (Phillips, 2016)

Arms and Training for Syrian Rebels

- From 2012-2017, the U.S. covertly armed and trained thousands of Syrian rebel fighters deemed "moderate" oppositionists (Lister, 2016)
- However, much of this aid was criticized as too little, too late, and for sometimes falling into the wrong hands (Trisko Darden, 2019)

Strikes on Assad Regime Targets

- In April 2017 and 2018, the U.S. conducted missile strikes on Syrian government airbases in response to alleged chemical attacks (McInnis, 2019)
- Around 200 personnel, air defense systems, and aircraft were hit in these strikes condemned by Russia and Iran (Calamur, 2018)

Troop Deployment

- In late 2015, the U.S. deployed special operations forces into Syria to advise and assist Kurdish and Arab rebel groups (McInnis, 2019)
- Roughly 2,000 U.S. troops remained in parts of northeast Syria after ISIS' territorial defeat to act as a stabilizing presence (Calamur, 2018)

2.5.2 Yemen

In 2015, a Saudi-led coalition, backed by the U.S., intervened in Yemen's civil war against Houthi rebels, who had ousted the Saudi-backed government (Sharp, 2022). The U.S. has provided intelligence, logistics, and billions in arms sales to the Saudi coalition. However, this involvement has drawn criticism due to civilian casualties from Saudi airstrikes and the humanitarian crisis in Yemen (Riedel, 2017). In 2019 and 2021, Congress voted to end U.S. military involvement in Yemen, but was blocked by presidential vetoes (Sharp, 2022).

Military Support for Saudi-Led Coalition (2015-Present)

- In 2015, the U.S. began providing intelligence, logistics, and billions in arms sales to the Saudi-led coalition intervening in Yemen's civil war against Houthi rebels (Sharp, 2022).
- This included air-to-air refueling for coalition jets, intelligence sharing, and deployment of a limited U.S. military presence in Yemen (Riedel, 2017).
- The U.S. has conducted some direct strikes against Al Qaeda and ISIS targets in Yemen, but the main intervention has been in support of Saudi operations (Feickert et al., 2022).

The Saudi-led air campaign, assisted by U.S. arms and refueling, has been criticized for high civilian casualties from airstrikes hitting non-military targets (Riedel, 2017) and the conflict has created one of the world's worst humanitarian crises, with millions facing famine and lack of basic services (Sharp, 2022). Then Some U.S. lawmakers pushed to end or condition arms sales over these humanitarian concerns (Feickert et al., 2022).

2.6 US Actions to create chaos and instability in third world

The 2011 intervention in Libya by the United States and its NATO allies was influenced by a combination of factors, including the internal situation in Libya, the broader context of the Arab Spring, and international political dynamics.

The 2011 U.S. and NATO military intervention in Libya succeeded in overthrowing dictator Muammar Gaddafi, but is widely criticized for lacking a coherent post-conflict strategy and allowing chaos to take hold. With no plan for what came after Gaddafi's fall, a dangerous power vacuum emerged that empowered rival militias and allowed militant groups to flourish (Chivvis, 2013). Huge stockpiles of weapons were left unsecured and subsequently looted by various armed factions across North Africa and the Sahel region (Lacher, 2019). Rather than disarming and reintegrating under a unified national force, the rebel militias the West enabled remained armed groups vying for power and territory (Wehrey, 2017).

This security lapse and political fragmentation caused Libya to fracture between two parallel governments competing for legitimacy and control of key areas and resources (Lacher, 2019). The interim authorities left in charge after Gaddafi proved too weak to unite the myriad factions and rivalries unleashed (Wehrey & Bateman, 2020). The resulting ungoverned spaces provided fertile ground for terror groups like ISIS and al-Qaeda affiliates to establish safe havens and training camps in areas like Benghazi and Sirte (Wehrey, 2017). While the intervention stopped a potential massacre, critics argued the lack of post-conflict planning and failure to fill the power void allowed chaos and instability to overwhelm Libya in ways that ultimately benefited extremist forces (Chivvis, 2013).

2.87The relationship between US foreign policy and terrorism

The relationship between U.S. foreign policy and terrorism is a complex and multifaceted issue that has been extensively debated and analyzed by scholars, policymakers, and experts. U.S. military interventions, particularly in the Middle East, have been widely criticized for contributing to the rise of terrorist organizations and fueling anti-American sentiment.

