

US Strategic Objectives in Afghanistan and Iraq before the Events of September 11, 2001 and Beyond

Hani Mefleh Hamdon,

Al Al-Bayt University –Jordan

Hani A.M.AkhoRashida

Al Al-Bayt University- Jordan

Abstract:

In an analytical monitoring of American objectives in Afghanistan and Iraq, as part of the US campaign against terrorism since the Cold war and until the US invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003, this research aims to explore the nature of American goals throughout this period, and how Washington invested the events of September 11, 2001 in passing its policy and strategic objectives, most notably the pre-emptive military positioning in geostrategic zones that constitute the heart of the world; in the Middle East and Central Asia, near the borders of former enemies: Russia.

The heir to an economically collapsed Soviet Union, not militarily, and potential enemies (China) or a group of Asian countries may enter into alliances which constitutes a rival pole for the United States of America in the future. So, the United States came out with a national strategy about resorting to wars (preventive / proactive) and not waiting for the enemy to threaten or control the strategic and vital areas of American interests, but the United States needs to access these areas before others and before entering into a state of competition or conflict with the enemy which could embody a threat to America and its interests in various important regions of the world.

Keywords: Strategic Goals, USA, Afghanistan, Iraq, 11 September 2001

Introduction

Despite the great influence and military and economic power enjoyed by the United States of America especially after the end of the Cold War, as the sole pole on international affairs, but this imperial project of the United States violated the symbols of power and prestige in its home on 11 September 2001, and raised the war under the slogans of extremism (who is not with us is against us), and declared its controversial methods of preventive wars and strikes preemptive or abortion, and the American war on Iraq in 2003 was the last wars fought by the United States in the new century. But it is certainly not the only war in it, preceded by a US-led international war on Islamic lands like Afghanistan after the September 11, 2001 attacks. The United States has a long record of interventions and wars in the last century on the Arab territories, such as the Second Gulf War in Iraq in 2003.

All of Washington's wars were under different pretexts; they were justified in the language of democracy, environmental protection, freedom, and human rights principles. After the events of September 11, these principles were put aside for use when necessary and replaced by justifications and a new language. For reasons and security reasons, the elimination of terrorism is one of its objectives, and there are political and economic goals that the United States seeks to achieve.

It is clear that all the American strategic goals and plans that were drawn after the Cold War are concentrated in carefully selected geographical areas of the Islamic world, which are directly referred to by the United States as "the new target and the enemy".(Such as political Islam, Islamic extremism, crusade, Islamic fascism) and other US political vocabulary, and in practical terms during the military moves to surround the lands and Arab and Islamic countries, and launched wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but under the pretext of the war on terrorism. This will be discussed in this research.

Research problem:

The problem of this research stems from the fact that it deals with a topic related to American policy to control the oil reservoirs. In the last decade of the last century, it was found that all countries of the world are seeking sources of energy from sources at cheap prices. Naturally, oil is linked to geography, Elements of international strategy. This is because of the importance of the overall development processes in the contemporary world and is problematic in itself that the superpowers create pretexts and justifications through which wars are waged to control those sources, for example the United States of America of hot wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, under the titles and its stated objectives are the war on terror.

However, they have made reservations - not publicly - about other (undeclared) goals, and are surrounded by a lot of ambiguity. These goals were revealed by the place and time of those wars, and even by the historical experience of US policy toward these countries with concern and anticipation, and to try to understand the undeclared American goals. The research tries to answer the following questions:

What is the importance of Afghanistan, Iraq and the Caspian region for US English policy?

American campaign against terrorism before and after the events of September 11, 2001?

Is it just revenge for what happened to it on September 11 or is it an exploitation of this event to complete the policy of hegemony and uniqueness of American encirclement of countries with a weight at the regional and global level?

What tools does the US use to achieve the post-Cold War goals?

What are the declared and undeclared American strategic goals that mobilize armies and wage wars in the Gulf region and near the Central Asian region?

What is the political strategy of the United States towards the Muslim world under the administration of President (Barack Obama)?

1.0 US policy towards Afghanistan and Iraq before 9/11

1.1 US policy towards Afghanistan during the Cold War and beyond:

1.1.1 US policy toward Afghanistan during the Cold War

The United States - from the reign of President Ronald Reagan in the 1980s - is preparing the world to introduce a new term into political terminology, namely international terrorism, and adopted a military strategy (deterrence and containment) during the Soviet-American competition to gain new areas of influence in Areas. The Third World and each of the two superpowers had to invent a pivot in which publicity was directed to weaken the image of the other in front of local public opinion and world public opinion. "It was the focus of American propaganda (defending the free world and political democracy) and was the focus of Soviet propaganda (social justice and victory for the oppressed), the weapon of religion was the tool that had its effectiveness on Public opinion in the Arab and Islamic countries for the United States, taking advantage of the position of Islam from Marxism and from (the famous statement of Marx (religion opium of peoples).

The US weapon of atonement branded every political movement opposed to infidelity and became all national action with the American goals being described as a communist and every kaafir (disbeliever). [2] This led US Secretary of State (Jules Foster Dulles) in 1955 to declare that religions should be used to resist "atheistic communism". The anti-Soviet Arab anti-communist rhetoric was useful to the United States and portrayed the anti-Soviet war in Afghanistan. The Muslim country violated by the forces of communism and atheism is a sacred jihad, no more than a jihad, and the largest propaganda campaign for the success of the idea of jihad against the Soviets. Indeed, the Mujahedeen rushed to present themselves in order to save Afghanistan from Communist colonization. [4].

Islamic groups throughout the world were supported throughout the Cold War. The siege of Central Asia was the goal of the CIA by creating a "green belt" and then igniting the underlying Islamic nationalism in the Islamic republics of the Soviet Union. On the grounds that Islam is more anti-communism than Catholicism and Orthodoxy and closer to the morality of capitalism?

To show the United States new facts and indicators in the conflict with the Soviet Union, declare the end of the Cold War will lead to the end of confrontation with the Soviet pole, they were preparing for a new world order, which will not provide the alternative enemy that replaces the old enemy, which guarantees the continuity of the individual control of the United States of America to the world, and has been shown this alternative under the name of international terrorism. Without the idea or function of the enemy, the United States would not have led the Western world after World War II, had it not been for this position, or would have faced great difficulties to achieve that leadership. After the Cold War, it needed a new enemy and its propaganda focused on the direction of the Islamic political movements with which the confrontation began in the first half of the 1990s and became an ally and friend of yesterday.

