THE U.S. NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING TERRORISM AT THE BEGINNING OF THE XXI CENTURY

The following text represents a Summary of Findings of Dr. Niksa Nikodinovic's homonymous Doctoral Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Political Science Graduate School of the Belgrade University

Niksa Nikodinovic, PhD

2017

European Police Union
Europäische Polizei Union
Union Européene de la Police
Europese Politieunie
Unión Europea de Policía

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Abstract

International terrorism has „risen" at the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century as one of the key security issues and challenges of the modern and more and more globalized society. The main sources of this political and security phenomenon, which are usually defined as its causes, and in fact represent conditions that are conducive to its formation, development and expansion, are piled up in the deepening social inequalities and contradictions (poverty, powerlessness, frustration, etc.) and in the adverse social conditions (discrimination, exploitation, etc.), that particular organizations, but rarely individuals, try to change at all costs, mostly with the violence, as well as in unrealized political ambitions of certain social groups.

Bearers of terrorism are majorly particular social groups. Those are usually extremist political or para-political organizations, but also religious ones, which according to their ideology and objectives have chosen violence rather than legitimate political methods (democratic and institutional) as a way to achieve their goals. The range of terrorist activities (methods and tactics) is broad and characterized by a growing cruelty and brutality of the attacks, often suicidal, which eventually became deadlier. For that we can be thankful to the modern technological developments, because along with the evolution of mankind terrorism has evolved too, while its types and forms of organization and the modes of operation have been constantly changing (perfected). Today, one of the most sinister terrorist threats is suicide terrorism. Its main feature is the determination (awareness and willingness) of individuals, rarely the whole group to, besides not having any respect for lives of others, even sacrifice their own lives for the sake of „the common/greater good" (the main goal of the organization).

Above all, frivolous understandings of the dangers that it entails and the application of double standards by world powers when it comes to its opposition, have contributed to the global expansion of terrorism. The fight against this global scourge is, among other things, aggravated by the fact that the enormous resources, primarily international political will, are focused on its consequences, instead of detecting its profound causes and their suppression.

The beginning of the twenty-first century was marked by the biggest terrorist act in the history of humanity, September 11th 2001 (**9/11**). In the way that they were carried out, their size and consequences, suicide attacks committed on that day, on the territory of the United States (**US**) have ensured that the start of the new millennium will be remembered in the world by the rapid expansion of international terrorism, which has shocked and horrified almost everybody due to the direct victims, material damage, the fear and insecurity which it evokes. Today, modern terrorism, dramatically portrayed through 9/11, represents one of the key security issues and challenges of a globalized society, whose frequent, more destructive and deadlier acts clearly emphasize its domination over the other forms of endangering safety.

Shortly after 9/11, the U.S. President George W. Bush Jr. announced an all-out, spatially and temporally unlimited war on terrorism, with the support of most countries in the world as well as international institutions, such as NATO and the United Nations (**UN**). This unconventional and still ongoing warfare includes a variety of military, political and legislative actions whose main objective is to prevent and combat terrorism on a global level. For this purpose, the special anti-terrorism strategies, and a number of other relevant strategic documents were adopted, both, in the United States and in the European Union (**EU**), as well as in it's Member States.

The U.S. National Strategy for Combating Terrorism has eliminated the glitches in American anti-terrorism prevention and resulted in raising the level of internal security of the United States. The main indicator of its effectiveness is the fact that the US have been spared of large-scale terrorist attacks after the 9/11. This was not the case with the European Union, its biggest ally, which in the first decade of this war was terrified with two large attacks by Al Qaeda (Madrid 2004 and London 2005). Unfortunately, the EU is still the target and a base of Islamist extremists, which is an evidence and a most serious warning that its anti-terrorism prevention, unlike the U.S.'s, is in one or more segments inadequate (permeable).

Military operations in the first ten years of the war included the anti-terrorist armed struggle in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as sporadic bombings, armed intervention and support of the U.S. and allied troops to local anti-terror fights in Pakistan, Somalia, the Philippines, Yemen, Kashmir and Mali. Thanks to them, Al Qaeda has suffered a decline in power and focused on self-defence in the Middle East, but also on launching attacks in the weaker, less protected and more vulnerable European countries. These and a whole lot more, preventive as well as repressive security measures at the national level, have prevented the terrorist operations of Al Qaeda and her related organizations in the US.

Comprehensive security measures (tightening of current anti-terrorism laws and the adoption of a number of new laws and the security and safety procedures) and internal reforms of federal security institutions, as well as establishments of new ones have eliminated the gaps in the anti-terrorist prevention of the United States. Their use has largely reduced the ability of terrorists to travel, organize and carry out attacks in the US, which led them to divert their terrorist activities to the EU. However, in this process of tightening legal regulations and security procedures, the balance between security and values of American society has been disrupted, making it seem that the security of the country has become more important than respecting the rights of its own citizens.

Two supporting, reformative and repressive laws have been adopted after the 9/11 - Patriot Act and the Homeland Security Act. They have removed the legal obstacles for conducting investigations, primarily secret ones, and have also made it easy to exchange the intelligence. Enforcing both of the laws resulted in a great number of investigations and arrests of terrorism suspects, but at the same time threatened the human rights and civil liberties of the entire US population. During the same „War on Terrorism", the European Union, unlike the US, has not compromised the privacy and civil liberties of its citizens in exchange for the

increase of their security, but also it has not been nearly as successful in correcting its own anti-terrorist prevention like the United States were.

Finally, drawing a line after the completion of the first decade of the global anti-terrorist war, it can be concluded that the United States, unlike the EU, have managed to establish a security appliance that fully responds to threats and challenges of the modern era, led by the terrorism. Unfortunately, the necessity to reform its own security system, especially the part in charge of prevention, has been brought to attention after the horrific terrorist attacks in 2001.

However, despite the enormous efforts and vigorous measures by the international community, led by the US and EU, aimed at the efficient prevention and suppression of terrorism at the global level, the effects of this kind of political violence not only did it not decrease, but the number of victims, primarily innocent ones, significantly increased in recent years. For that reason it is indispensable to deeply analyze and critically evaluate all previous antiterrorism measures with a purpose to the successful identification of flaws in them, and finding effective solutions for their elimination.

It is clear that terrorism can never be eradicated, but its efficient prevention is possible, and not only by the use of military forces (hard power), rather by changing the overall social relations in the world, and by reducing the economic and social disparities within the countries, by development of democracy and the continuing of the mass educating public on terrorism and the long-term evil that it entails.

Washington D.C., the year of 1759

Benjamin Franklin:

„They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary

safety deserve neither liberty nor safety".

THE U.S. NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING TERRORISM AT THE BEGINNING OF THE XXI CENTURY:

Comparative Analysis of the US's and EU's Anti-terrorism Approaches and their Effectiveness after 9/11

Defining Terrorism

It's only the second decade of the 21st century and it has been clearly marked as "The Age of Terrorism", because at the very beginning of it, an abrupt expansion of that phenomenon occurred, and which has shocked the world, due to its casualties, destruction, and constant fear and insecurity it causes. Furthermore, the precautions taken as a response to the greatest terrorist act in the history of mankind (9/11), as well as consequences of it had defined and characterized the century we live in.

In addition to that, is the concerning fact that even though terrorism represents the greatest plague of the modern age, and aside from science investing great efforts to offer the generally accepted definition of it, this security phenomenon of the modern day represents a problem on which an international consensus is still impossible to achieve. Definition, as well as the very study of terrorism as a socially-political phenomenon is made difficult, before anything else, by its complexity and a wide variety of forms and shapes in which it is being manifested today. Since it represents a multidimensional social phenomenon, a multidisciplinary approach is needed when attempting to clarify it, and it can be observed best from the aspect of criminology, criminal justice (law), sociology and psychology but also other social studies that could contribute to its adequate monitoring and overcoming.

Therefore, there are many definitions, because after the spectacular terrorist attacks on the US in 2001, terrorism has been labelled as one of the most important international political problems in the world, by which it has become one of the most attractive subjects and topics of social studies, which had resulted a whole wave of definitions. However none of them are generally accepted, even though it has been attempted to establish a unanimous definition through the highest ranks of international institutions and organizations, like UN. It has been impossible to achieve the aforementioned unanimity mostly because of, for some countries or

nations, such as the Albanians in Kosovo, terrorism is a legitimate right of defence, leading to the creation of situations in which individuals or groups become idols or symbols of freedom fighters for one part of the society, while they are considered to be terrorists by the other part of society.

Maybe experts could manage to agree to a unified definition if the matter of terrorism did not contain a large proportion of political components. The problems are different, often conflicted political interests of certain countries, as well as double standards – certain countries battle terrorism which jeopardizes their security or interests, and support the one in correlation with own interests. There are certain organizations that had been viewed as terroristic for a long time, and are accepted as legitimate political parties today, just like the Palestinian Hamas or PLO, etc. Americans apply double standards more than any other country when it comes to defining terrorist actions, and the victim of this type of behaviour from the powerful West has also been the Republic of Serbia in the end of the last century, when it confronted the terrorist acts of the so called "UCK" decisively and legitimately. Basically, anything that doesn't affect American security and their interests or the West in general is not considered terrorism, but rather as, by their interpretation, some form of *democratic* struggle for *human rights*.

Depending on the point of interpretation, violence against the enemy can be taken as terrorism or counterterrorism, as an aggressive attack or a legitimate defence, or simply as a criminal act. One group of authors assigns terrorism to certain individuals, groups or movements which strive toward the change of a specific political order via violent acts. The other group views it as a specific type of warfare (cheap, efficient, etc.) against a different country or a regime. The acts of the Albanian terrorists in Kosovo are an obvious example of internal riots of specific groups which has grown into a "special" war of paramilitary formations and subversive acts against the independent Republic of Serbia.

Therefore, it has been impossible to establish a unique international definition of terrorism so far, which would be generally accepted by everyone because all of those who possess the political power to define the legitimacy also have the power to define terrorism, of course in accordance with their own interests. Terrorism has become synonymous with every negative occurrence of using violence as a form of political expression over time. It has been deemed exquisite that it was used to mark a specific form of power display through history, and that the meaning of the term has become reversed over time. Hence, the states use it today to characterize all violent political opponents.

Under the term of terrorism, regular people constitute guerrilla actions which happen in any armed struggle, furthermore, the kidnappings of diplomatic representatives, bank robberies, political assassinations, illegal border crossing, various forms of hectic behaviour and etc. It is therefore necessary to define terrorist actions which are unacceptable and illegal in the context of criminal law, of the international community as a whole. This practically means that a social consciousness needs to be developed about terrorism actually being a crime, regardless of which social group do its perpetrators belong, and whose interests they represent and serve.

In all existing definitions of terrorism, both administrative and scientific (academic), two definitional elements are obvious, and those are: **political goals** and **fear induced by violence**. Political motive of the perpetrator is the condition to label a criminal act as a terrorist, because it is the only definitional component which separates terrorism from ordinary crime. As far as fear goes, terrorists use it as the most powerful mean of psychic pressure so that they may achieve their goals. Typical methods of terrorists are abductions and kidnappings beside armed assaults, just like arson and bomb planting, assassinations and etc. All these offensive tactics induce fear which then rapidly expands via media, demoralizes opponents and creates an atmosphere of insecurity in the targeted society.