The invasion of Iraq in 2003 is often cited as a catalyst for the growth of groups like ISIS (Byman, 2015; Cronin, 2015). According to Byman (2015), the U.S. invasion of Iraq "helped trigger an insurgency that ultimately facilitated the rise of ISIS" (p. 2). The chaos and power vacuum created by the invasion, coupled with the disbandment of the Iraqi army and the marginalization of Sunni groups, provided fertile ground for the growth of extremist organizations like al-Qaeda in Iraq, which later evolved into ISIS (Cronin, 2015). Cronin (2015) argues that the U.S. military intervention in Iraq "helped spawn the very threat it was intended to thwart" (p. 38). The presence of U.S. troops and the perception of Western occupation fueled resentment and provided a rallying cry for terrorist groups to recruit new members and gain popular support (Byman, 2015; Cronin, 2015).

In reality, the prolonged U.S. military involvement in Afghanistan has also been linked to the resurgence of terrorist groups like the Taliban and the growth of new organizations like the Islamic State in Khorasan Province (ISK) (Mirahmadi et al., 2016; Shay, 2017).

2.7.1 USA Support for authoritarian regimes

The U.S. has historically supported authoritarian regimes in various countries for strategic reasons, which has often bred resentment and provided fertile ground for the growth of terrorist groups. One notable example is the U.S. support for the Shah of Iran, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, until his overthrow in the 1979 Iranian Revolution (Gasiorowski, 1987). Gasiorowski (1987) argues that "U.S. support for the Shah's regime was a major factor in the growth of anti-American sentiment in Iran", which ultimately contributed to the rise of Islamic fundamentalism and the hostage crisis at the U.S. Embassy in Tehran.

Similarly, during the Cold War era, the U.S. provided support to various authoritarian regimes in Latin America, such as the military dictatorships in Chile, Argentina, and Guatemala, in an effort to counter the perceived threat of communism (Kornbluh, 2013). Kornbluh (2013) suggests that "U.S. support for repressive regimes in the region fueled resentment and encouraged the growth of revolutionary and extremist movements" (p. 11), some of which later embraced terrorist tactics

More recently, U.S. support for authoritarian regimes in the Middle East, such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt, has been criticized for contributing to the rise of extremist groups like al-Qaeda and ISIS (Hashim, 2018; Karagiannis, 2017). Hashim (2018) argues that "the repressive policies of these regimes, coupled with a lack of political and economic opportunities, have created an environment conducive to the spread of extremist ideologies and the recruitment of disillusioned youth.

Critics have long argued that the U.S. has applied double standards in its approach to terrorism, often overlooking or tolerating violence perpetrated by allies or groups it deems strategically important, while taking a hard line against others (Jackson, 2005;

Stampnitzky, 2013). For instance, the U.S. has been accused of turning a blind eye to state-sponsored terrorism by allies like Saudi Arabia, which has been linked to the spread of extremist ideologies and the financing of terrorist groups (Byman, 2005; Jones, 2017). As Jones (2017) notes, "The U.S. has consistently prioritized its strategic relationship with Saudi Arabia over concerns about the kingdom's role in fueling extremism"

Similarly, the U.S. has been criticized for its support of right-wing paramilitary groups and death squads in Latin America during the Cold War, which were responsible for numerous human rights violations and acts of terrorism against civilian populations (Chomsky, 1985; McClintock, 1992). Chomsky (1985) argues that the U.S. government "has been directly involved in the practice of terrorism on a massive scale" by supporting and training these groups, while simultaneously condemning terrorism by other actors (McClintock, 1992).

Some scholars have pointed out that the U.S. has been selective in its designation of certain groups as "terrorist organizations," often based on political considerations rather than consistent criteria (Jackson, 2005; Stampnitzky, 2013). According to Stampnitzky (2013), the U.S. has "embraced a double standard, applying the label of 'terrorism' to some forms of political violence while ignoring or justifying others".

Proponents argue that these partnerships, while unsavory, are difficult tradeoffs necessary to protect American security interests and tackle urgent threats like terrorism. However, critics charge that the U.S. prioritizing stability over democratization has empowered authoritarian rulers, fueled extremism long-term, contradicted American values, and involved blatant double standards (Huber, 2008; Carothers, 2022). There are concerns that backing dictators for real political reasons will only undermine U.S. credibility and the push for liberalization in these regions moving forward (Fukuyama, 2022).