1.1.2 US policy towards Afghanistan after the Cold War:

After a decade of occupation of the Soviet Union to Afghanistan, the Russians killed one million Afghans and displaced about 5 million, and the Russian army lost 15,000 thousand troops, and when the Afghan people - and with the help of Arab Afghans supported by the United States - to force the Soviet Union out of Afghan territory in the 1980s. This success was admired by the Western world, especially the American side. [7] But after that success, Afghanistan did not enjoy peace: when the communist regime fell in Kabul in April 1992 - three years after the withdrawal of Soviet forces in 1989 - a new round of fighting between rival Islamic and ethnic factions broke out; other countries such as Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Uzbekistan have entered the newly independent state, to support one or the other of the conflicting parties.

In 1994, the Taliban emerged as a new player aspiring to power on the basis of a program based on restoring order and adherence to Islamic law and succeeded in wresting power from Hikmet Yar, The Taliban were an anti-Iranian movement.

The tension between Russia on the one hand and Iran on the other entered the Taliban regime in talks with representatives of American oil companies were looking for a stable government of Afghanistan can protect the pipeline oil and gas planned to reach the Pacific, but the issue of growing strong Islamic trend in Afghanistan Led by the Taliban, disturbed Western governments during the 1990s, when the Taliban regime provoked Western discontent by committing and destroying the Buddha statues, an international attack on human heritage Since that time. With the game of national interests, the global political rush towards the oil-rich countries of the Muslim world was accompanied by a new attempt to use the old Muslim warriors in Afghanistan, where they became evil to the European and American societies that were inspired by the media influence as heroes and freedom fighters (10). Islamic fundamentalism - after the collapse of communism - became the new enemy and the Islamic world began its state and civilization described by this description.

1.1.3 American policy towards the phenomenon of terrorism after the Cold War:

After the Cold War, the United States suffered several attacks in its embassies in Kenya and Tanzania on August 7, 1998, the United States after the military attacks on the US Air Force on what it called the infrastructure of the group (bin Laden) in Afghanistan, in response to those bombings and repeated such attacks American missile under the signature of President Bill Clinton on Sudan in August 1998 (11). The US response is the first military response to attacks that were not the first in themselves since the early 1990s, although the previous attacks were accused by Islamist groups led by Osama bin Laden, which - according to the American classification - the original source of terrorism to consider that It has no central management to control it.

The confrontation reached its peak with the arrival of George W Bush to the White House in 2000, between the United States and Islamist groups that he described as terrorist groups, particularly al-Qaeda, especially following the bombing of the USS Cole in Port Aden on 12 October 2000. As a result of that bombing, the George W. Bush administration showed a great deal of hardness about dealing with terrorism. It was considered one of the biggest threats to American interests in the world. It also sought to link directly between Islamic movements and armed resistance movements and terrorism, especially anti-Israel movements. Its threats to the international Islamic groups in the Middle East and in Central and South Asia were against the use of force against it. Despite the US military response to bin Laden's bases in Afghanistan and the pharmaceutical factory in Sudan, the attacks did not result in casualties, but they depicted a picture of bin Laden in the imagination of the people as Washington's most dangerous enemy and the most elusive Between them (12).

1.2 US policy toward Iraq during the Cold war and Beyond:

1.2.1 The dual containment policy towards Iraq and Iran during the Cold War:

After the success of the Iranian revolution against the Shah, the Iran-Iraq war broke out and lasted for eight years (1980-1988), during which more than 1 million people were killed and nearly two million injured and disabled. It was known as the first Gulf War, because it took place among the two strongest Islamic Gulf states, and because it is in the forefront of its attempts to dominate the victor over the Gulf region, which is a huge oil interests on the one hand, and one of the American strategic axes in its plans to control the Gulf region. In that war, the United States supported Iraq against Iran, for several reasons, the most important of which is the issue of hostage-taking at the US Embassy in Tehran. Whatever the reasons, Washington benefited from the Iraqi-Iranian conflict and its function in line with the American and Israeli aspirations and political goals in the Arab and Muslim world. Throughout this conflict and under the slogan of "divide and rule" the United States sought to weaken the Iraqi and Iranian regimes by supplying the two countries with weapons, and the human nature of the two Muslim countries. This policy was known as the Iran Goat incident, which is the scandal of supplying Iran with American weapons. This scandal led to public embarrassment for President Ronald Reagan. Despite this scandal, supplying Iran with weapons was a tactical step imposed by the war and the priorities of the American goals in the continuation of the military fold of Iraq and its economic exhaustion.

1.2.2 US policy toward Iraq after the cold war

After the Cold War, since 1990 there has been one military force, the United States of America. [15] This has strengthened the importance of the Arab region in the American strategy, using it in the economic game as a trump card against both Japan and Europe led by Germany and France. With an important geostrategic location, it represents the heart of the ancient continents (Asia, Africa and Europe). In addition to controlling and supervising its waterways, its control over the oil wells is the first engine of this conflict. The geographical location of Iraq is one of the main components of the Arab world, and the elements of its power.

It is also critical to the security and stability of the Gulf region, which is of particular importance to the United States, and a major determinant of US policy toward the Arab world.

The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990, one of the reasons the first opportunity for the United States in the final elimination of the most powerful army in the Arab Gulf States, and try to end the rule of Saddam Hussein, did not miss this opportunity, the administration of President Bush Jr., the mobilization of forces to more than thirty countries under Decisions (international legitimacy) to strike Iraq militarily. This American response confirmed that the United States will not allow for the foreseeable future any attempt by any local or international to dominate the oil reserves in the Arabian Gulf. Thus, the Gulf region has become a US military lake where its troops are deployed whenever they wish, in accordance with various agreements with the Gulf States. Accordingly, in order to weaken the Iraqi regime, it was introduced into the search for weapons of mass destruction for more than a decade, despite the issuance of a series of international resolutions against Iraq and the formation of multiple committees, did not obtain evidence to prove the US claim the existence of such weapons, the main objectives of the administration of President George W. Bush were to topple the regime in Iraq for the purpose of settling old accounts. This goal has not been achieved since President George HW Bush. However, the entry of major events that changed the world, such as the events of September 11, 2001, under the slogan "Who is not with us is against us".

2.0 The events of September 11, 2001 and the declaration of war on Afghanistan

2.1 the events of September 11 and the American and international reaction:

2.1.1 The events of September 11, 2001:

The United States of America suffered the worst national disaster in its history on September 11, 2001, when three commercial planes turned into mobile weapons full of high explosives and dropped them unknown to the symbols of power and prestige and American sovereignty, and in the home, and killed more than 3000 people and created a case (17), followed by panic and fear (18). This deep security breach undermined the theory of absolute security, the fall of the wall of security immunity from the United States of America by the fall of the two collapsed towers on the ground by the impact of aircraft, and the breach of security and intelligence by the United States.¹⁹ These operations were not the result of unintentional human error, Intentionally, and carefully planned (20). Despite warnings by the US authorities, to the Bush administration, this has been deafening and hindered subsequent investigations. Despite the event, the US administration quickly absorbed the events of September 11 in its outline policy and global goals. The events of September 11 had its international repercussions, namely, the adoption of strict international security measures, the launching of an international campaign against terrorism, and, according to US strategic objectives, wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are still going on today. Here we can say that the events of September 11, 2001 were not transient or temporary events as they were before attacks on US interests, they are in fact pivotal events where history is no longer in its context of decades ago, these events established a new phase which has a great impact on the new world order in terms of the ability of the United States to continue to lead the world, ²¹ and to complete the imposition of a world order is completely different in the direction of the world order that the world wide has lived throughout the twentieth century.