We can conclude that terrorism, regardless of its features, goals and means is the result of various economic, social, and before anything else, political factors. Bearing in mind that the difficulties that arise while analyzing it (development and spread, course of actions, possibilities of transformations etc.) are caused, not by the non-existence of a unique generally accepted definition, making it difficult to contain it, therefore, a conclusion arises that establishing an internationally acceptable definition is a necessary condition for its overcoming. This constitutes the establishing of an all-inclusive definition by the UN, so as to create an efficient international anti-terrorist strategy and that the frame of actions is precisely determined, as well as the obligations of member countries. It has long grown into a global security issue, which means that all borders have been rendered pointless to it. Terrorists are being recruited, financed and sent all around the world, which makes it international. Hence, after achieving an international consensus in defining terrorism, it is necessary to create an international, anti-terrorist network, as well as an efficient global strategy for its prevention.

Bearing in mind that a clear definition of terrorism is utterly necessary as well as the classifications of terrorist acts, thus honouring analyzed definitions and by being guided by their basic structural parts and factors, as well as the main definitional elements, we have developed our own definition which had guided us in our research, and that definition is as follows: **Terrorism is a pre-determined (planned, organized, systematic and coordinated) use of violence by an individual or a group, most commonly used on civilian targets, in order to invoke and spread fear, thus causing leniency or obedience of the government, and by which the ultimate sociological goal is achieved (political, ideological, racial, religious, ethnical and others).**

History of Terrorism

Even though the most of uninitiated considers or even believes it to be, terrorism is not a contemporary phenomenon as a kind of collective and political crime. Throughout history, people have been applying various terrorist tactics, such as regicide, assassinations of various levels, bomb planting, kidnappings, abductions etc. This leads to a conclusion that it has emerged at the same time as society, or as the state itself, but its beginning has been wrongly connected to the Middle East and the emerging of religious, that is, Islamic fanaticism by a good portion of public. However, according to many historians and analysts, the French

revolution, more accurately described as *Jacobin Dictatorship* is the period in which the term has been used for the first time, and its predecessors were **Zealots**, **Assassins** and **Tages**.

In its original forms, terrorism has represented terror, the reign of intimidation and violence. Then, as a form of political violence that an individual uses to confront the state (assassinations of rulers), it has been manifested in the medieval period. Also, it has been used to characterize revolutionary and anti-monarch movements, repressive apparatuses of authoritarian and fascist countries such as the USSR and Germany during the fourth decade of the twentieth century, as well as anti-colonial extremist and nationalist movements in the next three decades, including religious fanatics of the 1980's in recent history. After WW2 and until the 1980's, an ideological terrorism that strived to revolutionary changes has reigned, with the emerging of the Red Brigade, Red Army Fractions and others. In the last two decades of the 20th century, an abrupt rise has occurred, based on religion, and the creation of Islamic organizations such as Hamas, Hezbollah, Al-Qaida and many smaller ones. Therefore, in contemporary definition, since the 60's, terrorism represents a politically motivated induction of fear and insecurity in individuals (governing elite) and populace by the use of various forms of violence. The beginning of the 21st century brings a new dimension which corresponds with globalization to terrorism, and drives its strength completely from the escalation of Islamic extremism.

After the end of the Cold War, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of USSR and other socialist federations, a bipolar ideological rivalry has disappeared from the world, creating **neoliberalism**, which was specifically oriented to the profitable concept of globalization, with the projection of American **unipolarity**, and new options for resolving open international matters worldwide were created. With the end of 2nd and especially the beginning of the 3rd Millennia, the unipolar influences are internationally suppressed, as well as in broader and more narrow regional dimensions. In the new Post-Cold War era, powerful countries with US as the head, don't choose means for their goals, just like those who oppose them, so military interventions, or so called "*hard power*" has become more and more present. The development of modern **multipolar** world with new weight-stones of economic and political power has lead to the creation of new problems and new enemies. It has then come to past that instead of defeated communism, as the main and biggest enemy of the capitalist order, has been taken over by radical Islam which is expanding. Simply put, the new age brings new challenges, this time in the form of a global terrorist threat. Therefore, the main security issue, aside from regional and ethnic conflicts, has become terrorism embodied in religious (Islamic) extreme fanaticism, dramatically vivified through 9/11.

As the only world's super power, the winner of the Cold War which had been represented as a war of liberal democratic capitalism, and a war against communist totalitarian rule, America has imposed a role of a "***world's policeman***" and a global peacekeeper to itself. It has promised to build a better and safer world with an expansion of democratic values as well as implementing fundamental human rights in all its areas. However, its global domination in the 2nd half of the 20th century has been marked by double standards when it comes to justice and interventions, peaceful or hostile ones, with all countries or alliances that threatened to jeopardize her leading position, or deny her political determination. The governments of these

countries had been labelled as "hostile", because they, allegedly, represented a threat to American national interests. The same practice had been carried on throughout the beginning of the 21st century, but, at this point, these were mostly Muslim countries in the Arabic world. Anger has been piling up among the populace of these countries, because the process of globalization, whose invoker and carrier is America, has been leaving them poorer and poorer in spite of great resources and enormous wealth. The Islamic religious fundamentalism has grown into extreme fanaticism over time, which has found its institutional frame in terrorist organizations. This was directly confirmed by professor Folk, who stated: "Societies, from which serious terrorist movements are being recruited, represent societies in which the deep historical and modern injustices inflicted to their countries and regions are synthesized".[1] When it comes to the Middle East, he explains: "the fact that the West has had more benefits from its oil reserves then the nations in which the oil had been found runs very deep".[2]

It is undisputed that at the end of previous and the beginning of the new millennia, enormous changes in all spheres of life took place. We have technological progress on one side, and the erosion of social state and growth of poverty on the other, and when it comes to the undeveloped countries, regardless to the increase of foreign capital investments, poverty is ever present. Many people blame globalization for the increase of economic inequality, the growth of social insecurity and the division between the rich and poor in the world. Its critics explain it as a strategy of the *New World Order* that enables open and direct interference, as well as super power dominion over the undeveloped countries, or even entire regions. There is no "*Humane Interventionism*" for them, just a clean capital interest. Supporters of globalization claim that it brings liberty (spread of democracy and open market) and general bliss (economic development and monetary stability) while the naysayers agree with this point of view, but they emphasize that it is all about the freedom and prosperity of the chosen ones (powerful elite) all according to the standards of the people who were in control of the capital, who also direct the way of life and the term of democracy.

The increase of violence has become the greatest social problem, and terrorism only represents one form of violent behaviour, within states, just like in international communities. It is no wonder that poverty has been identified as the main cause of terrorism and its development, because a fair portion of the world lives impoverished,[3] that is, in a huge contrast to the relative bliss of the developed and wealthy West.

Even though there are many talks about "new", more dangerous and cruel terrorism, we are talking about terrorism that has existed throughout history, and has evolved and been modernized over time. The development of technology, communication systems and weapons

---

[1] **Source:** Folk Richard, *Great Terrorist War*, Filip Višnjić, Beograd, 2003, p. 71.
[2] **Source:** Ibidem, p. 69.
[3] A development program under the auspice of the UN (*United Nations Development Programme - UNDP*) has been researching the causes of terrorism with hindsight of 2001, when the deadliest and greatest terrorist act in the world has been committed. According to their report, 1.2 billion people had been attempting to survive with less than a dollar a day in 2001, and the same number of people had not had access to clean, drinking water, with another 2.9 billion who had had no access to sanitation, and over a hundred and fifty million children were malnourished, and during this year alone, over 10 million children died of famine and disease caused by malnutrituon. **Source:** United Nations Development Programme Bureau for Development Policy, *Humanity Divided: Confronting Inequality in Developing Countries*, United Nations, New York, 2013.

has made it possible for terrorists to operate in thus far un-witnessed ways and has encouraged its transnational activities with an escalation of evermore destructive and spectacular violence. Put simply, terrorism has been modernizing along with the society as a whole over time, and its actions have gotten new dimensions which become ever more brutal and reckless.

The Characteristics of the Contemporary Global Terrorism

Modern terrorism is global when it comes to its spread (international terrorist networks), and as such, it makes all boarders pointless, and differs from its previous condition by its proportions of destruction, professional planning, coordination and execution, as well as a decentralized manner of organization from its previous state. Modern terrorist organizations have branches and flipping cells in almost all countries, they expand fast, and while doing that, they use the cutting edge technology, especially when it comes to communication systems, which they use to efficiently and in secret (encoded) communicate around the world. Internet is the thing that, beside spreading hate, endorses and enables potential recruitment, while financial globalization and the so called "*digitalization of money*" have enabled quick and easy financial transfers worldwide, while at the same time making it more difficult to track the money and terrorist organization finances, as well as their actions. The goals of modernized terrorism reach to the destabilization of a social system of an invaded country and its international relations as a whole, and those actions can be of any kind and can be conducted using all and every means necessary. Its bearers have enormous, mostly unreal ambitions, use modern strategies, doctrines and tactics, and demonstrate power using brutal violence, whose destruction has been vastly overcame by its psychological effects (fear and a sense of insecurity) by which they fulfil their political goals. Unlike classic terrorist acts, the activities of global terrorists, besides their international character, are much faster and much more professional. In addition to that, they are planned and performed in a highest level of secrecy, with maximum efficiency and a factor of surprise. Their direct victims are usually picked randomly, which means that they are no longer mostly focused on state officials, but rather on common people, who represent the means by which terrorists bring their messages across, or are picked selectively from targeted population and used as statements (symbolic goals). Also, the targets of terrorist brutality are not only people, but more and more the objects of symbolic value, which can be seen in terrorist attacks of 9/11, when three symbolic objects in US were picked as a target: Pentagon and World trade centre, which symbolize military and economic power of the US, as well as the Congress (fortunately an unsuccessful attempt), which represents political power of this country and the pillar of its democracy.

The actions of modern terrorists are sensational because they are, in most cases, unexpected, and as such they attract enormous attention from the media which they use to force their own goal or intention, but also fear and insecurity among citizenry. By performing such actions, which are classified as "*states of emergency*", they purposely obstruct normal functioning of state and society, and in such a way apply pressure to the authorities demanding them to fulfil certain condition, or simply bring their message across to the vast media. They are counting

the public pressure on the government to produce the desired result of the government yielding in these situations, and that is the main reason they take public responsibility for their actions. They use media as a gauge of the efficiency of performed attacks while the publicity gained, and then the reactions of the government and citizens determine the success of these actions. Let us take, as an example, the attacks of 9/11 that caused the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. They were more successful than Bin Laden himself thought they would be, and unlike them, the bombings in London in 2007, after which the Brits continued with their normal life on the very next day, were not half as successful. The question is – **why**? Because, the British government has cohabited media space for terrorists, since its adamant reckoning with Ireland's republican army depriving them publicity. Spain has, facing her anti-terrorist activities when it comes to ethnic-separatist organization called "Basque Homeland and Liberty (ETA)", for a while now, been following that experience example from Britain.

We can come to the conclusion that the practice of the most of the world media so far, lead by American media, and abrupt reactions of numerous countries are only encouraging terrorists to perform bigger and deadlier actions that are appalling to the world with their cruelty and brutality creating international fear. The publicity that follows every terrorist act is enabling public display of their goals and motives, and in that case the media represents the means for communication with the state (the authorities) and with the public, whereby the fear of brutality is meant for the public, and the request/condition for achieving political goals is meant for the governments. That is the main characteristic of modern global terrorism – today's terrorist actions don't have a purpose of their own, but are more the means of transmitting the message of what may follow (a threat of future violence resulting in more horrific violence) if the requested terms/conditions aren't fulfilled, and are often followed by new actions with even greater consequences. That is why it is necessary to limit the media access to terrorist groups and organizations, and narrow down media attention, restricting them the mass publicity in that manner.