Nevertheless, the short-term calculations of cooperating with controlling authoritarian forces on key strategic imperatives continue to shape U.S. policies and partnerships across the globe.

2.7.2 US Drone Strikes

The United States has increasingly relied on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) or drones to carry out strikes against terrorist and militant targets since the early 2000s. This drone warfare tactics expanded significantly in scope under the Obama and Trump administrations across several countries including Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia and Afghanistan (Purkiss & Serle, 2017). The methods have included missile strikes from armed drones as well as special operations raids assisted by surveillance and intelligence from unmanned aircraft systems (Boyle, 2013).

One of the major criticisms leveled at the drone program has been civilian casualties resulting from these strikes. While estimates vary, analyses point to hundreds and potentially thousands of civilians being killed in drone attacks in regions like Pakistan and Yemen (Purkiss & Serle, 2017). High-profile incidents such as the 2015 U.S. drone strike that killed over 40 civilians in Kunduz, Afghanistan have drawn widespread international condemnation (Boyle, 2020). A core issue is the lack of transparency around data on drone strikes as well as how the U.S. defines civilians versus combatants eligible for strikes.

Beyond the human toll, critics argue the drone campaign and attendant civilian casualties have served as a powerful recruitment tool for terror groups and fueled anti-American sentiments in regions impacted by strikes (Boyle, 2013). The proliferation and normalization of drone warfare has raised broader concerns around violations of national sovereignty and circumventing international law governing warfare as well (Boyle, 2020).

There are also debates around the criteria used to determine who is an eligible threat for targeted killing by drones and the lack of due process involved.

Proponents of the drone program counter that it has been an effective counterterrorism tactic, allowing for the targeted killing of terrorist operatives in hard-to-reach areas without risking U.S. soldiers' lives (Boyle, 2013). However, critics charge that the negative strategic consequences of drone strikes in terms of radicalization and resentment may ultimately outweigh any tactical gains (Boyle, 2020). As drone technology continues advancing, the ethical and legal implications around its use as a deadly force remain highly contentious in military and international policy circles.

2.7.3 US Perceived Double Standards

2.7.3.1 The non-proliferation of nuclear weapons

There is a perception among many countries and groups that the United States applies different standards or policies to different situations and nations based on its own strategic interests, rather than adhering to consistent principles across the board. This perceived double standard by the U.S. is a source of criticism and resentment in some parts of the world here is some examples

The United States has long advocated for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, promoting itself as a global leader in this effort. However, the U.S. has been accused of applying double standards when it comes to the enforcement of non-proliferation policies, leading to criticism and resentment from other nations (Sridharan, 2019). One prominent example of this perceived double standard is the U.S. stance towards Israel, an ally that is widely believed to possess nuclear weapons, and countries like Iran and North Korea.

Despite the lack of official acknowledgment, it is widely accepted that Israel has a substantial nuclear arsenal (Kroenig, 2018). However, the U.S. has maintained a policy of ambiguity towards Israel's nuclear program, neither confirming nor denying its existence (Bahgat, 2007). This stance is in stark contrast to the U.S. approach towards Iran and North Korea, both of which have faced severe economic sanctions and the threat of military action for their pursuit of nuclear technology (Sridharan, 2019).

Critics argue that this discrepancy in treatment is a clear example of double standards, with the U.S. overlooking the nuclear capabilities of its ally, Israel, while taking a hardline stance against adversaries (Bahgat, 2007). This perception is further fueled by the U.S. provision of substantial military aid to Israel, which some argue indirectly supports its nuclear program (Kroenig, 2018).

The perceived double standard in non-proliferation policies has implications for the U.S. credibility and moral authority on the global stage. It undermines the U.S. position as a neutral arbiter of non-proliferation efforts and provides ammunition for countries like Iran and North Korea to question the fairness and legitimacy of U.S. policies (Sridharan, 2019).

2.7.3.2 The promotion of democracy

The promotion of democracy has been a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy rhetoric, with the U.S. presenting itself as a champion of democratic values and principles. However, the U.S. has been accused of applying double standards when it comes to the actual implementation of its democracy promotion efforts, leading to criticism and resentment from various nations (Carothers, 2017).