2.2 American and international reaction after the events:

2.2.1. American reaction to the events of September 11:

Following these events, the United States took all security measures to protect the American people and worked to reorganize the American security establishment, ²³ including the US military, in America and in the world on high alert and strengthen inspection and measures to confront similar incidents throughout the world. US bases have been subject to enhanced security measures. The US President officially announced within hours of the names of the suspects that the United States (FPI) identified, the "state of war with terrorism" and that it was involved in Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda network, and in the preparation of American society by the coming of war on what he describes" the enemies":

"Tonight, we are a country that is at risk and called for the defense of freedom," President George W. Bush said in an address to a joint congressional hearing on September 20, 2001. "Our grief has turned into anger and anger at design." Whether we bring our enemies to justice or bring justice to justice, our enemies will be brought to justice ". Bush vowed to rid the world of the evils of "not letting evil stay." The United States took advantage of the events of 11 September quickly and systematically, and the quick reaction that was revealed by President George W. Bush in calling for his crusade only confirmed the aim of the American administration by declaring a relentless war against the enemies whom it called terrorists and those behind them from countries and networks distributed around the world (26).

2.3 International Position of September 11:

In the aftermath of the military option, American leaders were wailing to extort and terrorize many of the world's regimes. "The attack falls under the heading of international terrorism, an act of war that requires strong military action, and the new strategy of the United States of America is based on a comprehensive confrontation of all that it considers terrorist organizations and the rest of the world has no choice but to stand with terrorism or to the contrary; "these famous rhetoric, which divided the world into two parts (with and against), in order to incite the world to enter the ranks of the international coalition. In the same direction, the former Secretary of State (Colin Powell) The United States is intent on establishing a strong international alliance on the NATO and Middle East countries to fight terrorism. [28] It was important for the US administration to organize allies and friends into the US campaign voluntarily or unwillingly, your accumulation would mean the beginning of the decline of America's leadership to the world, yet, it is possible to say that the United States not only won the support of its major competitors, but also found loyal partners in its war against terrorism. [29] Some countries have even exceeded the limits required to harass movements Such as Russia and China, which have found in the war on terror an opportunity for the two countries to eliminate the rebellion of armed minorities within their borders.

This is the price of those countries' cooperation with the United States in the war on terror, which was not expected before the events of September 11, because of the political differences between the United States and those international powers individually, but the events of September 11, led to the building of a new alliance and partnership between the two sides, and created a new atmosphere in the nature of international relations. (31) For its part, did not exclude the Arab and Islamic countries outside the squadron that condemned the attacks of September 11, and declared its standing with the United States in the campaign against terrorism, and advised the US government to linger, and not to embark on military operations before the definitive determination of the enemy. The aim of these operations is to combat terrorism by all means, not revenge. Apart from the official positions calculated, many positions were issued by analysts and intellectuals from around the world ranging from condemnation to attacks and other positions. What were the real reasons for this great event in America? "The September 11 attacks certainly involve horrific sectors, but the Americans should realize that they are only a reaction to the equally grave atrocities of US English policy since the last half century," said Professor Noam Chomsky. The United States has resorted to force almost all over the world. We do not forget the US intervention in East Timor, Central America and Vietnam, and how much support for Israel is a wave of resentment throughout the Muslim world.³² In the same vein, "Uri Avnery," who writes Connection Maariv newspaper 16.09.2001 m by saying, "America has sparked outrage in large parts of the world, not only because of its strength, but because of the way power is used in the killing of their dreams, it is hated by millions of Arabs because of its support for the Israeli occupation, and because of the suffering of the Palestinian people and the hatred of the Muslim masses because of its support for Jewish control of the Islamic holy sites in Jerusalem, American policy is responsible for creating a breeding ground for volunteers full of hatred and ready to sacrifice everything and the most precious thing, including the human soul in retaliation for the American grave digger and the horror of their children and the killer of their dreams. "33 In a bold challenge, Charles Johnson sees" "We believe in the United States that we do not deserve any blame for what happened on September 11." "The suicide bombers ... did not attack America," our political leaders and the media insist, even attacking US English policy, for Chalmers, a rebound in which the United States has won the awards of its imperialist policy towards the Third World, including its support for state terrorism. [34] How were the views, attitudes and attitudes of the September 11 events formal or popular or even after the Islamic paper was a winner against Moscow, it cooperated with these groups in Afghanistan to expel the Russians. The United States of America is now looking for alliances with Moscow to liquidate it. According to James Noyer, who believes that what happened in the United States of America was amplified in order to strengthen the belief of American and international public opinion that it was not possible to defend the United States against various terrorist acts. The launching of a war on terrorism outside the US is inevitable and Arab and Islamic countries are the main targets of this War, because of the origins of the aggressors involved in the attacks. "35 The realization of future American goals has been formulated and implemented to defend economic and strategic interests, and claims of defense of values are nothing but excuse to justify the logic of the war against terrorism, War P Rida in History (36).

2.4 American Declaration War on Afghanistan:

2.4.1 US justification for declaring war on Afghanistan:

The Taliban controlled Afghanistan during the September 11, 2001, attacks. After the September 11 attacks, American pretexts were needed to convict al-Qaeda, so all the US charges of Osama bin Laden were brought together as a result of the 1998 and 1998 bombings in Kenya and Tanzania. Yemen, in 2000, according to information Washington is the main financier of the attacks of September 11, located on the territory of Afghanistan, has become the task of pursuing the leader of the alleged terrorists bin Laden and topple the Taliban regime that hosts and provides protection,

The argument used by the US administration to justify war with its military forces and in a remote but important country to implement undeclared American objectives.

The United States did not make an effort to seek a UN resolution giving it the legitimacy of the war on Afghanistan. The Security Council did not delay the attacks of September 11, 2001 with the unanimous support of its members, and issued two resolutions on terrorism between the period from September 11 to the moment of the war on Afghanistan, the first resolution (1368) on 12 September 2001, and the second resolution No. 1373 on September 28, 2001, as well as the Assembly 1 on September 18 of the United Nations. The United Nations Resolution No. 56 of September 11 states that the attacks on September 11 constitute a threat to international peace and security. It adopted a number of urgent measures to counter the repercussions of the September 11 attacks and called for redoubling efforts to prevent and suppress terrorist acts by International Cooperation (37).