Classification and Forms of Terrorism

Terrorism has always been leaving the impression of being uncivil because, with its actions (disrespect of human lives, including its own), it creates the state of uncontrolled brutality and unlimited cruelty, while at the same time refuses to accept established norms, laws and properties of society. Considering the nature of this phenomenon, the necessary adjustment in accordance with social processes, it's easy to conclude that it doesn't have firm and simple, but rather a complex and fluid form, which is why it is not easy to separate and classify it. However, according to today's understanding of terrorism, the most common typology is done according to: causes and goals, areas and the means of actions, and subjects and targets.

Nowadays, the terrorism is represented by various causes and purposes. It has been used in anti-colonial conflicts, such as the ones in Britain, Algeria and France. It is also used when dealing with conflicts between different ethnical and national groups in dispute over territory,

such as Serbia and Kosovo, then Palestine and Israel, etc. It is also present in religious disputes, for example the conflict between Catholic and Protestants in Northern Ireland and in internal conflicts between revolutionary forces and newly-formed governments, for example Argentina and Nicaragua… However, the most common forms of terrorism at the moment are ethno-separatist and religious ones.

The form that is getting more and more pervasive is suicide terrorism, reaching global scales, because it is no longer tied to the area of Middle East and Islamic fundamental organizations. It can, from its points of origin (the Middle East, North Africa and Chechnya), reach any part of the world if that is decided by the terrorist organizations, that more and more consider it to be purposeful, because of its effectiveness and relatively simple and cheap performing. The main social factors that contribute to emerging and evolution of suicide terrorism are: in the first place, the terrorist organization as an organizer and sponsor of this type of extremist activity in order to achieve certain political goals, ideological foundation (most commonly religious – *Jihad*) that launches it, secondly, the personal motivation of the perpetrator and, last but not least, the social environment that supports and encourages such behaviour.

The question has always been, and especially after the suicide attacks of 9/11 – who are the terrorists and what kind of people are they? To properly answer this question it is necessary to make a profile of terrorist personality, which is a very complex and difficult task, and the final result can never be completely precise and accurate. Even though it is impossible to create a terrorist personality profile that is complete and temporarily sustainable, it is clear that nowadays those are mostly young and very intelligent males that have certain cold-bloodedness, tenacity, wits, confidence, capability and endurance. They are, firstly, strong personalities, politically motivated, and mostly religiously inspired, and determined to fulfil their assignment at any cost. Although they have a normal appearance, terrorists are sociopaths that in their desire and determination to succeed in performing their actions became completely insensitive to human traumas and tragedies that are caused by those very same actions. Research and statistic show that the modern terrorists are mostly a category of sagacious and conscious individuals for whom the terrorism is a rational choice and devastation and bloodshed are justified means for achieving their own political goals. They don't see themselves as the initiators of injustice, as perpetrators of the atrocity, but more as those who are trying to correct such atrocities and punish the ones that are responsible. A terrorist considers that the act that he had committed is not his fault, but that the fault lies with the one who didn't fulfil his request, which lead to the crime.

Today there are around 200 international terrorist organizations and groups, and most of them are located in the Middle East, and they are mostly Islamic. These ones in particular, lead by the Al-Qaeda and so called "Islamic State", which can be considered as a synonym of global terrorism, represent the biggest threat to the modern society. The main factors of development and expansion of terrorism in that area are, among others, the conflict between Israel and Palestine that goes on for several decades and the previously mentioned globalization, based on "modernization" of the society through secularization (the decline of religiousness, in society, as well as in the consciousness of an individual), that hasn't been put to past, but that a planned process of "democratization" and "modernization" in Islamic

countries has lead to emerging of powerful and widely spread anti-globalist movements and organizations, out of which many have resorted to violence (terrorism). Also, it is quite clear that the US's foreign policy, at least to a certain degree, is responsible for political extremism in the Islamic world. The results of it's policy represent some of the main reasons for the frustration that is easily becoming intolerance in the Muslim population and that is manifesting in violence towards abhorred West.

It should also be noted that the connection between religion and the majority of important political processes, out of which some are extremely violent, has always been evident, but that many of those processes were also consequences of religious conflicts. However, Islamic terrorism itself has lead to the realization that Islam as a religion is completely and directly abused and politically instrumentalized, which has caused, however hard it may be to admit, global intolerance towards Muslims. And that is how the bloody attack in New York in 2001 was experienced and convicted by many as a Muslim crime, which shouldn't have happened, because, just like Auschwitz, Jasenovac and etc., do not represent Christian crimes. Those who committed these crimes have names and surnames, and in these cases well organized structures. Aside from that distorted interpretation of Islam by those who misuse it, it should be taken into consideration that it has been, ever since the Palestinian conflict against Israel, and then the wars between Iraq and Iran, in a way "demonized" as a terrorist cult, that prompts suicide attacks, which is the exact opposite of what this religion stands for.

It is a fact that Islamic terrorism aspires to have as much victims as possible and uses the most brutal method of suicide that disgusts the whole world. Organizations of this kind have been the most active since the end of the last and the beginning of this century, and they aspire to establish social values that are based on the wrong interpretation of Islam. The main characteristics of their members are: dedication to Islam as the only true religion and dedication to ideology (*Islamism* - that represents the entirety of all other Muslim ideologies such as those that are most extreme – *Jihadism* and *AlQaedism*), sacrifice, obedience and allegiance towards their leadership, and also willingness to sacrifice for the greater good.

Al-Qaeda; Osama bin Laden; 9/11

The one that stood out the most is Al-Qaeda and its leader Osama bin Laden when in 2001 committed the most brutal terrorist attack on the US, which resulted in nearly 3000 human casualties. That was the biggest and the most brutal individual terrorist act in the history of terrorism. More than two and a half billion people from all over the world witnessed a direct TV transmission of that horrible tragedy on that dreadful morning – the crash of two airplanes into the buildings of the World Trade Centre in New York. Aside from that, the fact that someone performed a direct attack on the American soil that was unimaginable until then, the public was shocked by the report that the third airplane hit the centre of Americas military power, the Pentagon itself, as well as the news that the passengers on the plane stopped terrorists from performing a suicide attack on Congress with the fourth plane by resisting their kidnappers, and that in the conflict they crushed the plane down and died to the

last one. Until then, the powerful Western audience did not know much about Al Qaeda and Laden, but after the performance of their spectacular action which main characteristic was unexpectedness and the goal, aside from clear and direct political message, was to have as many casualties as possible and maximization of material damage, they became the metaphor of evil. In fact, those who orchestrated these suicide attacks were instantly portrayed in the media as religious fanatic extremists, infinitely inspired by the demonized Laden's personality, who became the embodiment of world's evil over night.

After that, Al-Qaeda imposed herself on majority of other Islamist extremist groups as a leading organization. It has, as a direct product of Soviet-Afghan war that transformed itself over time into a powerful terrorist organization and then a global network, since its beginning, sought to radicalize the existing Islamist terrorist groups and create new ones to destroy US and Israel, which are, according to it, the main enemies of Islamic society and Islam in general. To that end, it is abusing religion by misinterpreting Quran and endorsing worldwide Jihad in which all sacrifices are justified and all means are allowed. That is why Jihad is in the Western World, even though it does not necessary involve physical combat, considered as a "*Holy War*" and as such it represents great, maybe even the most serious obstacle of globalization.

Bin Laden, the originator and leader of Al-Qaeda, a man that comes from a rich Saudi family who was plain and humble regardless of his wealth, and whose actions were exquisite in every aspect of leadership, had risen into an ideological leader whose idea is followed by the majority of Islamic terrorists even today, after his death. It is a bloody ideology of global Jihad, which represents the most brutal manner of combat using all means that are at the disposal to completely annihilate all "enemies" of Islam. Even though his liquidation was meant for striking the mighty blow against the worldwide Jihad, it only provoked terrorists and in one hand caused even greater anger, and in the other inspired Muslim fanatics who raised his character and work to such a point that today he represents the biggest icon of modern terrorism. His martyr cult is greatly magnified, but that was to be expected and therefore it is believed that his body was thrown in the sea. The fear of Bin Laden's grave becoming a site of deification and pilgrimage for his followers and sympathizers was probably the reason why US were conditioned to "bury" him in the Arabic Sea.

There's no doubt that his liquidation was highly significant for the international anti-terrorist efforts and that it has rather positive implications towards the "Global War on Terrorism" itself. It is still considered to be the greatest success of the US in that war, and it also represents huge psychological triumph for the citizens of the United States, who waited over a decade for a revenge for 9/11. However, it was soon clear that the modern Jihadistic terrorism had risen into an ideology that didn't require an operative leader that many thought Bin Laden was and expected that Islamic terrorism will end with his demise. It was quite the opposite, he was more of a symbol of Al-Qaeda, and the organization was, and remained after his death, an ideological brand of Islamic terrorism. On the other hand, many theorists had a justified suspicion that Islamic terrorist organizations and groups act together, and that there is a powerful and great organization that stands behind them, with developed infrastructure, financial stability and countries that, even though secretly, support it or at least do not

distance from the actions of that world terrorist centre, which has, at least until now, quite successfully governed the Jihadists around the world.

Therefore, Al-Qaeda has become an embodiment of modern terrorism, thanks toLaden, deprived from transnationalism and globalization. It is, as an apostle of global Jihad and establishing pan-Islamist caliphate, transnational by its identity (distribution, recruitment and financing), and global by ideology (goals and strategy).

It is also evident that even though Al-Qaeda has only coasted and damaged Muslim people and the fact that the governments in most of Islamic countries publicly condemn its actions and implement certain anti-terrorist measures, a great portion of their population supports this organization in one way or another. Therefore, we can come to the conclusion that 9/11 was, to the great part of Islamic Arab world, a practical response to American foreign policy towards Middle East.

The War on Terrorism

9/11 is one of the rare events that had such an impact on the collective thinking of society, and the fact that it was named after the date when it happened speaks about its uniqueness and exquisiteness. The terrorist act performed that day on the American soil has represented, considering the manner of its performance, its greatness and consequences, the destruction of symbols of American power. That is to say, this "spectacular" terrorist attack has shown that economically and military strongest, and by that the most stable country in the world, isn't the safest one, that is, that power, whether it's economic, military or political, or all of those together, is no longer a guarantee of security. It was then that we became aware that nobody, nowhere and ever, is not and cannot be immune to the politically motivated security phenomenon of terrorism, and that the only solution to this global problem was general international war against it, which was initiated and is still being lead today by the US. After that day, the world that we live in has changed, the atmosphere of increased tension and uncertainty took over while the blade of primarily American intelligence repression in anti-terrorist campaign was very skilfully and deliberatively aimed towards the limitation of civil rights and liberties, especially privacy.

Until then, America's political elite didn't pay much attention to terrorism, focusing more on disabling the uprising of possible global competition (Russia, China and India), then providing economic wellbeing to its citizens and promoting democracy and human rights in the world. The cruelty and spectacularity of 9/11, as well as the shock that it had caused, then sense of insecurity, uncertainty and fear have lead president Bush Jr. to instantly, with all available means of national power, stand up against the global terrorism.

