

September the 11th 2001 and Security Dilemma

LE 11 SEPTEMBRE 2001 ET LE DILEMME DE SÉCURITÉ

Fakhreddin Soltani¹

Jayum A. Jawan²

Zaid B. Ahmad³

Abstract: Security and insecurity are complex concepts that states have problem in defining them in different conditions. Complexity of the concepts comes out of security dilemma which states face when they seek to recognize enemy and scale of threat that the enemy may cause. Events of September the 11th formed a new condition in which United States faced the security dilemma that had not risen from a specific country but the enemy that was not recognizable and did not behave like states. United States attempted to solve the mentioned security dilemma by defining enemy, its threats and the new condition after events of September the 11th. This article, in order to explain the security dilemma of the United States after events of the September the 11th, is written in two parts; the first part is to explain security dilemma and the approaches that have been given to solve it and the second part tends to explain the security dilemma that United States faced after terrorist attacks of September the 11th 2001.

Keywords: Security dilemma; Terrorism; United States; September the 11th

Résumé: La sécurité et l'insécurité sont des concepts complexes et les Etats ont des difficultés à les définir dans des conditions différentes. La complexité des concepts vient du dilemme de sécurité auquel les Etats font face quand ils cherchent à reconnaître l'ennemi et l'ampleur de la menace que l'ennemi peut causer. Les événements du 11 septembre a formé une nouvelle condition, dans laquelle les États-Unis ont fait face à un dilemme de sécurité qui ne venait pas d'un pays spécifique, mais d'un ennemi non reconnaissable qui ne se comportait pas comme des États. Les États-Unis ont tenté de résoudre ce dilemme de sécurité par la définition de l'ennemi, de ses menaces et de la nouvelle condition après les événements du 11 septembre. Cet article, afin d'expliquer le dilemme de la sécurité des États-Unis après les événements du 11 septembre, est composé en deux parties: la première partie est d'expliquer le dilemme de sécurité et les approches qui ont été utilisées pour le résoudre et la deuxième partie tend à expliquer le

¹ PH.D Candidate, Politics and Government, Department of Government and Civilization Studies, Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. Email: fakhreddinsoltani@yahoo.com.

² PH.D. Department of Government and Civilization Studies, Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti Putra Malaysia , 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. Email: Jayum@putra.upm.edu.my.

³ PH.D. Department of Government and Civilization Studies, Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti Putra Malaysia , 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. Email: zaid_a@putra.upm.edu.my.

*Received 13 July 2010; accepted 17 September 2010

dilemme de sécurité auquel les États-Unis font face après les attentats terroristes du 11 septembre 2001.

Mots-clés: dilemme de sécurité; terrorisme; États-Unis; 11 septembre

CONCEPTUALIZING SECURITY

Security studies include political, economic, societal, and environmental issues (Buzan, Waever, & Wild, 1998) which refer to different security concerns in new era. Different kinds of ideology in political aspect, poverty in societal aspect, economic problems of countries and problem of immigration, and environmental degradation are the problems that may refer to security concerns and are part of defining security. But security of the states is the most important subject of security studies in international politics. Although limiting of security to national level is narrow studying of security and will result in ignoring of important factors in international politics (Graeger, 1996); but security and insecurity of the modern state is still the most important subject because of its primacy in control of force and it is the basis of relationships among sovereign states in international politics (Buzan, 1984).

Security is a condition in which states are able to maintain their independent identity and integrity (Buzan, 1984). Booth and Wheeler define security as process of emancipation, they argue that security is safety of a nation against others and simultaneously safety of others against earlier nation (Wheeler & Booth, 1992). Among different definitions of security, there is a consensus on Wolfers definition (Baylis, 2001). He emphasizes that numerous factors such as national characters, preferences, and prejudices influence the way of defining security in a nation and defines security as lack of threat and fear against values of a nation (Wolfers, 1952).

A common idea among definitions of security refers to ability of nation to defend itself against external threat and defeating of threat. Based on the definitions provided above, threat and fear are the main elements that are used to define security. So, Security has no meaning in the absence of insecurity in which threat and fear are negative values that make nations able to define their security. Insecurity of the values can be interpreted in different ways and have different meaning for different countries. These different interpretations cause security dilemma which its result is permanent feeling of distrust and insecurity among nations.

1.1 Security Dilemma

The term security dilemma, first coined by John Herz in 1950, refers to the condition in which increase in power of one states will be interpreted as insecurity of the other states. In other words, in self-help system of international politics, creation of more security for one state is equal to less security or insecurity of other states (Sorensen, Sep 2007). John Herz asserts that security dilemma is striving to attain security from attack; therefore, states try to increase their power because they are afraid of increase in power of other states. Other states follow the same way and attempt to react the actions of first state by increasing their power. Since none can ever feel entirely secure in such a world of competing units for power, and the vicious circle of security and power accumulation is on (Herz, 1951). Hence, security dilemma can be result into the war between states while none of the states tend to begin the war.