2.4.2 Announcing the First Wars of the Century in Afghanistan:

In the light of Security Council resolutions, George W. Bush's administration has stepped up the war on Afghanistan in a speech addressed to the American people and the world that the war began on the evening of 10/7/2001, the first war in the 21st century, 27 days after the events of New York and Washington. US President George W. Bush has threatened to launch a crusade against evil; most of the countries included in the "evil list" are Arab or Islamic states. This speech assured many in this world that the war did not begin after the September 11 attacks; directing selective operations according to a military mechanism in the context of objectives that are in harmony with the aim of the American strategy to isolate international terrorism. The American focus must have been on certain targets; at least in the first stage, pending the determination of the subsequent objectives, these goals were the destruction of the Taliban and al-Qaeda networks, a minority in Afghanistan, and the United States has been keen to involve the Arab and Islamic countries in the international front to fight (terrorism), because of the importance of these countries to the US operations in the pursuit of terrorists in terms of geographical location, Li provide Americans with intelligence information, and to provide logistical support and facilitation of air traffic from its territory, and it is important to involve the Arab and Islamic countries to show the process on the basis of the fight against it (terrorism) to the United States, away from the suspicion of hostility to Islam.

2.4.3 American (declared) goals of the war on Afghanistan:

The United States' stated objectives, after the events after 9/11, are as follows:

- A. The retaliation against the Taliban and the overthrow of its regime in Afghanistan and replacing it with the pro-regime, to restore the prestige of America, which was extracted under George W. Bush the impact of the events of September 11, 2001.
- B. The deployment of US forces in different parts of the world, to support the war on Afghanistan, which aims to pursue al-Qaeda terrorists wherever they are? Depriving them of any safe haven, eliminating al-Qaeda and arresting Osama bin Laden.
- C. The freedom of American action everywhere in the world to eliminate terrorism and start the battle under the name of "permanent freedom" and the absorption of Pakistan in alliance with America. US Secretary of Defense Ronald Rumsfeld said the war on terror is an open war that is not limited by time or place "a war that will not end with the occupation of an area, nor a military defeat". It requires long-term political, security and intelligence control. This war should lead to the completion of political-security control and to full transparency in the political and economic activities of all States ". The United States Government therefore sent a letter to the Security Council that the United States of America might expand its military operations beyond Afghanistan from the principle of self-defense adopted by the United Nations, which it might carry out military operations against States that supported terrorism.

2.4.4 American (unspoken) goals of the war on Afghanistan:

If the declared objectives of the US war on Afghanistan lie behind the legitimacy of self-defense and deterrence of terrorism, the undeclared objectives can be extrapolated from this war in that they were launched for the capture of oil and gas, particularly the oil markets in Central Asia, as well as the US military presence in strategic places, it is in the interest of the United States not to wait for the enemy to threaten or control these vital areas, but the United States to access these areas before and before entering into a state of competition or conflict with the potential enemy, which will pose a threat to America. The United States has come to its aid and is now closer to the supposed pipelines across the world, Afghanistan, which is counted from the spoils of this war, Washington has already begun to strengthen its strategic position in that region by building military bases in Kazakhstan, and provide railways, bridges, warehouses and communication centers and the transfer of military bases from one place to another as a strategy for the post-invasion of Afghanistan (43). The objectives can be extrapolated from the wider US undeclared goals through the United States of America through the securing of global hegemony, within the vision of US interests, and to prevent any regional bloc or international weakening, including:

1. The deployment of US forces, not the United Nations or NATO, under the shadow of the smoke of the war on terror in Central Asia, in order to secure direct military presence and not by means of this region of great importance (politically, security, economically) , and the failure of Turkey to do this function, this presence in the Caspian Sea region of the important reserves of oil and mineral resources in order to complete the conditions for the imposition of US dominance on the basic joints in the world and this goal is divided into two other goals 44; first, the need to dominate Central Asia, and decisive for Washington to control Gas and oil and strategic interests in the Caspian Sea, the second; prevent the growing strength of Islamic movements in Central Asia.
2. Preventing the expansion, weakening of the Chinese genie through the direct American presence in Central Asia and nothing else.
3. The continuation of the policy of containment of Russia by standing at the gates of Moscow militarily: Despite the disintegration of the Soviet Union, American policies have been continuing since the end of the cold war, any policy of containment and confrontation in areas of influence; Russia is a direct goal of the American administration, Russia, despite its limited role and external influence, is still the heir to the constant hostility, fear, anticipation, and threat between the West and the Soviet Union for 50 years. 45 With the same logic of uncertainty, the United States is working to prevent any bilateral or triangular Russian rapprochement or more, in any direction, aimed at forging new strategic alliances with China, Iran, India, Cuba, North Korea and Pakistan, all of which deserve attention and response.
4. Reducing Russian control of the Central Asian region gradually through the military presence in that region. The direct US presence in Central Asia aims to stifle Pakistan's transformations and prevent it from possessing nuclear weapons and missiles in transit.
- 5 - The need to work to encircle the giant India, which grows up and carries with it an implicit threat to US interests, and placed under permanent control.
6. To counter any strategic alliance between Russia, China and India, which if realized would threaten the uniqueness of America led by the world.
7. Approach the countries of the "Axis of Evil", such as Iran, a country outside the American will, which represents a regional not insignificant. It is also an American goal worthy of adventure and expansion of the circle of war, and placed under the direct supervision of the US Army and under the threat of US bases, and the West, preventing it from acquiring strategic weapons technologies and reaching the deciphering of the nuclear puzzle, according to the US intelligence agency's "CIA."
8. Preventing what might emerge in the future from an alliance (Iranian, Russian, Syrian).
9. It has become clear that the goal of the US administration, which was formulated before 9/11 and then applied in the ongoing war on terrorism, goes well beyond the declared goals of the capture of Osama bin Laden or the elimination of the Taliban or even the war on terror. The Caspian Sea and the wealth of the promising Central Asian countries are also direct American targets because everything that happens on the ground in Afghanistan and Iraq is a long-drawn-out plan aimed at achieving American interests under a right-wing religious administration whose members have international interests and companies. Dick Cheney, President Dick "The Afghanistan war and the proposed invasion of Iraq are just the first shots in an open conflict that will continue for years against a new kind of enemy. These campaigns will be more powerful and vital in the future. There is a hidden terrorist world in more than sixty countries that could be a legitimate target for American intervention. "46 This speech did not come from a vacuum. It reflects an American agenda prepared for Iraq and the Arab and Islamic region. After the threat, the implementation came and the events of September 11 was like a bridge crossed by the United States to achieve its goals and implemented what it wanted as a single force, the 2003 war is the outcome of the continuation and escalation of the war in 1990, especially if we know that the preparations for the war in Iraq in 2003 was on the pace. The presidential candidate, George W. Bush, announced in September 1999 his intention to build the next century's army, promised to develop weapons and strengthen the army. Bush identified one of the goals he would pursue as "the ability of the United States to invade some hostile regional powers, Iran, Iraq, Korea South (47).