We can come to the conclusion that the main priority of US in the days after 9/11 was to urgently and with maximum efficiency disable Al-Qaeda's transnational network, minimalizing its capacities to the point where its further actions would be disabled or at least restrained, for start. That clearly shows the America's fear that came from belief that this

mega-terrorist organization has both, the will and capacities to perform similar actions in the future. However, not even today, after a decade and a half of ongoing "War on Terrorism", as well as on its beginning, isn't quite possible to estimate the real level and extent of the threat that Al-Qaeda and Islamic State represent.

It is obvious that the 9/11 had represented a turning point in US's modern history, but also in the world politics. Namely, only a couple of days after the shocking attacks America has lead, as a main priority, a "Global War Against Terrorism" in which she remains most engaged to this day, gaining mass international support. Until then, international aspects of combating terrorism were manifested with numerous initiatives, expert's and scientifically-academic conferences, publications and documents of regional and global organizations, as well as binding international acts – international community stood up to terrorism with norms of international law, through legislation of various conventions and resolutions aimed towards raising the efficiency in combating terrorism, but also bringing to justice all those who are responsible for terrorist acts.

The administration of American president George W. Bush Jr. started the "first war" in the 21st century, and the administration of his successor in the presidential office, Barack Obama, continued it, only by the name of "*Transnational Unpredictable Operations*". The war itself includes a lot of military, political and legislative actions with a goal to stop and suppress terrorism.

Many thought that the biggest absurd was the fact that America wept over itself on 9/11 and at the same time was the greatest power on Earth. However, that image presented by the media was actually created to use international empathy as a perfect alibi for the use of unlimited power with a peace of mind and with a complete justification of possible abuse of power. Patriotic enthusiasm, in America itself, which was huge in the early stages, gave President Bush, as a political leader but also as a supreme military commander, a total and complete clearance in his dealing with a wide variety of questions concerning anti-terrorist prevention in the US. He had wisely recognized the fear in the world and the willingness for action and promptly declared a "***Preventive War***" against terrorism. The name of this war has clearly defined the place where the war will be fought (Middle East), the need for solidarity, and most importantly the need for a swift reaction. The use of the term "war" has also created an impression that the modern world has a unique enemy, embodied in Al-Qaeda and primarily its leader Osama bin Laden, but it has been changed by Obama by the term "operations", moreover unpredictable, with an explanation that the concept of war against terrorism is too extensive and comprehensive that it could ever be ended.

This isn't a classic example of warfare between countries. It represents unconventional and asymmetric war of certain countries against, primarily, non-state actors (terrorist organizations), but also certain regimes (state sponsors of terrorism) as those in Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria are being represented. Thus, it is mainly directed towards global terrorist network, and not towards territorially based country. That is what makes it difficult because the identification of war goal isn't clear and is practically disabled by America's generalization of enemy, which has been broadened, aside from Al-Qaeda to the thing that

Washington named "*International Terrorism*". However, that is only a tactical step that US government has taken, so that it could at any time declare arbitrary victory in the war, risking, however, the future mega-terrorist attacks that could show that such declaration could have been anticipated. Furthermore, it is impossible to deal with this kind of enemy in a diplomatic way, or by using any traditional means of territorial self-defence. The White House itself has stated on many occasions that the "War on Terrorism" is different from all the other wars so far, and that the means that are not military (soft power) are of equal importance and that the victory will be achieved in a different way than pure military definition of victory. Namely, it can't be expected from terrorists to surrender in a classic military way in case of defeat.

The hardest thing in this unconventional war, which is unlimited by time and space, is to measure its efficiency and progress. It is important to know that terrorism is a tactic that is used by many in the present, that it will be used in the future, as it was used throughout history, so that there isn't a distinct physical enemy that could be defeated. Therefore, it is difficult to realize how the victory could be achieved, and the main problem is that this war is different from all the others, so the victory would have to be different as well. However, we believe that this war, if its goals are soon determined towards disabling Al-Qaeda's network and breaking down todays Islamic State, can end successfully. Naturally, this claim is highly hypothetical and as such is susceptible to radical revision, if the terrorists manage to perform actions of equal or even greater intensity than the ones in September of 2001.

International Support and a Global Crackdown on Terrorists

Since the terrorism has been, with the beginning of the third millennia, identified as a main security risk and a global threat to the world, it was understood that as such it requires engagement of the entire international community. Most countries have accepted Bush's invitation for participation in a global confrontation against regional and international terrorist organizations and groups. However, the thing that should be taken into account is the fact that this decision was affected by President Bush's warning that if other governments don't join American global anti-terrorist action, they are aligning themselves with the terrorists. Then, in fact, it wasn't genuine multilateralism, but forced alliance through expression of America's power and supremacy in international politics.

Either way, the entire West has shown unconditional solidarity in American combat against terrorism, lead by Russia, China and India. The evidence to support that is the fact that the governments of many countries, following the example of US, declared unlimited war against terrorism, forming various larger-scale international anti-terrorist partnerships. The most interesting, certainly is the one between two countries whose conflict lasted for decades, US and the Russian Federation, which was greatly intensified after terrorist attacks in Moscow in 2001. Also, Russian military interventions against Islamic State initiated in 2015 have confirmed that the relationship between Russia and US is the key factor of anti-terrorist combat and securing global security. Together, lead by mutual interests, these two countries can successfully face modern security threats and challenges, such as international global

terrorism, and help with crisis and conflicts in different parts of the world, not only with the use of force, but also by managing constructive dialogs and cooperation.

All available resources of international institutions that represent today's main agents and actors of making and maintaining the peace and stability on global political scene, such as NATO, OSCE, UN, EU and its members, were instantly engaged and directly focused towards suppressing international terrorism. Therefore, the world gave global terrorist network a decisive response with global anti-terrorist coalition. Considering that America was directly attacked on 9/11, it became the epicentre of that combat with the biggest engagement of these countries' military resources after the 2nd World War. America also included its NATO partners, and the biggest ally in its military operations was the Great Britain.

That was the first time in the history of this Alliance that the article 5 of the Contract was activated, that actually represents the basis for its legitimate actions for the purpose of defence, and with that NATO became the leading international organization that implements anti-terrorist measures. By doing so, all its activities were directed towards combating terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. In the shortest amount of time, the operative and institutional anti-terrorist frame was created, new international activities were initiated, and old ones strengthened and expedited, in order to create unity in that combat.

Because of the sudden escalation of modern day terrorism and global danger that comes with it, but, primarily, because of the fact that countries, especially less developed ones, aren't capable of providing measures and mechanisms for its successful prevention, control, and suppression on their own, the role of UN became crucial. Unlike the one that NATO has, it has normative, monitoring and advisory character and consists of bringing various regulations on the international level. This most powerful organization ever since it was established has been making certain steps against terrorism, from the standpoint of international law. However, specific measures for suppressing global terrorism were taken only after the UN Resolutions (1368, 1373 and 1377), approved on General Assembly sessions shortly after 9/11. These Resolutions had a great impact on creating a global anti-terrorist force lead by the US which asked UN to support their response to 9/11, at least up to the point that was necessary for the member countries to take steps inside their own borders and according to their capacities, in order to stand up to fractions of Al-Qaeda's network located on their territory.

However, even with all of the measures that UN undertook that were surely very important, the need for a universal, internationally accepted definition of terrorism still exists, and it is rightfully expected from the most powerful international organization to make a concrete effort in its defining. We think that the main prerequisite for a definite showdown with modern terrorism is the assimilation of generally accepted definition of terrorism on the General Assembly of UN, that would be validated by the Resolution, and which would be regarded as obligatory by all member countries. That, certainly, implies that all members of UN, primarily, major powers on which the financing and operating of this organization depends, to give up the double standards when it comes to their attitude towards terrorists and

their organizations. If that is not accomplished, it would be possible and rightful to question the need for further existence of this organization, which is obviously being instrumentalized by those major powers. The true combat against modern terrorism is conditional upon the same attitude towards everyone, that is, everyone's terrorism, in which every form of support must be eliminated, especially its encouragement and financing, for everyone's and anyone's goals and interests, whether they are public or secret and indirect.

On today's global scene, where the modern terrorism has no boundaries and is more and more looking like an organized criminal grouping with elements of participation of certain governments, and with fewer isolated incidents, it is quite clear that countries, especially less developed ones, aren't capable of conducting successful anti-terrorist activities on their own. If we take into consideration that the biggest modern day challenges, risks and threats, such as terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, aren't researched enough, we come to the conclusion that no country is capable of dealing with them on its own, nor taking total care of its national security. That's why, the fight against these threats demands coordinated cooperation of all international subjects, as well as all subjects of international law and security. Aside from membership and acting through international institutions, primarily the UN, it is necessary that the countries cooperate with each other (bilaterally and/or multilaterally) in security, law enforcement and intelligence affairs when it comes to terrorism. That kind of successful cooperation is possible to achieve and maintain only through a high level of trust between all the branching institutions. In addition to that, global anti-terrorist actions would have to be adjusted to both the minimums of common interests of the centres of world power affected by this phenomenon (US, EU, Russia), and rational predictions about the future development of terrorist threat. If that had been done in the beginning of the "preventive" war, it wouldn't have come to new terrorist threats that are posed by new extremist formation in the Middle East – the Islamic State.

Despite the aforementioned, the reform of international institutions lead by the UN is also necessary, in order to secure an adequate response to global terrorism. Naturally, it is a lengthy and expensive process that, among other things, requires political will and approval of all the world leaders, for whom it is about time to address the creation of new and more humane system of global governance. A realization of peaceful and righteous solution principle is also necessary (ethnical, religious and international), along with elimination of a practice that included imposing pre-set solutions that was done thus far.

Military Operations (Afghanistan & Iraq)

Military operations in the first 10 years of anti-terrorism war included armed combats in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as occasional bombing, armed interventions and support of American army and allies towards local anti-terrorism combat in Pakistan, Somalia, Philippines, Yemen, Kashmir and Mali. Unlike the military interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, and later in Syria as well, the ones in other aforementioned countries and in the region of Kashmir were not directed against those countries or their regimes, but were, under the

auspices of global unconventional "War on Terrorism" along with their governments, more or less, organized and conducted against the terrorists hiding or acting in or from those lands.

Involvement in direct military operations in Afghanistan, that gained legitimacy through the UN Resolution, included, aside from the United States and local oppositionists, 20 other countries - members of NATO, that were asked to participate through article no.5 of the Washington Contract of this organization. However, after the successful military operation in Afghanistan, that represented merely a beginning of global clash with international terrorists for Bush's administration, transatlantic allies parted their ways. Apparently, the majority of other countries, lead by the key members of the EU (Germany and France), were against interventions in Iraq without a mandate of UN Security Council, because they were aware that such action would lead to the endless conflict against completely undefined enemy, which did not stop US, backed up by Great Britain and with the assistance from Australia and a small number of countries members of NATO, from performing it. Even though the American president Bush tried to make it look like the US had wide international support for that war, it was quite the opposite.