One prominent example of this perceived double standard is the U.S. approach towards authoritarian regimes in regions like the Middle East. While the U.S. has been vocal in its criticism of undemocratic practices and human rights violations in adversarial countries, it has maintained close ties with authoritarian allies in the region, such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt (Kienle, 2015).

Critics argue that this discrepancy in treatment is a clear example of double standards, with the U.S. overlooking the lack of democratic governance and human rights abuses by its allies, while taking a hardline stance against adversaries (Carothers, 2017). This perception is further fueled by the U.S. provision of substantial military aid and support to these authoritarian regimes, which some argue undermines the credibility of its democracy promotion efforts (Kienle, 2015).

The perceived double standard in democracy promotion has implications for the U.S. credibility and moral authority on the global stage. It undermines the U.S. position as a neutral arbiter of democratic principles and provides ammunition for adversarial countries to question the fairness and legitimacy of U.S. policies (Carothers, 2017).

2.7.3.3 Environmental Policies and the Perceived Double Standard

The United States has positioned itself as a leader in addressing global environmental challenges, such as climate change and biodiversity loss. However, the U.S. has faced criticism for applying double standards in its environmental policies, which has fueled resentment and erosion of trust from other nations (Bang et al., 2016).

One prominent example of this perceived double standard is the U.S. historical resistance to international environmental treaties and agreements. Despite being one of the largest emitters of greenhouse gases, the U.S. refused to ratify the Kyoto Protocol, a

landmark international agreement aimed at reducing emissions (Byrne et al., 2009). This stance was seen as a double standard, with the U.S. demanding action from other countries while being reluctant to take significant domestic measures.

Critics have also pointed to the discrepancy between the U.S. rhetoric on environmental protection and its domestic policies. While advocating for global action on issues like deforestation and biodiversity loss, the U.S. has been accused of prioritizing economic interests over environmental concerns within its borders (Bang et al., 2016). Examples include the rollback of environmental regulations and the promotion of fossil fuel extraction on public lands.

2.8 US benefits from the rise of terrorism.

The rise of terrorism, especially in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, provided several significant benefits for the United States, though these benefits came at considerable costs and challenges. It is important to approach this subject with nuance and recognize the complex trade-offs involved.

Firstly, the "War on Terror" led to a massive increase in defense spending, which acted as a form of economic stimulus. Between 2001 and 2011, the U.S. spent over \$1.5 trillion on counterterrorism and homeland security efforts (Hellmich, 2011). This influx of spending boosted manufacturing, technology, and construction sectors tied to defense contracts, creating jobs and driving growth in the defense and security industries.

Secondly, the threat of terrorism provided a rationale for the U.S. to intervene militarily in countries like Afghanistan and Iraq. This allowed the U.S. to project power and influence in strategically important regions like the Middle East and Central Asia.

Such interventions enhanced the U.S. ability to shape geopolitical dynamics, secure access to resources, and counter the influence of adversaries like Iran and Russia.

Thirdly, in response to the perceived threat of terrorism, the U.S. created new security agencies, such as the Department of Homeland Security, and significantly expanded its surveillance and intelligence-gathering capabilities. Measures like the Patriot Act granted the government expanded powers for monitoring communications and collecting data. While controversial, these measures were seen by proponents as enhancing national security and thwarting potential attacks.

The 9/11 attacks and the subsequent "War on Terror" initially rallied public support behind the government and its policies, providing political capital for the administration to pursue its agenda. This included measures like the invasion of Iraq, which may have been more difficult to justify in the absence of the terrorism threat.

Finally, the threat of terrorism was used to justify a range of domestic and foreign policy changes. The Patriot Act, for example, granted the government expanded powers for surveillance, detention, and other measures. This allowed the executive branch to accrue greater authority and influence over various domains, from immigration to law enforcement.

Conclusion

Critics may argue that there are ulterior motives behind US foreign policy actions, it is essential to approach such claims with caution and skepticism. The US government's stated objectives in its foreign policy typically revolve around promoting national security, protecting American interests, fostering stability, and promoting democracy and human rights. While there have been instances where US actions have unintended consequences or been criticized for exacerbating conflicts, it is generally not accurate to suggest that the US actively seeks to benefit from terrorism or chaos in third world countries.