3.0 American Objectives of the 2003 Iraq Conquest and Occupation

3.1 American justifications for the invasion and occupation of Iraq.

The United States of America raised a number of justifications and pretexts that enable it to control Iraq and its oil and even its geographical location. One of the justifications prepared by the files of the US intelligence agency and carried by the English Ministry to the Security Council Chamber includes: preventing the Iraqi government from developing weapons of mass destruction, and the claim that Iraq has committed fundamental violations of UN Security Council resolutions. In an important meeting of the Security Council on 5 February 2003, Rumsfeld said, "What we present to you are facts and conclusions based on reliable intelligence."

But most members of the council had doubts about what Washington was proposing, and the council ultimately did not agree to the use of military force on Iraq. It would be appropriate to quote British intelligence chief Richard Derloff on the invalidity of the US and British allegations: "Intelligence and the facts are consistent with the policy of leaders in Washington and soon worked in London in a parallel campaign of false allegations and inflated, "Nevertheless, the US administration to the Senate requested the adoption of the budget of the US military in 2003, \$ 379 billion, an increase of 45 billion from the budget 2002, the justification for this increase was the full readiness for the war (Rumsfeld) on Iraq, according to Defense Minister Rumsfeld that we need the forces of rapid deployment and fully integrated with each other, to be able to quickly access to distant battlefields, and to cooperate with our air and naval forces to strike "49. This statement to the US Secretary of Defense confirms that the war on Iraq was postponed until now, to achieve the American dream planned - since the administration of Bush the father - did not miss the awareness of the Bush administration and the surrounding team, such as Vice President Dick Cheney (50), Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and Minister of Defense Paul Wolfowitz; because the importance of Iraq was a precedent for the events of September 11, and it was Cheney who asked hours after the attacks to strike Iraq militarily, as Bush's administration stepped up the violent language towards Iraq. After a failed attempt to secure a United Nations resolution that would allow it to strike Iraq or rally a new international coalition along the lines of the Second Gulf War Alliance - the United States, in cooperation with Britain, invaded Iraq on March 20, 2003, US forces launched severe and violent strikes on Iraqi territory, it had the largest share of the fall of various weapons and tons and destroyed Baghdad, the home of Islamic civilization. That control of Iraq militarily means the completion of the United States of control and control of energy resources in the Arab world, and redrawing a new political map of the Middle East, which serves Israel. Not only that, but the American war on Iraq has given Iran the advantage of the region's most prominent state. Iran has become a key player in Iraq's internal affairs and will gain strength and prestige when it declares that it possesses nuclear weapons.

3.2 American objectives of the occupation of Iraq in 2003

The strategy of preventive war has come into force, to ensure the protection of American national security and to find justification for it, despite its violation of the principles of international law. [52] Within the framework of identifying the enemy in al-Qaeda in Afghanistan led by Osama bin Laden, after 9/11, it did not change, because the one who painted it and dreamed of achieving it was the one who carried it out after the events using military force outside the framework of the international legitimacy, which the Bush administration did not care about with the civilians and the military on the extreme American right in the midst of the international campaign against terrorism. "The challenge we face is the difficulty of protecting our national security from an unknown, invisible and unpredictable enemy.

It may seem impossible, but it is not. We will be able to deter and defeat the enemies and enemies who have not yet shown us to challenge us," Defense Secretary Rumsfeld said. ... The factor that could change this scenario is the destruction of weapons of mass destruction by terrorist groups and an American operation to remove Saddam Hussein from power. "The fact that adversaries and enemies are not in Europe, but elsewhere?". This speech clearly explains America's moves by shifting its strategic weight from Europe to Asia, the most important of which is the Gulf and the Central Asian region as new security environments through which political and economic pressure can be exerted on Europe, Japan and other emerging powers and control of their destinies. Therefore, Bush's doctrine of September 20, 2002, declared that the war on Iraq must come. Unlike the war on Afghanistan, the war in Iraq had nothing to do with terrorism, democracy or Saddam Hussein, as it was declared. Not only by the New Caliphate, not by the influence of Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle and Abrahams, but by part of a long context that has been crystallized over ten years. The events of September are to be resolved definitively and expeditiously in Iraq. [54] This new doctrine of the American administration hides undeclared targets, 55 including:

1. The declaration of US control over the new international order and the formulation of its principles on the basis of ensuring the security and safety of the United States security and economic in the light of the events of September 11, 2001, Iraq and occupation is the place and time that George Bush the son announced the American control of the world, after his Father had failed in his achievement (56) in the beginning of 1990.
2. The marginalization of the role of the United Nations, in addition to marginalizing the role of any country that may oppose the United States in launching the war on the one hand, and informing the American citizen that his country in the circumstances and repercussions of September 11, strong and capable of beating enemies anywhere in the world on the other hand, and security for the United States of America.
3. Preserving military bases near the countries that oppose them, through which Washington controls the various politicians in the Arab world and the Arab Gulf region in particular to dissolve it into a geopolitical and strategic space that extends even to Central Asia and the Caucasus, with the intention of dominating Eurasia. This means that the occupations of Iraq complete the cycle of control of the East and limits any expansion of the influence of Russia or China and further expand the military and political scope of NATO led by the United States of America.

4. The goal of the US occupation of Iraq is to stay in one form or another, 57 and establish a new pro-US political system in Baghdad that will make it a major player in determining oil prices by strengthening its ability to exert pressure to control the region's oil. Arab and other countries (OPEC), and this session will contribute to the opening of the magazines of American hegemony on the world oil markets to reduce prices, and access to cheap oil supplies to the joints of the US economy in various sectors.
5. The occupation of Iraq is an important goal, because that would show interventions by neighboring countries in Iraq, which allows Washington to lure these countries into new crises leading to a new war, with precedence to destroy Iran's nuclear program. The United States therefore places its hand on the important areas where most elements of the world stage are available in this century.
6. To establish full relations between Iraq and Israel so that Tel Aviv plays a major security and intelligence role and prevent the return of Iraq to a regional force threatening Israel again.
7. Restrain any sleep of national and Islamic resistance movements in the region which could pose a threat to their economic interests or to the Zionist entity.
8. To undermine Iraq's Arab identity and its Arab affiliation and turn it into another Afghanistan, as is being done by Karzai and his government and the pro-Western expatriates.
9. Preventing the repetition of the Arab oil embargo on the West and keeping the Arab oil systems in need of American security protection by creating an atmosphere of political instability in these countries and make them - always - seek US assistance (security, political, military).
10. If the main objective of the war on Afghanistan is to control Afghanistan and Central Asia, the war on Iraq by removing its political system as an example was to send a message to the world that the United States is capable and able to deal with countries hostile to it and its strategic interests.
11. The United States is the only imperial power in the world without competition, and that it will act seriously in the implementation of its objectives in the Arab region and the Central Asia region, where the main sources of energy lie, and there is no way to oppose them and to inform them that cooperation with them through the conclusion of political deals in the interests of and mutually beneficial benefits.