There are three main reasons for rising of security dilemma including system-induced, state-induced and imperialist. In system-induced security dilemma, uncertainty arise from anarchy in which any of states intend to attack other states but they are interested to maintain status quo, hence they are afraid of change in the system. In state-induced security dilemma, uncertainty arises from hegemony's requirement that others are insecure; states do not tend change the status qua but if they do, they cannot change it because hegemony determines the conditions of status quo. In imperialist system, uncertainty arises from revisionist ideas of aggressors that are threatening status quo. Compared to tow earlier security dilemmas, in imperialist system, security dilemma is more likely to transfer into the war (Collins, 2004).

Butterfield underlines "uncertainty" as key element of security dilemma. He states that uncertainty is main character of all kinds of security dilemma. States do not risk their security and if they are not sure about intentions of other states they prefer to suppose that other states have hostile intention (Butterfield,

1951). So, uncertainty refers to knowledge of states about intentions of other states; therefore, uncertainty about intentions of other states leads to fear that others intend to attack. Lack of trustiness strengthens feeling of insecurity among the states and makes cooperation fragile among states. Hence, security dilemma is the main element of understanding nature of anarchy in international system in which states act on the basis of self-help.

Other new concepts such as “insecurity dilemma” and value dilemmas are added to complete idea of security dilemma. Insecurity dilemma refers to weak states on the basis of the fact that global great powers are looking for allies and try not to let the rival power to have more allies. So, weak states are powerful because great powers are sensitive about actions of rival powers in weak states. This condition makes weak states unconstrained and at the same time they are vulnerable and easy to be defeated in war (Sorensen, Sep 2007). It is the condition that dominated Cold War era in which both super-powers were deeply concerned about increase in number of allies of the rival country no matter the ally is powerful or not.

Value dilemma is the concept that refers to problem of new era that has its root in security dilemma. Value dilemma refers to liberal values which are appearing to be stronger and more dominant in post-Cold War era. In General Assembly Resolution 55/2, the liberal values are “freedom” that is about right of all human kind to live their life, to have participatory governance and free from violence; “equality” that refers to equality rights of all individuals and nations to benefit from developments; “solidarity” that indicates to decreasing of gap between those who benefit most and those who benefit least from world opportunities; “tolerance” that emphasizes on respect of all human kind from different cultures, beliefs, or languages to each other; “respect for nature” which refers to preserving of living species and natural resources; and “shared responsibility” that refers to collective managing of social economic affairs and responsibility of all nations for peace and security with central role of United Nations (United Nations Millennium Declaration 8 Sep 2000). To secure liberty dilemma, comprehensive action is needed to remove freedom obstacles, but comprehensive action is equal to intervention. Intervention is not compatible with tolerance. Many countries are far from respecting these values, so there is no deep commitment to these values in international sphere (Sorensen, Sep 2007). Therefore, states should respect these values but for doing so they have to intervene in other countries and intervention strengthen security dilemma among countries.

1.2 Collective Security, International Regimes and Security Dilemma

Some approaches are given to deal with security dilemma among countries. Collective security is the concept based on the idea that although states do not trust each other and operate on the basis of self-help in anarchical system, but there are opportunities to move beyond self-help nature of anarchical system and in following weaken security dilemma. The idea of collective security was dominant between World War I and World War II. Collective security refers to the condition in which states make agreement in order to enhance their security. For achieving the purpose of enhancing security, states must agree on three principles. First, states have to solve their tensions peacefully and none of them should apply military force to change status quo; because in collective security system, change is possible through negotiation. Second, interests of international community are prior to national interests and all states are responsible to respond aggressor collectively in collective security system. Third, states must trust each other to avoid security dilemma. Hence, on the basis of collective security, states are able to risk their security and do not rely on self-help system for achieving more peaceful and secure relations (Baylis, 2001).

Before 1914, there was an idea that balance of power makes war improbable. World War I strengthened the idea that creation of collective security system is necessary to avoid war. The idea of collective security was supported by Woodrow Wilson in the United States and finally led to creation of League of Nations in 1920; but collective security system was unable to prevent World War II. Great powers tried to create collective security system after the World War II but failed because of United States and Soviet Union adversaries (Kunz, Dec 1953). In history, except two cases of Korean War in 1950 and Persian Gulf Crisis in 1990, collective security system remained idealistic rather than realistic.