It is true that US military interventions in third world countries like Afghanistan, Pakistan and Yemen have contributed to creating instability and breeding resentment among local populations, which in turn has fueled the rise of terrorism, but, it is also important to differentiate between the unintended consequences of US foreign policy actions, such as the destabilization of certain regions following military interventions, and the deliberate pursuit of chaos and terrorism for strategic gain. While the US has at times supported authoritarian regimes or engaged in interventions that have negative repercussions, these actions are typically driven by complex geopolitical considerations rather than a desire for its own sake.

In conclusion, while it is crucial to critically examine and hold accountable US foreign policy actions, it is essential to base assessments on evidence and facts rather than unfounded claims or conspiracy theories. The relationship between US foreign policy and terrorism is complex and multifaceted, and it is important to approach the topic with nuance and a critical perspective.

General Conclusion

This study attempted to analyze evidence related to the potential involvement of US I the rise of the worlds' hardest enigma. From the analysis of the principals of the American foreign policy, military interventions and their objectives and impact, it is now evident that the United States has played a major role in the rise of terrorism over the past few decades. Through its foreign policy decisions and military interventions, the U.S. has directly and indirectly contributed to the conditions that have fueled the growth of terrorist organizations and extremist ideologies.

One of the primary ways the U.S. has contributed to the rise of terrorism is through its involvement in various conflicts and regime change operations in the Middle East and other regions. The U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, based on faulty intelligence about weapons of mass destruction, destabilized the entire region and created a power vacuum that groups like al-Qaeda and ISIS were able to exploit. The brutal tactics used by U.S. forces, such as harsh interrogation techniques and civilian casualties, further inflamed anti-American sentiments and provided a powerful recruitment tool for terrorist groups.

The U.S. has historically supported authoritarian regimes and provided military aid to countries with poor human rights records, often in the name of strategic interests or counterterrorism efforts. This has bred resentment among local populations and fueled the narrative of Western hypocrisy and double standards, which terrorist groups have capitalized on for recruitment and propaganda purposes.

The U.S. drone strike program, while aimed at eliminating terrorist leaders, has also resulted in significant civilian casualties, further radicalizing local populations and perpetuating the cycle of violence. The opaque nature of these operations and lack of accountability have undermined the moral authority of the U.S. in the eyes of many.

U.S. approach to counterterrorism, which has heavily relied on military force and intervention, has failed to address the underlying socio-economic and political factors that contribute to the rise of extremism. This short-sighted strategy has often exacerbated the very conditions it sought to address, perpetuating a cycle of violence and instability.

While the U.S. has valid national security concerns and has been a victim of devastating terrorist attacks, its policies and actions have undoubtedly played a significant role in the rise of terrorism globally. Addressing this complex issue will require a more nuanced and comprehensive approach that addresses root causes, promotes diplomacy and development, and upholds human rights and the rule of law.

References

- Adams, J. (2020). *The Global Impact of American Military Interventions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ahram, A. I. (2015). The role of the United States in the rise of ISIS. In *Narrating ISIS* (pp. 25-37). Gerlach Press.
- Bamford, J. (2005). *A pretext for war: 9/11, Iraq, and the abuse of America's intelligence agencies*. Anchor Books.
- Belasco, A. (2014). *The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terror Operations Since 9/11*. Congressional Research Service.
- Berntsen, G., & Pezzullo, R. (2005). *Jawbreaker: The attack on bin Laden and al-Qaeda*. Crown.
- Bhui, K., Everitt, B., & Jones, E. (2012). Might depression, psychosocial adversity, and limited social assets explain vulnerability to and resistance against violent radicalisation? *PLoS ONE*, 7(5), e34851. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0034851>
- Bilmes, L. (2013). *The financial legacy of Iraq and Afghanistan: How wartime spending decisions will constrain future national security budgets*. HKS Faculty Research Working Paper Series, RWP13-006.
- Borum, R. (2004). *Psychology of terrorism*. University of South Florida. <https://web.archive.org/web/20180819191524/https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/208552.pdf>
- Boyle, M. J. (2013). The costs and consequences of drone warfare. *International Affairs*, 89(1), 1-29.
- Boyle, M. J. (2020). The legal and ethical implications of drone warfare. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 19(2), 105-126.