In the light of the above, we can say that for the United States to establish its empire, it is increasing its influence by establishing a friendly government in Baghdad, after which the stage of unreliable and rogue regimes comes one by one. In other words, the process of annexing all Muslims to the "Good Empire" will begin from Iraq. 63 Based on the above, we find that the battlefields of the war on terror are located in Central Asia (near the countries of Bahrain) and the Middle East (the Arabian Gulf) Islamic countries? The United States has adopted a policy of pre-emptive war aimed at direct presence near these countries, and the indicator of the rapid military expansion that is being carried out by the United States, with thousands of miles stretching from the Balkans to the borders of China.

This expansion took the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Middle East and the Indian subcontinent. From Cape Pondstil in Kosovo after the NATO campaign in 1999, to Bishkek air base in Kyrgyzstan after the US presence in Afghanistan, and the Americans are working to establish a military presence in places where they were not before. In addition to the presence of 13 new bases in nine countries surrounding Afghanistan quickly established, making South Russia an American theater for the first time. "64 In addition to the Eastern European countries, which block the possibility of future Russian expansion, the Central Asian countries, Caspian, along with its importance as a barrier, are characterized by an oil wealth that provides the economic power of its dominant, a force that the former Soviet Union has neither exploited nor been able to do. Known as the third world in this field and comparison with the countries of the Middle East, which are also classified from the Third World countries, so the two regions belong geopolitically to a rectangle extending from the south of Russia and ends in the southern Arabian Gulf, an Islamic rectangle made up of countries rich in oil and gas, and does not have the funds or technology or political and economic ability to control the background of the American goals, including what has been announced and not announced by seeking to pass their policies and the justification for their intervention in many places in the world, specifically in Iraq to the provisions of control in the Middle East.

Afghanistan is the gateway to the Central Asian region and the military presence near the existing or potential enemies. In this way, the United States of America has implemented its global strategic objectives from a practical perspective, in order to achieve theoretical planning, which was drawn up by the strategic thinker Mahan, (The one who rules Eastern Europe controls the heart area, the one who controls the heart area controls the world island, and the ruler of the world island controls the whole world). 65 The United States of America maintains these important geographical positions and controls its fortunes Oil and gas, etc., which have ended its direct military control over the world, so that no continent or territory remains free from the US direct military presence.

This means that the issue of Russian thinking to return to warm water and the Middle East is difficult to achieve now, and that the rise of China's future civilization, after the US military presence near him, in the difficult task. As well as to reduce the role of Indian rising, and betting on Pakistan is a hostage fraught with great danger, having become a target under the direct control of the American armies. However, in light of this new situation for the United States, freedom of movement towards the completion of control and control of the most important areas of the world (the heart of the world), most of which are located within the territory of Arab and Islamic, which the United States did not control militarily for the exceptional circumstances of the opportunity of the events of September 11, 2001, and started with the war on terrorism, and the important question that arises here is: Will these conditions continue to afflict the peoples of the Islamic world as a result of the arrogance of American power and its uniqueness in the international resolution, and its invasion of Iraq and before Afghanistan and its support for the Israeli occupation and the displacement of the Division, and its ongoing interventions in Arab and Islamic affairs. In other words, is it possible for the new US administration led by Barrack Obama to make a change or at least modify the strategy or doctrine of the Bush administration toward the issues of the Islamic world or will things remain the same? Is it possible to predict unexpected surprises in the internal and external affairs of the United States of America? This will be explained in the following section:

4.0 The nature of US goals under the Obama administration.

4.1 the legacy of George W. Bush after September 11, 2001:

On November 4, 2008, the presidential election re-formed the political map in the United States. With the arrival of the Democratic Party under the banner of change, under this new situation, many questions were raised by local politicians such as: Achieving change? We can say that given the data of the Bush administration's post-September 11, 2001, legacy of a very heavy legacy, it is a real nightmare for the administration of President Barack Obama, not only because it has reduced the chances of finding practical solutions to current crises and tensions in the Arab region, also, the resulting facts and different variables will make the new administration more complex. Especially the decision to invade Iraq and follow the wrong strategy and tactics in dealing with the Iraqi file in all its aspects, the old administration has occurred in a difficult predicament to get out of it. This impasse has increased to the extent of international embarrassment for America as a result of its floundering in the political and military decisions and the receipt of strong and successive blows by the armed national resistance and did not enable it to achieve its project that is calling for in accordance with its own interests and expose the falsity of democracy and alleged freedom advocated by the falsification of claims of liberation and the future. The American policy in the era of Bush the son in Iraq finds that it has begun to try internationalization, as in the study of former Secretary of State (Kissinger), and then moved to Urbanization in accordance with the proposals of the Center for Strategic Studies of the United States, then came the role of US Secretary of State (Rice), which called on neighboring countries to intimidate and encourage to intervene in Iraqi affairs, and help in resolving the Iraqi issue.

Through the continuation of political pressure on some influential countries regionally such as Saudi Arabia, Jordan and the United Arab Emirates to remove the White House from this political and military impasse. A few days before the end of his term and the media, George W. Bush acknowledged that a military solution alone had failed to combat terrorism and defeat it. He did not address the root causes of the political issues that contributed to the launching of terrorism. He did not address such obvious issues as the immediate withdrawal from Iraq and the need to resolve disputes such as the Arab-Israeli conflict by ending the occupation as a key link in weakening and narrowing the cycle of terrorism. His bloody policy and recognition before leaving the White House for the failure of that policy? In addition to the look of the shoe "Muntadr al-Zaidi," a farewell US president has won the least acceptance and popularity, and more hatred, and perhaps more than any president in American history.

4.2 President Barack Obama's military doctrine towards the Arab world And Islam:

Despite the heavy legacy faced by Barack Obama, but when he arrived at the White House announced the strategy and trends of US English policy in general and the Middle East in particular, and specifically the Iraqi file, which matured features and expressed a position to announce the start of the withdrawal of troops from Iraq, this position reflects the opinion of the majority of the American people. But the situation has progressively been softened and softened, as President Obama has said through the media: "We will withdraw from Iraq, but not before 2010, while leaving US forces in Iraq to confront al Qaeda and train the Iraqi army." This is an indication that these policies cannot be applied on the ground in the future.