E.H. Carr in his famous book titled “Twenty Year’s Crisis, 1936-1946” criticized collective security as utopian thinking and argued that World War II was result of utopianism and the idea of collective security that were dominant after the World War I. Collective security was result of ignoring principle of self-help and relying on optimism more than pessimism of anarchical system (Carr, 1946). Collective security and

the League of Nations which were created to implement collective security were based on the erroneous assumption that the territorial and political status quo was satisfactory for all the major powers in international system; and so, they can trust each other in security issues. But the problem arose between them because great powers go to war because of their aspirations that could only be dealt with on the basis of the anarchy rather than by appealing to universal principles of moral conduct (Griffits, 1999). On this basis, the World War II happened because founders of the League of Nations and collective security system forgot that states do not trust each other in security issues and just trust themselves. So, normative aspect of liberal idealism which dominated after World War I was main cause of World War II and main enemy of peace.

John Ruggie introduced concept of international regimes in 1975 and defined it as a regularities and commitments which have been accepted by group of states (Ruggie, 1975). In 1983, Stephen Krasner defined international regimes in more comprehensive way that his definition got consensus in international politics. He defined international regimes as “sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules and decision making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge in a given area of international relations. Principles are beliefs of fact, causation, and rectitude. Norms are standards of behavior that are defined in terms of rights and obligations. Rules are specific prescriptions or proscriptions for action. Decision-making procedures are prevailing practices for making and implementing collective choice” (Krasner, 1983, p. 2).

International regime is the approach to fill the gaps of collective security by creating the basis for trustiness among countries. Theory of international regimes was response to problems of relations between states. States deal with each other under the shadow of security dilemma and do not trust each other because none of them are likely to risk their security. International regimes theory tends to solve the problem of security dilemma by enacting regularities among countries. Therefore, the first goal of the regimes is to facilitate cooperation among states (Keohane, 1984). Keohane argues that actors or states follow their interests under bounded rationality that will value the facilities of cooperation provided by regimes. Regimes will help governments to reduce negative effects of change in the future. They may seek to join regimes to bind those future administrations which are looking for change (Keohane, 1984). Great powers and especially hegemony; on the basis of his arguments, form international regimes to reduce prices of cooperation and avoid security dilemma.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) are international security regimes that are created for purpose of promoting security of member states. NATO is a military alliance that was created in 1949 for security of capitalist world against Soviet Union (Brzezinski, Sep/Oct 2009). NPT (1968) is a treaty in order to limit proliferation of nuclear weapons and technology among the states that do not have it. The first goal of the NPT is to promote cooperation among states on peaceful use of nuclear energy and ensure other states that they will not be deprived from nuclear energy if they do not tend to achieve nuclear weapons. Those states that are member of the NPT have to cooperate with International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to monitor their nuclear activities (“Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons,” 2005). And after the NPT, CTBT was created by General Assembly of United Nations in 1996 with purpose of banning any nuclear explosion test in any place (Hansen, 2006).

2. TERRORISM AND SECURITY DILEMMA

Terrorism is advent of new security dilemma which no country can deal with it alone (Jackson & Towle, 2006). In contrast to political violence of the countries such as war against each other, terrorist activity is clandestine action that does not have identifiable perpetrators (Johnson, 2009). Terrorism is the instrument to achieve political and ideological goals (Drake, 1998) and can only be recognized according to characteristics of the violence. On this basis, terrorism which is expected to be political one, has three key features: 1. Violence against non-combatant victims, 2. Intention of violent actor to induce terror among people distinct from victims, 3. Expectation of violent actor for change in behaviour of terrorized people as result of violent action (ackson, Murphy, & Poynting, 2010). Although terrorism and political violence are related to each other but they are not same. In other words, all kinds of terrorism are political violence but all political violence’s are not included in terrorist actions.

Use of force by the government is not terrorism because governments are the legitimate power to use force against its own people. Very important element of terrorism is its ability to show itself before the world stage. So, use of press to cover its actions is critical part of terrorist actions (Drake, 1998). One important element that distinguishes terrorism from other kinds of violence is its ideology. Terrorism is intentional use of, or threat to use of violence against non-combatant people for achieving political goals (Perliger, 2006). Then, terrorists create fear among non-combatant population for ideological reasons. Ideology makes difficult finding the reasons of perpetrating terrorist attacks (Stapley, 2009). Another element that makes terrorism different from other kinds of violence is in its targets and goals. Terrorism tends to create fear among the population greater than the target population of terrorism (Drake, 1998).