- Brown University, Costs of War Project. (n.d.). Afghanistan War. Retrieved from <https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/costs/human/military/afghan>
- Brown, A. (1995). Humanitarian Interventions: The Role of the United States. *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs*, 10(2), 87-102.
- Brown, A., & White, B. (2018). *Understanding American Military Interventions: A Comprehensive Analysis*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Burke, J. (2004). *Al-Qaeda: The true story of radical Islam*. I.B. Tauris.
- Burnham, G., Lafta, R., Doocy, S., & Roberts, L. (2006). Mortality after the 2003 invasion of Iraq: a cross-sectional cluster sample survey. *The Lancet*, 368(9545), 1421-1428.
- Byers, M. (2005). Agreeing to disagree: Security Council resolution 1441 and intentional ambiguity. *Global Governance*, 10, 165-186.
- Byman, D. (2008). *The Five Front War: The Better Way to Fight Global Jihad*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cameron, G. (1999). Ideological Terrorism. In: *Nuclear Terrorism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230599222_4
- Carothers, T. (2022). Promoting democracy & fighting terror: US strategy toward the Muslim world. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Clark, E. (2019). *Debating the Ethics of American Military Interventions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, R. A. (2004). *Against all enemies: Inside America's war on terror*. Free Press.
- Coll, S. (2004). *Ghost wars: The secret history of the CIA, Afghanistan, and bin Laden, from the Soviet invasion to September 10, 2001*. Penguin Press.
- Coll, S. (2004). *Ghost wars: The secret history of the CIA, Afghanistan, and bin Laden, from the Soviet invasion to September 10, 2001*. Penguin Press.

- Congressional Research Service. (2020). Costs of Major U.S. Wars. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IF11086.pdf>
- Cordesman, A. H. (2008). *The Iraq War: Strategy, Tactics, and Military Lessons*. Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- Cordesman, A. H., & Khazai, S. (2003). *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Real Threat*. Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- Crenshaw, M. (1981). The causes of terrorism. *Comparative Politics*, 13(4), 379-399. <https://doi.org/10.2307/421717>
- Drake, C. J. M. (1998). The role of ideology in terrorists' target selection. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 10(2), 53–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546559808427457>
- Enders, W., & Olson, E. (2012). Measuring the economic costs of terrorism. In M. R. Garfinkel & S. Skaperdas (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Economics of Peace and Conflict* (pp. 223-251). Oxford University Press.
- Freedman, L. (2005). *The Official History of the Falklands Campaign* (Vol. 2). Routledge.
- Frischknecht, F. (2003). The History of Biological Warfare. *EMBO Reports*, 4(S1), S47-S52. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1326439/>
- Fukuyama, F. (1989). "The End of History?" *The National Interest*, 16, 3-18.
- Fukuyama, F. (2022). *Liberalism and its discontents*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gasiorowski, M. J. (1995). Economic crisis and political regime change: An event history analysis. *American Political Science Review*, 89(4), 882-897.
- Gerges, F. A. (2005). *The far enemy: Why jihad went global*. Cambridge University Press.
- Green, M. J. (2013). "The Pivot: The Future of American Statecraft in Asia." *Foreign Affairs*, 92(6), 70-83.

- Hafez, M., & Mullins, C. (2015). The radicalization puzzle: A theoretical synthesis of empirical approaches to homegrown extremism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 38(11), 958-975. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2015.1051375>
- Hashim, A. S. (2014). The Islamic State: From al-Qaeda affiliate to caliphate. *Middle East Policy*, 21(4), 69-83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mepo.12096>
- Herring, E., & Rangwala, G. (2005). *Iraq in Fragments: The Occupation and its Legacy*. Cornell University Press.
- Herring, G. C. (2008). *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776*. Oxford University Press.
- Hoffman, B. (2006). *Inside Terrorism (Revised and expanded ed.)*. Columbia University Press.
- Horgan, J. (2008). From profiles to pathways and roots to routes: Perspectives from psychology on radicalization into terrorism. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 618(1), 80-94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716208317539>
- Huber, D. (2008). Democracy assistance in the Middle East and the "advance of pariah" dilemma. In M. Ottaway & J. Choucair-Vizoso (Eds.), *Beyond the Facade* (pp. 15-35). Carnegie Endowment.
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2020). "The End of the Liberal International Order?" *Foreign Affairs*, 99(1), 82-94.
- Ilić, A. (2021). Discourse on modern terrorism. *Crimen*, 32(3), 309-341. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358197713_Discourse_on_modern_terrorism
- Jenkins, J. Philip (2024). *terrorism*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/terrorism>