It is fair to say that the arrival of US President Barack Obama to the White House has been accompanied by great optimism by the world, especially the Arab world, but that optimism at the same time questioned his ability to translate this optimism on the ground, however - and unlike his predecessor George President Bush's policy of inviting the United States to the Muslim world included a new partnership based on mutual respect and common interests. And his determination to follow a new approach to American policy toward the Muslim world based on mutual respect.

Through Obama and his administration; it is determined to follow the policy of listening and dialogue instead of giving orders, as was the case with the arrogant administration of former President George W. Bush, to the peoples of Muslim countries. Israeli aggression on the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip, and continued aggression on the Palestinians, and what strengthens their reservation is the reluctance of the new American president to take a position on the crisis condemning Israel, and justified during the dialogue conducted by Al Arabiya channel that he refrained from taking certain decisions and positions before conducting procedures with whom it may concern, and we believe that the change of the American administration from the administration of a radical republic governed by the extreme right to a democratic administration in the context of the assumption that it will achieve a new revolution in American policy toward the Islamic world in general and Palestine, Iraq and Afghanistan in particular, is a hypothesis waiting to be tested during the first or second term of President Obama.

If there is no other revolution contrary to the approach of change to assassinate President Obama, such as the assassination of President John F. Kennedy or the inability of his party to overcome the presidential elections, which will give him a second term; it is likely that the Republican Party will return to power and that the same or similar people who are walking in the orbit of the interests of the extreme religious right, the military-military complex, and the global Zionism will come. The Obama administration is likely to be a "break for the warrior man"; although the United States is still waging its war on terror under Obama, but with a quiet speech based on new principles of diplomacy and dialogue with those who consider the axis of evil. The strategic objectives have not changed real cooperation with the Allies, and the continued strengthening of Afghanistan by military mechanisms in the war on what it calls (terrorism), despite the achievement of undeclared goals to remove the Taliban regime and revenge for the American people as a result of the attacks of September 11, 2001, as well as the continuation of its occupation of Iraq; are still going on so far.

5.0 RESULTS

1. The focus of the American objectives primarily - since the post-Cold War and the events of September 11, 2001 - on the Arab and Islamic countries exclusively, preventive or preemptive war, is implemented in the squares of these States, by virtue of the capabilities of this nation and its constituent components, especially those countries that have deep buried resources Oil and gas, or those that form a geo-strategic zone, or trying to take their regional and international position, or directly or indirectly affect the interests of Western countries and foremost American interests and so on.

2-In the aftermath of the Soviet withdrawal, the United States found in Afghanistan a geographically important position in a strategically vital region of Central Asia, where Muslim countries, particularly those bordering on Pygmies, were concentrated. The events of September 11 and the war against terrorism were the golden opportunity to achieve a dual goal of controlling Afghanistan on the one hand, in which it can encircle Iran and get closer to the nuclear powers in South Asia (India and Pakistan) to thwart any regional war in this region, which could lead to a change in the balance of power in the region.

3. The war in Iraq in particular was the key turning point in the formulation of the global system of the twenty-first century, which clearly strengthened the global standing of the United States. The events of September 11, the second opportunity after Afghanistan, to the United States of America, to complete the imposition of the existing global order after the Second Gulf War. But after the American freedom destroyed a country like Iraq with its human, economic, civilization and heritage resources, and killed life in it, and destroyed the centers of science and research and the treasures of history and civilization.

4. The purpose of the US military action against Afghanistan is not revenge for what happened to it on September 11. It is a process of exploiting this event to complete the policy of American hegemony and isolation by encircling countries of regional and global weight, meaning that the events of September did not create a new strategic reality, but it created the opportunity and perhaps accelerated the implementation of strategies and options that were prepared and studied in advance, and the index of that American behavior and the movements demonstrated by the data prior to the events of 11 September. And also affirms that the achievement of future American goals, formulated and implemented to defend economic and strategic interests. American claims to defend values are nothing but excuses justifying the logic of the war against terrorism, which is not limited by time or place.

5. The outcome of the US war on Iraq was that Iran would gain the advantage of the most prominent regional state. Iran had become a major player in Iraq's internal affairs and would become more powerful when it declared nuclear weapons. Six days before his term ended, US President George W. Bush admitted to the media that the military solution alone had failed to combat and defeat terrorism. This recognition came after two wars were on in Iraq and Afghanistan, painful for Arabs and Muslims, to the whole world, left the White House, and abused the American people perhaps more than any president in history.

7. There is some real shift in American policy and American political discourse during President Barack Obama's administration toward the Muslim world in a way that seems to be different from that of George W. Bush. There is an Arab-Islamic reservation to judge Obama's speech, his determination to change English policy, and the difficulty of gaining Muslim trust.

8. The strategic objectives of Obama's new administration have not changed. The military tools and mechanisms in the war are still continuing in Afghanistan and Iraq, with the reinforcement of additional troops in Afghanistan despite the achievement of the undeclared goals, as well as the continued occupation of Iraq, declared and undeclared that the United States sought to achieve in this country.

References:

- POLLACK, K, (2002), **Next stop, Baghdad?** English affairs 8-12
- SULLIVAN T, (2005) "**External Terrorist Threats to Civilian Airliners: A Summary Risk. Analysis of MANPADS, Other Ballistic Weapons Risks, Future Threats, and Possible Countermeasure Policies, report to tire Center for Risk and Economic Analysis of Terrorism (REATE)**", University of Southern California. Los Angeles at: [HTTP://www.usc.edu/dept/creite/i-enoi-ts/MANPADS_MSEditVers_v2, pdf](http://www.usc.edu/dept/creite/i-enoi-ts/MANPADS_MSEditVers_v2.pdf)
- Abdul Khaleq, Lahib, (2003), **Iraq is a prisoner of the American security system and interests**, based on the website of the Baya N.
- Abu Taleb, Abdelhadi, (2002), **features international relations at the beginning of the 11th century September at the Academy of the Kingdom of Morocco, international relations in the first ten years of the twenty-first century**, i.e., horizon? Rabat, Morocco.
- Al-Ahmari, Mohammed bin Hamed, (2003), **Iraq... And then and then**. New Manar Magazine. Number 12.
- Al-Arimi, Mashher Bakhit, (2009), **international legitimacy to combat terrorism**. Culture House for publishing and distribution. Oman
- Al-Ashkar, Gilbir, (2002), **Saddam's barbarism, terrorism, counterterrorism and global chaos before and after 9/11**. Transferred to Arabic Adams, Beirut, Al-Talaa Printing and Publishing House
- Al-Attar, Muwaffaq Sadiq, **Uncle Sam and Islam, Confrontation or Containment?** Dar al-Awliya distribution and publishing, 11; Damascus
- Al-Desouki; Abu Bakr, (2001), **America and Terrorism Event and Fallout**, International Politics Magazine. Number 146.
- Al-Sharif, Mohammed Rashad (1998), **Dimensions of Aggression against Sudan and Afghanistan**, Middle East Affairs Magazine, Issue 76
- Amin, Jalal (2002), **The Globalization of Oppression: The United States, Arabs and Muslims before and after September 2001** in Cairo.
- Amin, Jalal, (2001), **The Globalization of Oppression: The United States, Arabs and Muslims Before and After the Events of September 2001**, Cairo: Dar al-Shorouk.
- Anani, Khalil, (2009), **Obama and the Middle East**. Good deputies lack vision. Arab Affairs Magazine. Number 137.
- Aqlan, Commander of Muhammad, (2003), **U.S. Policy toward Islamic Movements**, Ph.D. University of Baghdad, Iraq
- Arouri. Naseer, (2003), **George W. Bush's preventive wars between the centrality of fear and the globalization of 'state terrorism'**, Arab Future Magazine, Issue 297
- Bed, Juma, (2008), **Organized State Terrorism: Research submitted to the International Conference (Terrorism in the Digital Age 2008/ Hussein Bin Talal University and Petra, Jordan**.
- Chomsky, Naoum, (2005), **Who are the global terrorists? In Haqin Booth and Tim Dion, translated by Salah Abdul Haq: Worlds of The Clash of Terrorism and the Future of the World Order, Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research**, Translated Studies No. 24
- Digiz, Howard, (2004), **the lion, the magician, the warlord, "Good and evil" and the destruction of the imperial myth, in Fells craton; Arabization of Ibrahim Yahya Al-Shahabi**, Cultural Dialogue Company, Lebanon.
- Gades, John Lewis (2005), **grand strategy for the second Bush presidency. Torjeman and Ta'bak Ahmed Thabet**, Arab Center for Strategic Studies. Number 29

- Glion, Burhan (2004), **The Significance of the September 11 attack**, Al-Itihad newspaper of 15-9-2004
- Halliday, Farid, (2002), **Two Hours Shook the World September 11**, 2001 Reasons and Consequences, Beirut; Dar al-Saki.
- Happy. Abdul Malik, (1998), **Approaches to the Concept of National Security**, Political Research Journal, Yemeni Ministry of English Affairs, Issue 1
- Heikal, Mohammed Hassanein, (1992), **Gulf War: Illusions of Power and Victory**, Al-Ahram Translation and Publishing Center, Cairo.
- Hetty. Sabri Fares, (2000), **geopolitics with geopolitics applications**. Safaa Publishing and Distribution House, Amman.
- Isa. Nidal Samih, (2002), **These Blew Up America**, Syria, Dar Al-Desktop
- Ismail, Abdul Razzaq, (2005), **U.S.-Iran Relations and Its Impact on the Arab-Israeli Conflict (1945-2005)**, Master's Thesis, Aleppo University School of Economics, Syria.
- Khayat, Ahmed Salem, (2002), **the dual use of terrorism as a means of terrorizing the enemy**, Position Magazine, Sana'a, Issue 20.
- Linklater, Andrew, (2005), **The Unnecessary Suffering in Ken Booth and Tabam Dion, Translation, Salah Abdul Haq: Worlds clashing with terrorism and the future of the world order**, The Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, Studies of The Great Meters No. 24.
- Mawlawi, Faisal, (2002), **an Islamic vision of the bombings in New York and Washington. In: Amr Abdul Karim, America and the world after 9/11**. No date.
- Morteza, Yusuf, (2001), **The American Cowboy Brings Back in Afghanistan A War Without Borders Against Ghosts**, Political Witness Magazine, File 195.
- Morteza. Joseph, (2001), **The Big Transformation of the War on Globalization, Witness Magazine**, Issue 194
- Naru, Leicester, (1995), **The Struggle for the Summit, The Future of Economic Competition between America and Japan, Ahmed Fouad, Translation of the World of Knowledge Series**, Issue 204
- Nehra, Fouad, (2002), **U.S. Policy Changes toward Arabs**, Middle East Affairs Magazine, Issue 105.
- Noir, James, (2005), **The U.S. War on Terror and Its Impact on U.S.-Arab Relations**, The Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, The Emirates
- Omar, Farouk, (2002), **September 11, 2001, Crisis and Disaster Management**, Mirbet Publishing and Information, Cairo.
- Paul, James, Nahouri and Sibli (2007), **War and Occupation in Iraq: NGO Report: Weapons of Shock and Terror: The First Sign of America's Indifference to International Law**, Center for Arab Unity Studies, Arab Human Rights Commission, Beirut.
- Pollack, William, (2008), **How to Get Out of Afghanistan, Arab Future Magazine**, Issue 342.
- Rifaat, Said, (2002). **The new American perception of the region and the location of the Arabs in it**. Constants Magazine. Number 31.
- Shalq. Al-Fadhil, (2003), **Aggression against Iraq: The Bush Administration and neo-conservatives**, Middle East Affairs Magazine, Issue 111.
- Shaya, Abdulllah Haidar, (2001), **America after the storm, file on bombings in America**, Part 1, Press Office of the Yemeni News Agency, Saba.
- Shihab, Haitham Faleh, (2010), **the crime of terrorism and ways to combat it in comparative penal legislation**. Culture Publishing and Distribution House, Amman
- Shuaibi, Imad Fawzi, (2003), **U.S. Policy and The Formulation of the New World Study "Strategy"**, Yemen and neo-conservatives from the selective inside to proactive overlap. No date.
- Sri eddin, Abeda al-Ali (2002), **The Black American Tuesday and its Implications for Arabs and Muslims**; Beirut: Dar al-Hadi.
- Sweidan, Ahmed Hussein (2005), **International Terrorism in the Light of International Change**, Al-Halabi Al-Haqoub Publications, Beirut
- Thursday, Munir, (2001), **a long-term war is this what global capitalism needs to get out of its crisis**, Witness Magazine, Issue 197, Libya.
- Verson, Samih, (2002), **the roots of the U.S. anti-terrorism campaign in Ahmed Beydoun and a group of authors: Arabs and the World After 9/11**, Beirut, Center for Arab Unity Studies.
- Vries Gijs (2016), **Tire Fight. Against Terrorism - Five Years After 9/11** Id e, **EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, Annual European English Policy Conference**, London School of Economics & King's College London ,30 June2006, p 1, pdf
- Yassin, Mr., (2002), **Cosmic War III September Storm and World Peace**, Author.
- Zouahera, Rania, and others, (2001), **War for The New American**, Amman.