The invasion of Iraq in order to overthrow Saddam Hussein prompted anti-American mood in the world, managed to divide Europe, that is, cast suspicion on the genuine goals of the US, and in the same time weakened the forces and resources from Afghanistan. Many experts and analysts see the reason for its initiation differently than they are portrayed, especially since no evidence of possession of weapons of mass destruction was found and neither was the proof that there was a bond between Hussein's regime and Al-Qaeda. According to them, the main reason and motive was establishing control over rich oil sources, and strategic control over the area in case of possible invasion on Iran and other Arab countries.

International support towards American "preventive" war was significantly diminished by the invasion of Iraq, disregarding the UN, and especially because after the occupation no incriminating evidence was found that would connect that country and its government with the attacks of 9/11. Not only that Iraq didn't pose a terrorist threat to the world, as the Americans portrayed it to the international community, but the threat only became real by Al-Qaeda's rehabilitation and the establishment of Islamic State in this area after American invasion on this country under the auspices of global anti-terrorism war. Today, along with Syria, it represents a hotspot of testing all terrorist tactics and a source of indoctrination of extreme Islamism, which is representing terrorism as a resistance of "holy soldiers" against "infidels" through fanatical interpretation of Quran and misuse of Islam as a religion.

The war in Iraq was, militarily speaking, successful, but destructive in every other aspect. The US weren't nearly as efficient enough in the stabilization of the situation in that country as they were in its occupation. Not only that it didn't bring democracy and prosperity to Iraq, but it completely destroyed it. After the utter chaos that was brought upon that country, it became a fertile ground for terrorism because its occupation was used as a motive for extremist recruitment and inspiration. That has lead to even greater instability in the Middle East, the rehabilitation of Al-Qaeda and creation of the most notorious extremists of the

modern age – Islamic State, that today controls a part of that country, as well as its neighbouring Syria.

When it comes to Afghanistan, even though the Taliban regime was overthrown with Bin Laden's assassination, then, reducing Al-Qaeda's operational power and establishing some form of democratic system and the institution of state, the results of long and very expensive war aren't satisfying, because that country, along with Iraq, still represents a crisis area and a fertile ground that is breeding international terrorism. The stabilization of security of this country requires the revitalization of its whole society, lead by the economic recovery, which requires both, time and money, which are unfortunately lacking due to the **Global Economic Crisis** and **European Migrant Crisis**.

Considering that Afghan society doesn't have a democratic tradition and that religious and political spheres of life are not separated, the process of its *forced democratization*, whose final outcome represents guaranteed freedom of speech, elections, media, human rights, equality and, above all, the rule of *earthly law*, will be long and difficult. Aside from that, it will also be very expensive, excluding the high price that was already paid, both in lives and money, which is why there's been a question for a while now about its overall profitability. It's clear that it is necessary to achieve certain perquisites lead by social-economic improvement of the entire nation in order to change the people's perception, and when firm democratic state institutions and stabile politics are formed, it is necessary to keep them under close observation and, if necessary, intervene in order to ensure their sustainability and preservation. In other words, such forcefully imposed democracy, without its historical roots and in a country that is under extreme religious influence, and with tribal society that never knew or acknowledged central authority, isn't and cannot be self-sustainable.

As well as in Afghan example, it turned out that in Iraq also, the overthrowing of "cast out" regime and the establishment of some form of democracy in order to stop terrorists from organizing, and disabling their actions, isn't effective. Unlike Afghanistan, that had always been greatly affected by religion (Islam) and that had a significantly weaker democratic tradition, Iraq, as a secular state, had a less present fundamentalist and extremist influence. Besides, Iraq was significantly more developed than Afghanistan, that, unlike Iraq, hardly had any infrastructure and natural resources and whose population was mostly primitive and uneducated. However, similarly to Afghanistan, it is all the more likely that forced and therefore unstable democracy, will collapse if it isn't under constant international supervision.

A Comparative Review of the American and European Strategic Approach to Anti-terrorism

This war, like any other, required a comprehensive strategic approach. That said, the leading countries of the West along with many nations that were going through a transition in the end of the twentieth century, approached the development and implementation of national

strategies in order to efficiently stand up to terrorism. It primarily included the combining of the law enforcement, security-informative and institutionally-legal means and measures on the domestic and international scale, as well as the international military operations (offensive).

The main actors of global anti-terrorist combat are the US, as a creator of modern war paradigm against international terrorism, and the EU that, even though its America's biggest ally in this war, had chosen entirely different means. In order to determine the differences between American and European ways of combating terrorism and to identify certain similarities between them, as well as verify the achieved results, we've analysed anti-terrorist policy of the US and EU over the period of 10 years after terrorist attacks in the US (2001-2011). By using comparative and qualitative analysis, we've studied their security and anti-terrorism strategies implemented during the first decade of the "War on Terrorism", as well as their implementation in practice, but also the initiative that preceded them, in order to point out the different security consequences of anti-terrorism combat. Aside from defining the nature of the response (strategic vision, implemented initiative, the measures that were taken, methods and instruments used) towards the growing terrorist threat, we pointed out and compared the achieved results and their possible flaws and inefficiencies.

Leading to, the ways of suppressing terrorism and the strategies the US and EU implemented are significantly different. As a matter of fact, after 9/11 the combat against terrorism gained new instruments, but the real question is: why has EU, as a biggest US ally and its most important partner in the "War on Terrorism" chosen different methods and measures? Especially considering that the difference between strategic and anti-terrorism visions and implemented measures were, in one hand, pretty much responsible for the flaws in Europe's anti-terrorist prevention, and in the other, responsible for disabling future major terrorist attacks by Al-Qaeda and similar organizations in the US.

In fact, anti-terrorist priorities of the US and EU were practically identical, but their view on prevention of further escalation of international terrorism was different. Europeans, like Americans, believe that Al-Qaeda must be utterly destroyed. In other words, American and Europe strategic opinion doesn't differ on what at the beginning of the 21st century represents a global threat to security – **terrorism** – but on the seriousness and estimation of the strength of this threat, as well as the military and politically-democratic way of responding to it. While the US sees terrorism as an existential threat, the EU's view of it is less critical which is why it's choice of methods and instruments of countering it is different. The prevention and protection from terrorist actions are regarded as a crucial part of Europe strategic approach towards the combat against terrorism, while the US chooses aggressively-offensive approach based on hegemony, that is the "war model" for which the rational choice is the "hard power". The US uses all elements of national power and international influence, but relies more on the "raw power" (military interventions) than on diplomatic instruments in order to achieve victory. Unlike them, for the EU terrorism isn't merely a military threat, nor do they consider that it should be countered solely with military apparatus, but instead they use a combination of assets in order to limit the use of armed power, that is, to condition it by dire need, as a final asset after all others (political, legal and economic) had been depleted.

Additionally, the Union had adopted a firm attitude towards multilateralism, the development of functional international order and respect for human rights and civil liberties. The European approach is based on negotiations, consensus, and strict respect for international rights and acting under the auspices of the UN, while the Americans consider the concept of anti-terrorist combat based on the "soft power" non-efficient. For them the best long-term solution is the "hard power", that is, the use of military force through preventive attacks abroad, with an intention to disable terrorists from performing their actions on the US territory and with a primary goal to completely annihilate them.

Beside the fact that the US and EU have different views of the use of force and opposing terrorism overall, they also have completely different views of the threat it poses, that EU considers it to be both internal and external. According to the EU Security Strategy, the terrorists came to the countries of EU from poor and/or ruined countries with non-democratic regimes, organized crime and corruption, as well as ethnical conflicts, and therefore it could be said that the security of EU citizens is more threatened by the neighbouring countries than it is by the countries of the Middle East. The US, however, considers that the terrorist threat comes solely from the outside, from the states that support and finance terrorism, believing that the extremist indoctrination and radicalization in the US is almost impossible and therefore negligible. The one thing on which they have the same point of view when it comes to global security is the fact that terrorism, when combined with the weapons of mass destruction, represents its biggest, that is, catastrophic threat.

Since the terrorist attacks on the US in 2001 and until the end of 2011 (the period of this research), the highest identified threat towards the security of the US and its citizens was terrorism, and the highest priority was combat against it. The second highest threat towards national security, closely related to the first one, was the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. What was identified as the highest real, although, fortunately still unrealized, threat towards the EU security and anti-terrorist strategy was the possibility of terrorists obtaining nuclear, chemical or biological weapons.

The main difference between the EU and US Security Strategies in combating terrorism was the US's decision for the preventive "War on Terrorism", that will be fought beyond their borders, that was made under the influence of the events of 9/11. They wanted allies in that war, but were also prepared to act unilaterally, which makes it different from the EU, which emphasizes multilateralism and the prevention or appeasing of the causes of terrorism. Even though the European Security Strategy doesn't reject the possible need for preventive actions, stating that "in the future, the first line of defence will be located abroad", its different from the American one that downgrades the role of the UN, while the EU relies on the UN Resolutions and sets multilateralism as a main benchmark of its foreign policy.

Concerning the specific US and EU Anti-terrorist Strategies, their differences are almost identical to the ones in Security Strategies. The EU gives priority to the "soft power" and effective multilateralism, which combines diplomatic and economic measures with military assets if necessary. Unlike the EU, the US National Strategy for Combating Terrorism requires constant and direct military actions against terrorist organizations, that have a global

character in order to disorganizes, degrade and finally completely destroy them. Frome the European point of view, the excessive use of force isn't suitable for combating terrorism. While the Americans clearly force military solutions, Europeans are focused on prevention and protection from terrorist actions, responses to possibilities of successful terrorist actions in the EU in order to reduce consequences and, consequently, their performance, then on the global prosecution of those held responsible (the terrorists). In other words, the European approach is mostly directed towards internal anti-terrorist actions.

Since they represent different political communities,[4] differently consider social values and have a different national security culture, it is quite clear why the US and the EU have different foreign and security policies. Besides, they also have very different strategic perspectives of the world. While the White House in its National Security Strategies frequently states that the US is a dominant security-political subject in the world, the EU in its long-awaited Security Strategy only assumes its global responsibility. The US with its official strategic documents openly explains her plans and the ways of their development to the whole world. American approach is more direct than European, which makes it more effective. It clearly explains the ranges of US actions in international combat against terrorism, and gives precise instructions for the promotion of existing and development of new measures, mechanisms and instruments for the prevention and suppression of terrorist threat. The European way of combating terrorism isn't that concrete, and their strategies are more of a theoretical description of long-term goals, than they are direct measures for suppressing the threat.

Regardless of the historically long strategic partnership between the US and the EU, their different points of view have naturally caused different strategic assessments and approaches towards combating terrorism. However, there's a rightfully asked question about their efficiency, considering that terrorism still poses the highest threat and challenge both in the US and the EU. In other words, considering the increasing growth of terrorist threat in the world, even beside the huge amount of work directed towards its obviously inefficient suppression, it is justified to wonder were those efforts well-directed and what is making the terrorists active.

Our research has found that neither European nor American approach towards the suppression of terrorism is perfect, but that the American one is more efficient in repelling attacks, especially considering the fact that none of successfully carried out ones was on a high scale like the ones in the EU. It's evident that Al-Qaeda and other similar organizations were operating around the world, but also that they weren't operating in the US. In fact, the American combat against terrorism had resulted in raising internal security levels in that country. The success of this combat is primarily indicated through the fact that the US were spared from high scale terrorist attacks after 9/11. Many implemented strategies for anti-terrorist combat, their constant modification conditional upon the change of terrorist threat, as well as the numerous internal security measures are a clear indicator of the US's

---

[4] The US represents a mono-ethnic federal community, while the EU is a supranational political community of the European countries.

determination when it comes to dealing with terrorists, but they also show their determination in removing flaws in their own anti-terrorist prevention. Their practice has shown that the efficient suppression of terrorism and the threat it poses is possible through implementation of all-inclusive strategic approach, which must constantly be adjusted to the variable structure and nature of that threat.