- Johnson, R. (2020). *American Foreign Policy: Principles and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Johnson, R., & Miller, S. (1993). American Military Interventions and International Law. *Yale Journal of International Law*, 18(3), 45-60.
- Jones, C., & Brown, D. (2016). The Role of American Military Interventions in the Post-Cold War Era. *International Relations Quarterly*, 42(3), 215-230.
- Jones, C., & Smith, L. (1998). American Strategic Interests and Military Interventions: A Historical Perspective. *Security Studies Journal*, 22(1), 15-30.
- Juergensmeyer, M. (2003). *Terror in the mind of God: The global rise of religious violence*. University of California Press.
- Kennan, G. F. (1947). "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." *Foreign Affairs*, 25(4), 566-582.
- Kepel, G. (2002). *Jihad: The trail of political Islam*. Harvard University Press.
- Koduvayur, V. & Hasan, L.O. (2020). *Counterterrorism: A value-based strategy for the United Arab Emirates*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kruglanski, A. W., Chen, X., Dechesne, M., Fishman, S., & Orehek, E. (2009). Fully committed: Suicide bombers' motivation and the quest for personal significance. *Political Psychology*, 30(3), 331-357. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2009.00698.x>
- Kruglanski, A. W., Gelfand, M. J., Bélanger, J. J., Sheveland, A., Hetiarachchi, M., & Gunaratna, R. (2014). The psychology of radicalization and deradicalization: How significance quest impacts violent extremism. *Advances in Political Psychology*, 35(S1), 69-93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12163>
- Kydd, A. H., & Walter, B. F. (2006). The strategies of terrorism. *International Security*, 31(1), 49-80. <https://doi.org/10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.49>

- LaFeber, W. (1994). *The American Age: United States Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad since 1750*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Lefebvre, S. (2003). *Perspectives on ethno-nationalist/separatist terrorism*. Conflict Studies Research Centre Monthly. Retrieved from: https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/39989/06_Aug.pdf
- Mapping Militant Organizations: The Islamic State. (2019, August 15). Stanford University. <https://cisac.fsi.stanford.edu/mappingmilitants/profiles/islamic-state>
- Martin, G. (2016). *Understanding terrorism: Challenges, perspectives, and issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Martin, G. (2017). Types of Terrorism. In M. Dawson, D. Kisku, P. Gupta, J. Sing, & W. Li (Eds.), *Developing Next-Generation Countermeasures for Homeland Security Threat Prevention* (pp. 1-16). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-0703-1.ch001>
- Michaelson, R. (2019, April 25). The US is providing air support for the Saudi bombing of Yemen. That has to stop. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/apr/25/us-air-support-saudi-bombing-yemen-trump>
- Miller, A.D. (2022). A new US strategy for relations with Saudi Arabia. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <https://carnegieendowment.org/2022/04/06/new-u.s.-strategy-for-relations-with-saudi-arabia-pub-86846>
- Miller, S. et al. (2019). Multinational Coalitions and American Military Interventions. *Journal of International Affairs*, 68(2), 127-142.
- Nia, M. M. (2010). From old to new terrorism: The changing nature of international security. *Global Studies Journal*, 18, 1–20.