There are different kinds of targets and goals for terrorists. Different purposes and goals create different kinds of terrorism including: symbolic, functional, logistical and expressive. In symbolic attacks, terrorists attack symbols of a target and psychological reaction in population that is attacked is the main purpose of it. Functional attacks target organizations in order to disturb functions of the organizations. Attacks against police or intelligence centres are included in functional terrorist attacks. Logistical terrorist attacks are those that are designed to provide logistical assets or money to the terrorist for following their goals. Kidnapping for ransom is kind of logistical terrorist attacks. And expressive terrorist attack are those that happen in order to cause emotional responses (Drake, 1998).

2.1 September the 11th and Arising of Security Dilemma

Terrorist attacks of September the 11th are proper examples of symbolic attacks in which terrorists attacked symbols of United States' way of life. Terrorist attacks of September the 11th acknowledged United States about continuity of security dilemma. Fear which strengthened by threat of nuclear terrorism was the first impact of the terrorist attacks among citizens of the United States. What was clear after terrorist attacks of September the 11th was that United States faced with emerging threats that required new strategies. These events changed nature of security and war for the United States. Uncertainty is main character of national security strategies of the United States in the process of decision making. The ways of attack are not predictable in the future; so, the value of planning lies not in how someone can predict the future, but in how someone prepares itself to face unpredictable conditions in the future (Franke, 2005).

There are two main ideas about attacks of September the 11th, first idea is that the attacks were against United States and the second one argues that it is not about a single country like United States and it is the threat against global security (Schweiss, 2003). Some arguments about September the 11th describe it as beginning of fundamental situation that indicates to entering of people throughout the world into the world in which threats are not controllable. The "world risk society" (Beck, 2002) is a situation in which there is no even language to describe what is going on in it and its significant characteristic is "uncertainty". The concept of uncertainty in world risk society is deferent from the concept of security in security dilemma. Uncertainty in world risk society refers to three dimensions; "special" which means nation-state boundaries cannot confront new risks, "social" which refers to difficulty of determining a legally relevant manner to problems that people are facing and "temporal" which refers to latency period of dangers (Beck, 2002).

So, security alerts of September the 11th are the subjects that some arguments have focused on them and argue that it is the beginning and can be happen in any place in the world. On this basis, September the 11th is a security alert in many countries because the terrorists are not against just United States but they are threatening directly liberal democracy in liberal countries (Mythen & Walklate, Aug 2006). National security is no longer national security in world risk society and finally terrorist attacks clarified shortcomings of neo-liberalism. In brief, Americans cannot preserve their national security like before and have to make change in their perceptions and strategies. In contrast to world risk society, some explanations argue that September the 11th is not the beginning of new era or new world; it is tensions within post-cold war era that showed complexity of the roles that are created in this period and are playing norms; so, rules in international relations are central tools to understand the power to mobilize, to justify and legitimize action, or they are necessity of creating new order (Hurrell, 2002). Therefore, terrorist attacks of September the 11th illustrate that there remains tension between law and power-political structures or United States' unilateralism. Terrorism challenged the idea of hegemonic order based on power and coercion alone.

2.2 September the 11th and Security Dilemma in the United States

September the 11th was unique in history of the United States. Because it was sole attack in the soil of the United States since attacks at Perl Harbor in 1941 (Torabi & Seo, 2004) and changed life of Americans profoundly in a way in which they may never be able to think about life like before because it has had deep negative psychological effects including emotional and mental problems among Americans (Scurfield, Viola, Platoni, & Colon, 2003).

Nine days after attacks of September the 11th, George W. Bush declared war on terrorism and it was supported by Congress and Americans strongly (Allison, 2004). September the 11th caused creating of new grand strategy for the first time since end of the Cold War. On the basis of new grand strategy, United States emphasized more on unilateral approaches than multilateral ones especially in determining nature of the threats and the ways of confronting them (Ikenberry, Sep 1, 2002). September the 11th showed that the security dilemma which dominated politics of the Cold War era did not vanished; new threats provided security dilemma in which United States faced security problem with new actors. The new security dilemma did not come from strong states but weak states and groups; hence, increase in power of one does not necessarily mean increase in security of it and may even be irrelevant. Because strong states are more open to new challenges such as terrorism. So security of the states cannot be just founded on weapons and soldiers but needs new approaches (Jackson & Towle, 2006).

Right after the attacks of September the 11th, George W. Bush and his administration including Vice President Richard Cheney, Secretary of Defence Donald Rumsfeld, and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice began using the phrases "War against Terrorism" and "Global War on Terrorism". At the first, none of them mentioned to countries or governments; they just declared war against thing that is not identifiable or recognizable. The terms were vague and allowed George W. Bush and his administration to interpret it vastly. These phrases helped the administration to justify war against Iraq and gave the opportunity to George W. Bush and his administration to introduce war against Iraq regime as war against terrorism. There were no clear evidences that there was connection between regime of Iraq and terrorists attacks of September the 11th but the main reason was that Iraq regime cannot be trusted and George W. Bush administration asserted that regime of Iraq used chemical weapons against its own people and Iran in the war (McDonnell, 2010).