The Americans are proud of their strategy, of which efficient implementation has lead to the deprivation of freedom and processing of several thousand terrorists, stopping their planned actions in that area. This wasn't the case with the EU, which has been targeted and intimidated by Al-Qaeda with two large attacks (Madrid 2004 and London 2005) during the first decade of "War on Terrorism".

The US have shown good practice and continuity in implementing national strategies as well as the following documents regarding the security and terrorism suppression, which can't be said for the EU. Unlike European, the American authorities have, considering anti-terrorist policy over the period of ten years after terrorist attacks (2001-2011), developed three National Security Strategies, three Anti-terrorist Strategies, many sub-strategies and relevant documents within department ministries and federal security agencies, many action plans that define the goals, means and models for combating terrorism, as well as the guidelines for its prevention. All those strategies, sub-strategies and action plans are based on valid National Security Strategies, known as the "***Presidential Doctrines***". Therefore, the American anti-terrorist approach during the first decade of "War on Terrorism" has been based on two doctrines, Bush's and Obama's.

Bush's Doctrine v. Obama's Doctrine

A year after the 9/11, Bush's administration has revealed its National Security Strategy, that has been changed and amended to a certain extent four years later. The main emphasise of this doctrine was put into combat against terrorism, while the document itself represented the biggest turn in the strategic thinking and planning of the US since the Cold War – from discouraging and intimidation of enemies towards an aggressively-preamptive war against terrorism, and from reactive (defensive) into proactive (offensive) military approach. As its support, the White House issued the first National Strategy for Countering Terrorism, that was designed to process and complement its third chapter, which completely features anti-terrorism. That is how the US National Security Strategy has set up a foundation for combating transnational terrorism, and the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism issued in 2003 and changed and complemented on two occasions so far (2006 and 2011) has depicted the ways of combating it. This document, among other things, precisely defines the enemy and goals, interpreting the American need for destroying international terrorist organizations and strengthening the security of that country, as well as protection of her values and citizens home and abroad. It confirms the US determination to fight preventive anti-terrorist war with all military and other national resources available. It also depicts that the success in that unconventional war, aside from offensively-aggressive actions of the

military forces that play the crucial part in it, also depends on the effort in combating ideology that "feeds" the terrorism.

Bush's doctrine has, under the excuse that it cannot afford to wait for the enemy to strike first, as it happened on 9/11, found a solution in *preamptive* warfare and, if necessary, unilateral actions – independent military interventions without an authorization and support from international institutions such as the UN. Besides, its main elements are: the promotion of democratic regime changes in the world and carrying out attacks on the countries that give support and refuge to terrorists. With the publishing of his second National Security Strategy in 2006, certain changes and alterations were done on Bush's doctrine, and have come down to weakening of certain guidelines when it comes to action and use of force, resulting in an increased diplomatic activities. However, willingness and determination to act preventively, known as the "*Doctrine of Preamptive Warfare*", as a key point of both president Bush's National Security Strategies, along with the mission of maintaining the US leading role in the world, has marked his foreign policy and became the pillar of his presidential doctrine.

Obama's administration took over during the one of the most difficult times for the US, and the whole world. The "War on Terrorism", even though it had started eight years before, was globally in its full swing, the America as its initiator had been losing international, as well as the support of its own citizens over time in that endless combat. Besides, the US, along with the rest of the world, had faced the massive economy crisis which was nowhere near the end, and all that had been happening in the era of multipolar world order – the rise of Russian Federation. Aware of that and under the pressure from circumstances and the electorate, as well as his own pre-electoral promises, Obama had introduced his presidential doctrine a year and a half after he took over presidential duties from Bush (27th of May 2010).

The main characteristic of Obama's doctrine is a significant change of American government's focus and priorities regarding international relations and national security of that country. This doctrine describes the US international position in the recent past, present and the future, and shows reconciliation with the fact that they are no longer the only leading power in the world. Obama, through real understanding of the position of the US in the world, which credibility had been significantly damaged, calls for optimism among the US citizenry and binds the bearers of executive power to put maximum effort in the revitalization of American society and global leadership, even in those conditions of reduced economic power, in order to preserve not only American, but the global security as well.

The reason for that are the two highly proclaimed goals of military interventions in the Middle East by the former White House representatives, and those are: to completely eliminate (liquidate or arrest) terrorists and their infrastructure (bases, camps, logistics etc.) by direct military interventions, thereby completely eliminating terrorist threat from and in that area; and, the other goal, the democratization of the society. Unfortunately, even after a decade and a half of military interventions, none of those goals were entirely achieved. A logical consequence of their lack of accomplishment is a declination in international reputation of those who defined them. That is how the US position and power in the world were drastically diminished, that its president was well aware of at the very beginning of his

mandate, and therefore, declared revitalization of US reputation in the world as a main goal in his first National Security Strategy.

Therefore, unlike Bush's, Obama's strategy is realistic when it comes to understanding of the US current and future international position, but also when it comes to the presented possibilities of engagement of American resources in order to achieve long-term national goals, especially in the global combat against more and more dangerous radical extremists. This strategy, in order to protect national values, in one hand, represents the necessity of preserving the US military supremacy, and in the other, promotes the engagement of other American social institutions (diplomatic and economic), including the private sector, giving them suggestively-binding work instructions.

As mentioned before, Obama's administration has at the very beginning of its mandate rejected the phrase "War on Terrorism, that Bush used for ensuring global support recently after 9/11, explaining that "the term 'war' is too broad and all-inclusive to ever be ended". They used the term "operations" and/or "combat", and in addition to that, the Obama's strategy, unlike Bush's, didn't generalize the enemy, but rather clearly defined it as the Al-Qaeda and its adjoined terrorists (radical extremists). The important thing is that the primary goal of anti-terrorist combat was identical in both doctrines – the destruction and disruption of terrorist organizations with global outreach, and disabling terrorists from maintaining and strengthening any possibility of planning and performing terrorist attacks anywhere in the world, especially in the US. That basically leads us to the conclusion that Obama didn't develop his own new doctrine, but merely presented a less drastic version of Bush's through his National Security Strategy, with the same major elements, but with more thoughtfully (realistically and balanced) presented guidelines and means of action. He had, unlike Bush, only seemingly left unilateral military approach, and emphasized diplomacy and global partnership, that is, the instruments of "soft power". He hadn't entirely rejected the concept of preventive warfare, but has directed the policy of offensive defence towards prevention, and considered the use of military power only as a final solution, pointing out that the basis for maintaining the US security and power was strong economy.

The similarity with Bush's doctrine was confirmed in the practice of Obama's administration. That is to say, even though all the possible ways of opposing terrorism and resolving other types of conflicts were formally (through relevant strategies) specified, the US continued to combat terrorism entirely with military assets after Obama took charge. Therefore, Obama had accepted Bush's foreign policy legacy, and not only returned to the strategic fronts, in Afghanistan and Iraq, that haven't been entirely left by the US army since the beginning of the invasion, but had rather started new warfare in Libya and Syria. To further perplex the paradox, those "hotspots" had begun after he received his Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo in 2009, for the "extraordinary efforts in strengthening international diplomacy and cooperation". There's no wonder that the world responded negatively to that recognition, and it is justified to wonder if that recognition was earned, considering the pain and suffering that were caused and lead by the US all around the world. In fact, the general impression is that the Nobel Peace Prize was a way of presenting Obama as a peace-loving president, and in that way

justifying all American military-political moves on the international plan in the early 21st century.

It is clear that the American approach had been, at least formally, adapted to the changing structure and nature of the threat, which can be seen by their constant revision and complementation of Anti-Terrorist Strategies, as well as the follow-up security documents, while the EU has issued only one Security and one Anti-Terrorism Strategy during the first decade of the "War on Terrorism". However, it was still a large step for the EU, because its members had for the first time reached consensus on collective approach of ensuring their own safety and eliminating the danger that threatens it.

In fact, the EU had adopted its first Security Strategy that portrayed the foundation of anti-terrorist combat in 2003, and then issued its own Anti-Terrorism Strategy two years later. There's no doubt that since it was established and until today, the EU had put more or less effort towards suppressing terrorism within its borders. The occasional terrorist attacks in some of the member states, especially Great Britain, had practically dictated the intensification of those efforts. They would result in passing proper documents, which were mostly facultative, which dictated the passing of the legislations (mainly criminal, but also material and process laws) of member countries, with an idea of strengthening their cooperation. However, these normative frames weren't well implemented in practice because of member countrie's unwillingness to give up sovereignty in that area until the terrorist attacks of 9/11 when they changed unbinding for binding legal instruments. In other words, the advisory practice of suggesting normative solutions, which was used for unification of national legislations, was replaced with the establishment of minimal regulations regarding integral elements of incrimination and sanctioning of terrorists, as well as their more efficient criminal prosecution in the EU.

Therefore, the responsibility for opposing terrorism in the EU has been divided between its institutions and member countries, but it became significantly more unanimous only as the result of terrorist attacks on the US in 2001, by issuing binding *General Decisions* and establishing normative frames for combating terrorism, making the combat against it an integral part of already efficiently developed European combat against organized crime. The EU institutions had maximized their activities regarding overall security and defence and had invested a lot of effort concerning modifying criminal law of member countries then, all of which was related to terrorism and radical changes in prosecution and managing of its bearers.

Establishing a unique legal and strategic frame to combat terrorism was enabled by the European Union when it adopted its first strategies. The European Security Strategy represents an all-inclusive strategic frame of the EU in regards to security, by which a serious step of rendering its security policy has been taken. Existing global challenges are being identified by this document and key security threats to the Europe are being analyzed, as well as the strategic goals that could be used to successfully answer them have been defined too, and political consequences that the EU may have regardless of achieving these goals or not are being analyzed. The need to modernize own means of action is also being emphasized in

regards to solving security issues. At the same time, it is used to define the values on which the EU was founded as well as the principles it holds on to in foreign policy, its current international position has been clearly presented and a vision of the role in the world, as well as global security responsibility has been provided. In other words, the striving of the EU to increase its role in international relations, via developing its own political-security function, aside from previously recognized economic power were publicly displayed. Furthermore, a necessity to reduce internal tensions and to overcome the greatest political crisis thus far, which was caused by misunderstanding of country members in regards to the expansion in the war against terrorism in Iraq, all that without the support of the UN has been emphasized. That said, the strategy emphasizes the need to strengthen bilateral vision of member countries by achieving consensus about the strategic culture of the Union itself, especially when it comes to its security. As such, it represents a quality foundation to establish a coherent and steady foreign policy of the EU, as well as enforcing bilateral security and defence policy of its members.

As far as global challenges go, strategy clearly implies that a reduction of direct military threats has occurred, thus, the conflicts that are caused by poverty, energy and natural resources deficiency, and especially the lack of water, as well as misgoverning prevail. As main security threats to Europe it further defines: terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, organized crime and country failures. So, terrorism has been branded a largest threat to the security of the EU, while the other aforementioned threats are directly linked to it, and as such do not demean it, but render the possibility of the EU to be a target of a terrorist attack real. Since the majority of that threat comes from the countries that border the Union, the Strategy lists establishing of a stable security environment as a main factor of undisturbed development as a priority.