- Purkiss, J., & Serle, J. (2017). Obama's covert drone war in numbers. *The Bureau of Investigative Journalism*, 1-8.
- Rashid, A. (2000). *Taliban: Militant Islam, oil and fundamentalism in Central Asia*. Yale University Press.
- Rashid, A. (2008). *Descent into chaos: The United States and the failure of nation building in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Central Asia*. Penguin Books.
- Reeves, Jeremy R. "A New Typology for State-Sponsored International Terrorism." Naval Postgraduate School, December 2011. Available at the Robert Lansing Institute: [A New Typology for State-Sponsored International Terrorism \(Robert Lansing Institute\)](#)
- Riedel, B. (2008). *The search for Al Qaeda: Its leadership, ideology, and future*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Robinson, T. (1999). The Role of the United States in Peacekeeping Missions: Lessons from the Balkans. *International Peacekeeping*, 6(2), 123-140.
- Robinson, T. (2017). Motivations Behind American Military Interventions: A Comparative Analysis. *Foreign Policy Studies*, 30(4), 321-335.
- Rollins, J., & Wilson, C. (2007). *Terrorist Capabilities for Cyberattack: Overview and Policy Issues*. *Congressional Research Service*. Retrieved from <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/RL33123.pdf>.
- Sageman, M. (2004). *Understanding terror networks*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Scheuer, M. (2011). *Osama bin Laden*. Oxford University Press.
- Schmid, A. P. (2013). Radicalisation, de-radicalisation, counter-radicalisation: A conceptual discussion and literature review. *ICCT Research Paper*, 97(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.19165/2013.1.02>

- Schmitt, E. (2003, March 22). A nation at war: The air campaign; Cruise missiles lead an attack to shatter Iraq. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/22/world/a-nation-at-war-the-air-campaign-cruise-missiles-lead-an-attack-to-shatter-iraq.html>
- Schmitt, E., & Shanker, T. (2003, March 18). Bush issues ultimatum to Hussein. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/18/world/threats-and-responses-the-showdown-bush-issues-ultimatum-to-hussein.html>
- Schmitz, D.F. (2006). The United States and right-wing dictatorships, 1965–1989. Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, L. (2018). American Military Interventions: Historical Perspectives. *Journal of Military History*, 82(1), 45-60.
- Taylor, M. (2015). The Impact of American Military Interventions on Regional Security Dynamics. *Security Studies Journal*, 25(3), 210-225.
- Taylor, M., & Wilson, K. (2000). Counterterrorism and American Military Interventions. *Terrorism Studies Quarterly*, 25(4), 67-82.
- Trapp, K. N. (2011). State responsibility for international terrorism. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199592999.001.0001
- U.S. Department of Defense. (2021). Casualty Status: Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR) and Operation Freedom's Sentinel (OFS). Retrieved from <https://dod.defense.gov/News/Casualty-Status/>
- Victoroff, J. (2005). The mind of the terrorist: A review and critique of psychological approaches. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 49(1), 3-42.
- Wilson, K. (2016). American Military Interventions and Global Politics. *Foreign Affairs*, 94(5), 80-95.
- Woodward, B. (2002). Bush at war. Simon & Schuster.

- Woodward, B. (2004). *Plan of attack*. Simon & Schuster
- Woodward, B. (2010). *Obama's wars*. Simon & Schuster.
- Wright, L. (2006). *The looming tower: Al-Qaeda and the road to 9/11*. Knopf.
- Zafirovski, M., & Rodeheaver, D. G. (2013). *Modernity and terrorism: From anti-modernity to global terror*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill. doi:10.1163/9789004242883

ملخص:

تتناول هذه الأطروحة دور الولايات المتحدة في تنامي الإرهاب، مع التركيز على كيفية تأثير السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية والتدخلات العسكرية على الأنشطة الإرهابية العالمية. تبدأ الأطروحة بتعريف الإرهاب من منظور نفسي وأيديولوجي واستراتيجي، مما يوفر إطارًا لفهم العلاقة بين الإجراءات الأمريكية والإرهاب. ثم تم تحليل الأحداث الرئيسية مثل الغزو الأمريكي لأفغانستان في عام 2001 والعراق في عام 2003، وظهور القاعدة وداعش، والتدخلات الأمريكية في سوريا واليمن. تظهر الأطروحة بأن هذه الإجراءات قد خلقت حالة من عدم الاستقرار وفراغات في السلطة، مما سهل نمو الجماعات الإرهابية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، تأخذ الأطروحة في الاعتبار الإجراءات الأمريكية الأخرى التي ساهمت في الفوضى في العالم الثالث وتناقش كيف أن صعود الإرهاب قد خدم في بعض الأحيان المصالح الاستراتيجية الأمريكية من خلال فحص نقدي لهذه الأحداث التاريخية والسياسات. تسلط هذه الدراسة الضوء على العلاقة المعقدة بين السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية وانتشار الإرهاب.