George W. Bush administration faced the threats that cannot be tamed by sole military power. Events of the September the 11th demonstrated that geographic and military strength of the United States no longer guarantee security of the United States against enemies and threats ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Sep 30, 2001). So, United States declared that the task has changed ("The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America," September 2002); and emphasized that enemies of past eras needed great armies to threaten Americans but new enemies are not countries but individuals and groups that their goal is to bring chaos. They are terrorists who try to use modern technologies against the United States. Rise of non-states terrorists' networks is the characteristics that were used to define the threats of the new era after September the 11th ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Feb 6, 2006).

Threats against security of the United States and its interests range from states, non-states organizations to individuals. Non-state threats are terrorist networks, international criminal organizations, illegal armed forces and individuals that have the means and will to threaten international security. United States insist that these adversaries do not have the power of fighting United States in direct war; so, they seek asymmetric capabilities against United States (National Military Strategy "National Military Strategy of the United States of America: A Strategy for Today; A Vision for Tomorrow," 2004). The new enemies cannot be limited to geographical borders. Appearance of different enemies equipped with new modern technologies and weapons have changed the relationship between United States' geography and its security ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Feb 6, 2006).

George W. Bush tried to prove that nature of the war began on September the 11th is different from conventional wars and the new war is the war of opposite values. He stated that "Terrorists attacked a symbol of American prosperity", and added that September the 11th was a new threat and the war between freedom and fear (Bush, 20 September 2001). In order to emphasize on different nature of the terrorism as threat to United States in new era, he mentioned to purpose of terrorists that is not "merely to end the lives,

but to disrupt and end a way of life” (Bush, 20 September 2001). He declared that “Vast oceans” do not protect American security” but “vigorous action abroad and increase vigilance at home” will protect (Bush, 29 January 2002).

Very special part of George W. Bush speech in September 20th of 2001 was the part that he declared” Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists” (Bush, 20 September 2001). This statement is unique and makes a deep difference between the hostility among hostile nations during the Cold War, end of the Cold War and the post- September the 11th era. Neutrality was acceptable policy for other countries during Cold War and both super-powers tried to introduce themselves as the countries that respect policy of neutrality in other countries. But Bush declared that United States will not respect mentioned policy in post-September era; the fight against terrorism is world fight not just fight of the United States, this is the fight of every nation who believe in progress, pluralism,, tolerance and freedom; so, those who are not in fight beside the United States, then they are against the mentioned principles and are against the United States (Bush, 20 September 2001). The statements of George W. Bush indicated that those who follow policy of neutrality would be supposed as enemy of the United States.

“Path of action” was introduced as the way of providing peace and security against forming of the threats (“The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America,” September 2002). Path of action was the basis of preventive war theory of Bush’ administration and was the main element of preventing enemy from threatening United States. But strong actions can be done just under the situation in which other great powers cooperate with United States. The cooperation that can be achieved under perusing of common interests; these common interests can promote global security (Bush, 17 March 2003). For securing common interests, all nations have to accept their responsibilities; nations that enjoy freedom or depend on international stability and those nations that need international aid must participate in preventing spread of WMD and behave in expected way (“The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America,” September 2002). In other words, no country can have free riding. Therefore, preventive action was based on dilemma of recognizing threat and enemy. On the basis of preventive action, United States gave the right of supposing every threat as the worst one no matter that is correct or not.

Bush put every person, organization, or government that supports terrorists as guilty of terrorists and enemy of democracy. He mentioned to Franklin Roosevelt’s four freedom in the Truman Doctrine and in Ronald Reagan’s challenge to evil empire of Soviet Union (Bush, 1 May 2003) which are freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, freedom of want and freedom from fear everywhere in the world (Roosevelt, January 6, 1941) as indicators of United States policy. On the basis of the noted freedoms, United States give the right of intervening in different regions for supporting human rights because any region that democracy and freedom take place will be peaceful and safe for the world and for values, interests and security of the United States; as Franklin Roosevelt said in his speech “freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere” (Roosevelt, January 6, 1941). So, anyone who is enemy of the democracy; is enemy of the peace and stability and as a result enemy of the United States. Bush asserted: “Our aim is democratic peace... The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world... now it is the urgent requirement of our nation’s security... so it is policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world... the concrete effort of free nations to promote democracy is a prelude to our enemies defeat” (Bush, 20 January, 2005).