The main characteristic of the European Security Strategy is giving the lead to non-military means of resolving conflicts, as a way to ensure security over a longer period of time. However, to protect its security and promote its values, the EU must be prepared to answer key threats with adequate means, one of which is preamptive action abroad, which requires development of its own capacities. Another one of the main strategy features is the "*effective multilateralism*" – solving international security issues by common efforts of international community, institutions and law. It actually represents a clear resolve of member countries to build an international order which will be founded on building a strong international society and stabile institutions.

Horrifying attacks of Al-Qaeda branches in Madrid (2004) and London (2005) have initiated a more intense fight of the EU against terrorism and undertaking of a lot more concrete measures when it comes to collective defence. They have, among other things, lead to the first European Anti-Terrorism Strategy, whose main goal is prevention and protection from new terrorist actions, then securing fast and efficient responses to them, but also establishing mechanisms for efficient global pursuit of its perpetrators, as well as agitators, initiators and sponsors. Those who decide about policy in the EU and the rulers of member countries have recognized and understood that without identification of mishaps, removal of evident lacks and the perfection of its own capacities, as well as military-security and civilian, could not

respond efficiently to new and constantly changing security challenges and threats that global terrorism represents.

However, even after those attacks the European approach remained "reactive" while the American, as opposed to it, was completely changed from "reactive" to "proactive", just after 9/11. Namely, even thought the EU had finally realized that along with a long term solution or victory in the battle against terrorism, which includes removing causes and disabling radicalization through improving human dignities and freedoms through an effective democratization of societies and building of functional legal institutions in them, it is necessary to face its bearers aggressively, has remained dedicated to preventive actions, firstly using civilian means and multilateral approach, while exclusively taking care of respecting the international laws and civil liberties, respectively to the UN. It was focused on weakening the circumstances that are beneficial for its creation, development and spread within the Union itself, with the priority to suppress the terrorist propaganda as the root of ever growing problem of indoctrination and recruitment of extremists. It also continued to favorize the use of legal procedures by which the terrorists are being criminalized – arrest and bringing to justice those responsible for terrorist acts. Unlike the EU, the Americans strive for liquidation of terrorist leaders as a result of which the organization loses cohesion, and some of them are put out, which was unfortunately not the case with Al-Qaeda after the assassination of its notorious leader Bin Laden. One of the fundamental reasons for not picking up militarization is the fact that the EU does not have its own armed forces, therefore it is not prone to military solutions. Aside from that, it doesn't even have its own intelligence or a counterintelligence agency, but the suppression of terrorism is rather being dealt with by national services of member countries, whose mishaps like those made by the FBI and the CIA in 2001 are more than evident. Since the intelligence is a sensitive area closely connected to national sovereignty, independence and state security, this area is almost completely left to members of the EU and the Union does not have any other role aside from counselling, nor does it possess any instruments by which it could, at the very least, initiate necessary reforms of national intelligence agencies like those implemented in the US.

Unlike EU, the US has taken the battle to the terrorists by complete and instantaneous militarization of the problem that terrorists represent - outside of their borders. This lead to the fall of Al-Qaeda after Bush declared war on terrorism and, after allied interventions in the Middle East, and focused on war, that is, self-defence in Afghanistan and Iraq and later Pakistan. This has lead to disabling major terrorist actions in the US on one hand, while on the other hand the "dragging" of European allies into American anti-terrorist war had actually turned them into potential targets, proof of which is the fact that the terrorists mainly focused on conducting large-scale attacks in the Union.

Another important factor that had played a significant role in ensuring a long-term internal security of the US, unlike the EU, is their financial power. Namely, after 9/11, and the "War on Terrorism", the US has significantly increased the funding for its defence (arms and equipment, development and research) thusly increasing the already existing militarily-technological gap within the Euro-Atlantic Community.

Legal and Institutional Reforms in the U.S. after 9/11

Furthermore, the support that Bush got from his citizens as a "war president" has helped him not only to point the foreign policy in a desired direction (unilateral and preemptive military actions), but also to start the comprehensive internal reforms, which were later continued by Obama - the greatest reform and reorganization of American security agencies. With that in mind, and as a result of confirmed mishaps in the work of federal agencies with the CIA on the top, Bush has undertaken a complete reorganization of the American intelligence community by passing a law for intelligence reform and terrorism prevention in 2004 (*Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004*), which has significantly advanced the system for collection and inter-institutional exchange of intelligence. This not only lead to the increase of the capability of international institutions to prevent terrorist attacks, but also to reduce their effect, direct, as well as indirect, consequences. Also, a detailed and systematized long-term reform of police and security agencies has been started with FBI at the head which has minimized mishaps together with an application of more aggressive security procedures in the practical sphere of anti-terrorist prevention, raised the level of security within the country and rendered further terrorist attacks harder. This reform has never been ended, nor should it be. Namely, considering the US as a primary terrorist target, it will always have to have an efficient internal security system that will be able to answer any threat, challenge and risk at any time, perfecting of its agencies and services must remain a continuous process which will go step by step with terrorism, whose threat is being modernized over time, thus growing.

Moreover, the success of the American struggle against international terrorism in strengthening of the US security has been achieved not only by military interventions in the Middle East and beyond, but before all else, an entire line of, preventive, as well as repressive security measures on an internal plan. All-inclusive security measures (making already existing laws to combat terrorism stricter and the introduction of a variety of new laws and security procedures) and internal federal security institutional reforms, as well as establishing new ones, has removed mishaps in the anti-terrorist prevention of the US. The ability of terrorists to travel, organize and conduct assaults in America has been reduced by their implementation, which lead them to redirect their terrorist acts to less protected and more vulnerable European countries. However, in this process of making laws and security procedures stricter, the balance has been destroyed between the security and values of the American society by making the security more important than the rights of its citizens. Two reformatory repressive laws passed after 9/11 – the Patriot Act and the Homeland Security Act– had removed legal obstacles for investigations, firstly clandestine, but also for exchange of information, thus, at the very beginning of their implementation it had resulted in major investigations and numerous arrests of terrorist suspects, but at the same time jeopardizing human rights and civil liberties of the entire American population.

After dreadful terrorist attacks in 2001, the US undertook the most comprehensive anti-terrorist measures in their entire history. One of the biggest innovations that had been implemented into the system of national security was the adoption of the Homeland Security Act by which the US Government was expanded, that is, an entirely new eponymous ministry

was formed. Additionally, the most important legal-security measure in the US certainly was the Patriot Act, adopted only two months after the attacks in New York and Washington. It was presented as a main instrument of modern American anti-terrorist prevention, broadening the authorization of federal authorities to perform secret investigations, have an unlimited private data access, phone call surveillances and a lot of other measures in order to identify and track the suspects. Via this Act, the American police had gotten such, until then unimaginable, authorities for acquiring information in investigations, while the civil rights and private life of an individual have been completely disregarded.

As such, it instantly faced negative reactions from the political opposition, NGOs, and some of the American citizens, who claimed that it disregards the Constitution, limits human rights and civil liberties and unjustly targets immigrants. This protest was completely justified, because the legally-regulative and very repressing measures taken, primarily the Patriot Act, under the auspices of an overall national mobilization for the defence against terrorism, and under the pretence of security precaution, have damaged the foundations of American democracy, which had been establishing the "**force of rights**" until then, and not today's "**right to force**".

The unique character of 9/11, that is, the nature and the success of these shocking terrorist attacks were sufficient proof that the most powerful country in the world must undertake comprehensive anti-terrorist measures, but within the acceptable limits. Understanding the need for instant reaction, we still think that the American Congress has made a rush decision regarding the adoption of Patriot Act. Bush's administration has turned this Act into an instrument that would enable secret supervision and control over its own citizens and the others that are suspected to be terrorists or spies. His opponents claim, and new evidence is constantly being found, that he gave too much power to the federal government to dive deeply into the private life of the Americans and others living or residing in that country. Some critics may have gone too far, warning that under the pretence of a "Global War on Terrorism" he had created the conditions for the repressive apparatus to violate human rights of all those it desires, regardless of their real connection to terrorism. In their opinion, the Patriotic Act is based upon the classic ethnically-religious nationalism, declaring that the enemies are Islamic terrorists (Muslims), in the same manner as in the 1950's all sympathizers of the Communist Movement in the US were declared "the enemies of the state", and all Russians were potential terrorists. The fact is that after 9/11 Muslims, and especially those that came from the Middle East, became condemned throughout America, since they were being arrested, interrogated and deprived of freedom by the investigating authorities without any criteria. Naturally, the authorities denied their connection with racism, in spite of the fact that the FBI, through its program for systematic questioning, had interrogated around 5000 Arab males, aged 18-33, without any reasonable doubt that would directly or even indirectly connect those people to 9/11 and the terrorists responsible for the attacks.[5]

---

[5] **Source:** *Sanctioned Bias: Racial Profiling Since 9/11*, ACLU, New York, 2004 (Internet: https://www.aclu.org/files/FilesPDFs/racial%20profiling%20report.pdf, 20/01/2017) p. 5.

The Government is, indeed, sometimes forced to violate civil rights and liberties, like in this case, but it is also necessary to balance the relations of security and citizen protection, that is, to adjust the laws that protect national security with the ones that protect civil liberties. There may have been a justification for the reduction of civil rights in the immediate aftermath of 9/11, when there was a genuine threat of Al-Qaeda's presence in the US and the possibility of future bloodshed. In those circumstances repressive measures, the reasonable ones regarding security precaution, were somewhat expected, but only for a short period of time. However, in this case, the state of emergency declared in 2001 is still in effect, and the use of repressive measures hasn't been decreased over time, while the ruling elite's desire for the total control and constant supervision of the society is evermore present. It is difficult to estimate the long-term consequences of maintaining the active state of emergency on the democratic state constitution, but it is evident that that level of security preparation and anti-terrorist precaution, ensured in a repressive way, has gained traits of totalitarianism, with US becoming a more and more closed society, with a complete control and constant supervision of its citizens. Naturally, the strengthening of state at the expense of its citizens would be justified if its boundaries were clearly defined in the beginning, that is, if the violation of their rights in order to secure the safety and wellbeing of the entire community was short-term. So to speak, when the elementary human right - **to be free**, at the expense of fundamental right - **to be safe**, would be only temporarily suspended. Not only that, it would be tolerable to restrict only those rights and liberties that the terrorists were abusing, and for the purpose of limiting the space and the means of their action, and making it easier for the authorities to arrest and sanction them.

It is clear that even after a decade and a half of ongoing "War on Terrorism", there is no guarantee that 9/11, no matter what the US does, won't happen again, this time maybe even deadlier. But, as the breaking of laws and regulations isn't the reason for them to not be implemented, and as the inability of different institutions to protect their citizens at all times isn't the reason for their disbandment, thus the terrorist attacks of 9/11 aren't the reason for the US to stop being the open society, at least up to the point it was until then. Until the 21st century, this major world power has been a beacon of world's democracy, and the respect for human lives has been one of its fundamental principles. Today the situation is totally different. In one hand, the US foreign policy orientation towards the promotion of human rights is formally present, while in the other, the US questions those very same rights of its own citizens.