United States declared that terrorist attacks demonstrated that geographic borders are not sufficient barrier against challenges of new age. Defeating of terrorist networks require supporting of national and partner nations efforts in order to deny state sponsorship to terrorists. So, for threats of new era United States tried to undertake an approach that enhances security in the United States while extending defensive capabilities beyond borders of the United States. The mentioned approach had three elements including protecting of the United States against external threats; preventing of conflict, surprise attack and prevail against adversaries (“National Military Strategy of the United States of America: A Strategy for Today; A Vision for Tomorrow,” 2004). Achieving of elements of mentioned approach was based on integrated overseas presence of the United States that would make United States able to re-act any adversary more swiftly than in the past and support promoting of democracy. United States declared that military presence

of the United States is part of active global strategy to support security and stability ("National Military Strategy of the United States of America: A Strategy for Today; A Vision for Tomorrow," 2004).

The first question for undertaking preventive or pre-emptive action is about the enemy; in other words, who is enemy? Religious radicalism was the enemy that United States focused on it after events of September the 11th. It was why United States emphasized on changes in its policy as result of September the 11th events to pursue stability and promote peace which them all will help to advance freedom and democracy against radicalism and terrorism. So, based on nature of the enemy and the threat that religious radicalism could cause, the regions of the threat and insecurity were recognized by United States. Therefore, Transforming of Middle East, as the centre of radicalism, into democratic region was recognized critical to security of the United States, and furthermore, transformed Middle East is essential to security of entire world by undermining "ideologies that export violence to other lands" (Bush, 7 September 2003). The ideologies were referring to growing of religious fundamentalism which must be prevented.

Religious fundamentalism was vague concept that referred to problem of recognizing threat. It was the concept that was used in different ways to introduce the threats against American values. George W. Bush introduced September the 11th as a war in which the enemy tends for "imposing radical beliefs on people everywhere" (Bush, 20 September 2001). But the problem arises when one seek to recognize what exact meaning of radical beliefs is; and how they can threat security of the United States. For solving mentioned problem, George W. Bush used the word "beginning" (Bush, 29 January 2002) to describe new era and asserted that "history took a different turn by events of September the 11th" (Bush, 23 September 2003) because the nature of the enemy and the threats that United States faced in September the 11th were unique and therefore different from all periods in history of the United States. But it was not enough to solve existing dilemma of defining security and threats against security of the United States.

Hence, policy of the United States is to influence in other countries and help moderates and reformers who are looking for democracy and freedom that are necessity of United States' security. Bush said in his speech "The great question of our day is whether America will help men and women in the Middle East to build free societies and share in the rights of all humanity. And I say, for the sake of our own security, we must" (Bush, 23 January 2007).

United States declared four goals for viable peace and security of the United States. First, United States had to have active presence in the world for assuring its allies and friends about its commitment to their security; second, United States must prevent future military competitions in order to complicate military programs of potential adversaries in the future; third is to deter enemies against United States interests by increasing United States ability to respond any aggression immediately; and fourth is about actions of the United States if deterrence failed. Therefore, United States had to be able to defeat enemies including change in regimes of the adversary states, defeat non-state actors or even occupy foreign territory ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Sep 30, 2001).

Denying control of any nation by terrorist groups was introduced as critical element of United States' security. United States called terrorists as those who are trying to overthrow rising democracies; it is the basis of the United States' reasoning for giving the right of intervening in any country that is safe haven for terrorism. It is why Afghanistan and Iraq were so important for the goal of the United States. Winning war in Afghanistan and Iraq was called as the first step in winning the war on terrorism. Afghanistan now needs support of the United States and entire international community. Iraq needs international support to defeat terrorists who believe they can establish safe haven in Iraq. For preventing enemies to do so, the United States will isolate enemies and build stable pluralistic institutions in Iraq; strengthen security forces of the Iraq; and rebuild economy of the Iraq ("The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America ", 16 March 2006).

The mentioned goals of the United States was based on the concept of "shifting to a capabilities-based approach" that reflects inability of the United States to predict what kind of actors will pose threats against security and vital interests of the United States. But United States can anticipate the capabilities that can make other states or non-states actors able to threat it ("Quadrennial Defense Review Report," Sep 30, 2001). On the basis of this anticipation, United States will deter aggression and coercion in critical regions in advance.

Advance of freedom and human dignity through democracy was supposed as “long-term solution to the transnational terrorism. Four steps are recognized to create the space and time for the long-term solution (“The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America ”, 16 March 2006).

- 1st Prevent terrorist attacks to the United States before they occur. Security strategy declares that the terrorists cannot be deterred or reformed; the sole way is to kill or capture them. But deterring and disabling of the terrorist networks is possible in short time.
- 2nd Prevent rogue states and their terrorist allies to get access to WMD. Terrorist use WMD against innocent population. So, denying WMD is critical to security of the United States.
- 3rd Deny sanctuary of rogue states and supports of terrorist groups. There is no distinction between terrorists and those who harbor them. So, they are both guilty and have to pay price of their acts.

3. CONCLUSION

Events of September the 11th caused feeling of fear and insecurity and had different consequences in the United States including psychological, social and political ones. Outcomes of the September the 11th changed nature of security in a way that they cannot think about their security like before. The new challenge was supposed greater than Soviet Union and communism because there are expanding number of hostile regimes and terrorists that are looking for weapons of mass destruction without hesitation for using them (“Quadrennial Defense Review Report,” Feb 6, 2006). Then, United States could not feel secure like before because the new threat was different in nature and caused strong feeling of fear in life of Americans.

The feeling of fear because of new threats needed new definitions on nature of threat and security; but determining scale of threat and providing security strategy against the enemy which was not recognizable was the first problem in defining them. Security dilemma which arose in this condition was more complicated than security dilemma in previous eras; because in state of security dilemma among countries, the hostile or competitor countries do not trust the others but at least they recognize the country they do not trust. In security dilemma which was formed after September the 11th, there were both lack of trust and lack of recognized identity of the threat and enemy for United States. Therefore, United States not only was not able to trust any other actors including states and non-state ones, but it even was not sure about identity of enemy. Therefore, United States had to find the real enemy before evaluating scale of threat.

It was impossible for United States to identify enemy except under condition of supposing every one as enemy but those that support United States directly. The principal goal of the United States was to prevent all the regimes and terrorist groups from acquiring nuclear facilities with no attention to their intentions of achieving nuclear facilities. The first way to deal with terrorists and rogue states was called “pre-emptive action” against “imminent threat” (“The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America,” September 2002). Preventive attack to capabilities and objectives of adversaries was the United States’ another step if pre-emptive action failed. The United States had to prevent future terrorist attack because it could be more severe than the September 11, 2001 if terrorists acquire nuclear weapons. But the strategy of preventive war failed because it caused huge costs in wars with countries that were not serious threat for United States in future. Therefore, new security dilemma remained and has not been solved.

REFERENCES

- 55/2, General Assembly Resolution. (8 Sep 2000). *United Nations Millennium Declaration*. from <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/millennium.htm>
- Ackson, R. i. J., Murphy, E. a., & Poynting, S. (2010). Introduction: terrorism, the state and the study of political terror. In R. Jackson, E. Murphy & S. Poynting (Eds.), *Contemporary State Terrorism: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Allison, S. (2004). *Nuclear terrorism*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.

- Baylis, J. (2001). International and Global Security in Post-Cold War Era. In J. Baylis & S. Smit (Eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, U. (2002). The Terrorist Threat: World Risk Society Revisited. *Theory Culture Society*, 19(August), 17.
- Brzezinski, Z. (Sep/Oct 2009). An Agenda for NATO: Toward a Global Security Web. *Foreign Affairs*, 88(5), 19.
- Bush, G. W. (1 May 2003). *George W. Bush' Address Announcing End Of Major Combat Operations In Iraq*. Retrieved 27, 3, 2009, from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bushiraq4.html>.
- Bush, G. W. (7 September 2003). *President George W. Bush' To The Nation Regarding Iraq*. Retrieved 5,2, 2009, from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bushiraq5.html>.
- Bush, G. W. (17 March 2003). *George W. Bush's Address Regarding Ultimatum To Iraq*. Retrieved 12, 3, 2009, from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bushiraq2.html>.
- Bush, G. W. (20 January, 2005). *President George W. Bush's Second Inaugural Address*. Retrieved 24, 2, 2009, from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/bushinaug2.html>.
- Bush, G. W. (20 September 2001). *President George W. Bush's Address to Congress And The Nation On Terrorism*. Retrieved 20, 3, 2009, from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bush911c.html>
- Bush, G. W. (23 January 2007). *President George W. Bush's State Of The Union Address*. Retrieved 19, 2, 2009, from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/bushstun2007.html>.
- Bush, G. W. (23 September 2003). *George W. Bush' address To The United Nations*. Retrieved 23, 3, 2009, from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bushiraq6.html>
- Bush, G. W. (29 January 2002). *President George W. Bush's State Of The Union Address*. 13, 3, from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/bushstun2002.html>
- Butterfield, H. (1951). *History and Human Relations*. London: Collins.
- Buzan, B. (1984). Peace, Power, and Security: Contending Concepts in the Study of International Relations. *Journal of Peace Research*, 21(2), 17.
- Buzan, B., Waeber, O., & Wild, J. d. (1998). *Security: A New Framework For Analysis*. Colorado: Lynne Rienner.
- Carr, E. H. (1946). *The Twenty Years Crisis* (Second ed.). London: Macmillan.
- Collins, A. (2004). State-Induced Security Dilemma: Maintaining the Tragedy: Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 39(1), 18.
- Drake, C. J. M. (1998). *Terrorist' Target Selection* New York: St. Marten's Press.
- Franke, V. C. (2005). Introduction. In V. C. Franke (Ed.), *Terrorism and Peacekeeping: New Security Challenges*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Graeger, N. (1996). Environmental Security? *Journal of Peace Research*, 33(1), 18.
- Griffits, M. (1999). *Fifty Key Thinkers in International relations*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hansen, K. A. (2006). *Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty: An Insider's Perspective* (Vol. article I, no 1). California: Stanford University Press.
- Herz, J. (1951). Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma. *World Politics*, 2(2), 24.
- Hurrell, A. (2002). There are No Rules' (George W. Bush): International Order After September 11. *International Relations*, 16, 20.

- Ikenberry, G. J. (Sep 1, 2002). America's Imperial Ambition. *Foreign Affairs*, 81(5), 44.
- Jackson, R. J., & Towle, P. (2006). *Temptations of Power The United States in Global Politics after 9/11*. New York, N.Y: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnson, T. A. (2009). *The War on Terrorism: A Collision of Values, Strategies, and Societies*. New York: CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Keohane, R. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Krasner, S. D. (1983). Structural causes and regime consequences: regimes as interpretive variables. In S. D. Krasner (Ed.), *International regimes*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Kunz, J. L. (Dec 1953). The Idea of "Collective Security" in Pan-American Developments. *Political Research Quarterly*, 6, 32.
- McDonnell, T. M. (2010). *The United States, International Law, and the Struggle against Terrorism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mythen, G., & Walklate, S. (Aug 2006). Communicating the terrorist risk: Harnessing a culture of fear? *Crime, Media, Culture*, 2, 20.
- National Military Strategy of the United States of America: A Strategy for Today; A Vision for Tomorrow. (2004). Retrieved 1,11, 2009, from <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/d20050318nms.pdf>
- The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America (16 March 2006). Retrieved 28, 9, 2009, from <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/national/nss-060316.htm>
- The National Security Strategy Of The United States Of America. (September 2002). Retrieved 28, 9, 2009, from <http://www.ndu.edu/library/epubs/nss09-2002.pdf>
- Perliger, A. (2006). *The roots of Terrorism: Middle Eastern Terrorism*. New York Ny: Chelsea House.
- Quadrennial Defense Review Report. (Feb 6, 2006). Retrieved 10,11, 2009, from <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/qdr-2006-report.pdf>
- Quadrennial Defense Review Report. (Sep 30, 2001). from <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/pdfs/qdr2001.pdf>
- Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. (2005). Retrieved 19,11, 2009, from <http://www.un.org/events/npt2005/npptreaty.html>
- Roosevelt, F. D. (January 6, 1941). Franklin D. Roosevelt's Address to Congress: The "Four Freedoms". Retrieved 9,12, 2009, from <http://www.wwnorton.com/college/history/ralph/workbook/ralprs36b.htm>
- Ruggie, J. (1975). International responses to technology: concepts and trends. *International Organization*, 29(3 (summer)), 18.
- Schweiss, C. M. (2003). Sharing Hegemony: The Future of Transatlantic Security. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 38(3), 34.
- Scurfield, R. M., Viola, J., Platoni, K., & Colon, J. (2003). Continuing Psychological Aftermath of 9/11: A POPPA Experience and Critical Incident Stress Debriefing Revisited. *Traumatology*, 9(March), 27.
- Sorensen, G. (Sep 2007). After the Security Dilemma: The Challenges of Insecurity in Weak States and the Dilemma of Liberal Values. *Security Dialogue*, 38(3), 22.
- Stapley, C. (2009). Terrorism: Its Goals, Targets, and Strategies. In A. B. Lowther & B. Lindsay (Eds.), *Terrorism's Unanswered Questions*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

- Torabi, M. R., & Seo, D.-C. (2004). National Study of Behavioral and Life Changes Since September 11. *Health Education & Behavior, 31*(April), 14.
- Wheeler, N. J., & Booth, K. (1992). The Security Dilemma. In J. Baylis & N. J. Rengger (Eds.), *Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wolfers, A. (1952). National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol. *Political Science Quarterly, 67*(4), 22.