The real question for the American people is: Why is it that today, when they live in the "most democratic" society, whose system should represent a guarantee of life in prosperity and safety, they live in constantly growing fear and increasing uncertainty? This uncertainty isn't only a result of terrorism, but of an inadequate reaction from the authorities regarding its opposing, which is harmful for the democratic processes and institutions. That exactly is the terrorist's goal, not final or main one, but certainly an important one, and unfortunately almost completely achievable. Namely, regardless of current unaccomplishment of their grand goals, there was one goal that they had always managed to achieve, even if it was partially – many of them had claimed that they want to blow off the cover of the country

which they are attacking, to force it to unveil its ugly face, especially if that country claims to be democratic. The proof of their success is the fact that life in many countries has become far less pleasant and free with the coming of the new millennia.

Once more, we emphasize that the key to battle global terrorism is a collective international effort and a complete cooperation founded on promoting knowledge and liberties, and not in obstruction of human rights. Nobody wants to live in a "police state". Today's liberal democracy is founded on the right to vote, but the citizens demand a lot more. They demand actual equality, the true right to a freedom of speech, a just and public trial, and before all else, a right to a life in which the interference of the authorities has been brought down to a minimum. As opposed to that, those rights have been greatly compromised by the "War on Terrorism", so people are being arrested and detained without ever being charged, their right to the free choice of legal representation has been taken from them, and civilians charged with terrorism or espionage are being tried at court marshals, hence, all forms of audio and video communication are being tapped and all sorts of electronic communication are being surveilled. Fear of potential terrorist attacks has been and still is giving the White House a discrete right to sanction all those suspected to be perpetrators outside of standard rules and procedures up to 2001. Today, this has been legalized by the Patriot Act and an array of other laws and amendments in the branch of security, which is obvious to be one of two fundamental rights of the modern man, and was put significantly ahead the first one – **the freedom**.

Beside all this, the US had constantly been projecting the danger of terrorism as an uncontrolled and growing mega-threat to the entire modern civilization since 2001, by which they intend to impose a constant state of emergency in a bigger part of the world. This is why they have declared a "War on Terrorism" which is not limited in time and space, so that they could maintain this infinite global war, but for that they need an infinite threat which would cause general insecurity and uncontrolled fear, that can stretch forever and that can be adjusted to higher or lower intensity as needed. Is there a better threat than terrorism? Of course not! Its bearers are unpredictable and almost invisible enemies, who do not care about their own lives. So the showdown has become their number one priority under which auspices the Americans conduct anti-terrorist military interventions in sovereign countries, disregarding the need to legitimize them on an international level, and all this under the excuse of establishing democracy and protection of human rights. Those violent military actions, that more and more take the shape of armed aggression, are sarcastically being called "*Humanitarian Interventionism*" and to make the absurd even more absurd, their bearer - self-proclaimed as a world policeman tasked with alleged protection of human rights all around the world, is at the same time jeopardizing those same rights to his own citizens when combating terrorism.

Eventually, when a line is drawn with a first decade of global anti-terrorism war over, it can be concluded that the US have managed to establish a security system that successfully answers the threats and challenges of the modern age. Unfortunately, the necessity to reform its own security system, especially the part in charge of prevention, they have realized only after 9/11.

Therefore, it is undisputable that the US have had a significant success in regards to anti-terrorism in the period from 2001 up to this day, results of which are evident that the measures taken had increased the security of that country. But the fact remains that they had compromised privacy and civic liberties of its citizens in exchange for greater security. It is disappointing that those anti-terrorist measures had changed the American society which was outgoing until that point, and that they have jeopardized the rights of own citizens by passing a bill which had enabled this, and which has also enabled various security- intelligence and police services to gain new and more elaborate authorizations that delved deep into the privacy of its citizens. To put it a little differently, the White House did not pay attention to the balance between the strengthening of controlled systems within its borders and their influence to prevention of the rule of the law in the process of reform and strengthening of internal safety. This leads us to believe that the standpoints in American declarations about the importance of human rights were not attuned to actions of its security apparatus during the combat against terrorism. This further lead to the destruction of democratic foundations of this society within the US, while the European Union, on the other hand, had not compromised privacy and civil liberties of its citizens in exchange for a boost in their security within the frame of the same "War on Terrorism".

As far as the anti-terrorist practice of the EU goes, we can conclude that even though a big step in the operationalization of its internally-defensive policy, a lack of national will to apply the aforementioned has been noticed as a difficult circumstance, by the final adoption of the Security and Anti-Terrorism Strategy along with an entire array of sub-strategies. Unfortunately, practice has confirmed that it is a lot easier to create strategies than to implement them. A core application of these documents requires consciousness and responsibility from all sides – member countries: their army, police and all security intelligence services, then securing the suitable financial resources, as well as the change of an entire array of bills and amendments related to security, so that they may be attuned to pre-determined standards and goals in strategy.

On the other hand, the US had had two approaches in its practice of combating terrorism thus far. The first one came from Bush, who declared the war, and that represented a direct military assault on the countries that were the source of terrorism from the viewpoint of this administration (Afghanistan and Iraq). The second one, not so different, but a lot more subtle approach, had been used by Obama's Administration that achieved better results, including direct strikes to the centres and branches of terrorist networks in cutting the source of finance which eventually lead to the assassination of the supreme leader of the Al-Qaeda Osama bin Laden. The gap between the "War on Terrorism" and the protection of human rights had also been mitigated. What is clear is that 9/11 had caused a big curve in the American strategic planning and action. It has also caused the need of this country to demonstrate force directly by agitating it to aggressively-offensive action through preemptive warfare, which is also unilateral if needed.

Bush's administration had maximized and globalized the terrorist threat as an actual arbitrator an exclusively-military approach in fight against international terrorism, a terrorist threat that, according to them, had needed to be removed from the global political scene instantly,

without previously considering its causes. Not only was this approach non efficient, but it was inhumane, which was proved by the cruelty of American attacks on Afghanistan and Iraq, and is the reason why Obama's Administration focused on identifying the roots of terrorism, as well as establishing reasons that endorse the creation of an extreme, radical, anti-American and overall anti-Western mood in the Islamic world.

Therefore, in the beginning of "War on Terrorism" the establishing of the very source of terrorism and motivational factors had been put out of focus, while the use of force and military factor expansion had dominated in this war. Since it had become more and more obvious that terrorism could not be exterminated, an attempt to control it was under way, in other words, the suppression and elimination of terrorist threats. Even though the theoreticians had pointed to this at the very beginning, it took time for it to finally be understood that it is simply impossible to suppress terrorism by a military approach, but rather with a change of overall social relations through the development of democracy, but also economic subventions and the education of an entire society. The reaffirmation of basic principles on an international political relation scene is crucial, especially when it comes to smaller countries that are constantly being discriminated by the big and powerful ones. Therefore it is necessary to ensure that, even though small, they are recognized as actual subjects of international relations. Besides this, it is necessary to stop further deepening of economically-social differences between the rich and the poor countries by establishing righteous economic relations in the world. Without a healthy economy, the war-stricken countries cannot become independent nor can they provide a socially-economic improvement to their people, which is necessary to suppress a growing terrorist indoctrination in the Middle East.

Installing Democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq

The Afghanistan and Iraq examples have only confirmed that the final military victory isn't nearly enough for the establishment of a politically stabile society with sustainable economy and strong institutions in these countries. The establishment of strong state institutions, army and police is a necessary pre-condition for the establishment of a stabile country and its security. That is why the establishment of democratic authorities in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as the revitalization of economic entities of these countries, has become the essential political determination of the US, which must persist in its supports and providing aid in all reformative and transitional processes, no matter how long they might take. Especially because the establishment of representative governments in Kabul and Baghdad could inspire and encourage the democratic reforms in other countries of that region as well.

The belief that also turned out to be wrong, was that by the overthrowing of dictators and spreading democracy and the rule of law, the authoritarian regimes would transform into safe, stabile and dynamic democracies in the Middle East, transforming the life of their citizens, as well as their attitude towards West. On the contrary, the invasion on Iraq that only intensified anti-American attitude in the Muslim world and intensified their support of Al-Qaeda, had

provoked the creation of the new generation of Al-Qaeda members, and later the Islamic State itself, while today the Iraq is much more important than Afghanistan has ever been, both for Al-Qaeda and the Islamic terrorism itself.

In other words, the American anti-terrorism approach has been modified over time, due to the development of the situation and the change of circumstances, so that when compared with the start of anti-terrorist combat, where the emphasize was on the military interventions, in its later stages it had emphasized the need for focus on the initiatives of the "soft power", which main goal was to undermine the radically-militant Islamic influence through the promotion and establishment of democratic political, economic and social development in the vulnerable (poor and undeveloped) Muslim countries. That is to say, they had approached the removal of the causes of Islamic extremism within the meaning of its ideological foundation, because it had been understood that it cannot be defeated solely by military force and fear, but rather with prosperous hope that must constantly be given to Muslim people, and which offers them better, much more free and righteous life than the one that Al-Qaeda and other similar organizations promote.

The idea that people, who are ready to willingly perform suicide attacks, can be intimidated by military machinery is absurd. Even though we're talking about the clash of the most powerful country in the world with non-state actors, it became clear over time that military force by itself can not completely destroy decentralized terrorist networks that are mutating, skilfully adapting to the new circumstances, and which are almost completely independent. The proof of failure of a complete victory over terrorism by tanks and aviation is the fact that today, it had risen into an ideology of a global Jihad (*Al-Qaedism / Jihadism*) that is constantly expanding, primarily, through the internet, and for which no one can guarantee when and who will it inspire to mimic Al-Qaeda terrorist act against the Western domination over the Muslim world. That is exactly the reason for the necessity of a better perception of life, made out of social prosperity and democratic transformation which will be reflected in the establishment of stabile and efficient state institutions and promotion of liberties, firm civil society and strong private sector. By understanding of that obvious fact, and bearing in mind that the terrorism as a political phenomenon and the product of social circumstances requires a much more complex response than purely military one, the American administration had started the revision of their approach by the integration of all sorts of activities within it, including political, economic, and ideological, with and intention of establishing and expansion of the respect for human lives and civil liberties, elimination of poverty, the establishment of regional and global democracy and removing the discontent that is the effect of repressive and occupational structure, which the Western presence in the Middle East is considered to be. In other words, they had approached the establishment of a more humane way of global control (governance), because it had become evident that the victory over terrorism would depend more on moral factors than on the military capacities.

When all has been said and analyzed, we can come to the conclusion that the US strategy, based on the attitude that offense is the best defence, has turned out to be more effective than the European one, which is mostly orientated towards internal security through prevention and protection. Namely, the Americans have, with their offensive actions abroad and

aggressive internal security reforms, achieved one of their main goals in the "War on Terrorism", which is the prevention of major terrorist attacks on their territory, while the Europeans, focused more on the internal anti-terrorist actions, were unsuccessful. That fact itself is more than enough, but the success of neutralizing the direct perpetrators of terrorist actions also shows the effectiveness of the American repressive strategic approach.

However, the question arises as to the price of that security, that is, weather it is, in human lives and suffering, or the money, acceptable at all? The devastating fact is that the death of nearly 3.000 innocent people in New York has lead to the cruel military interventions all around the world in which more than million people had lost their lives, while the millions of others had become refugees. There's a terrifying estimation that the number total human lives lost, civil and military, during the first decade of anti-terrorist war is around 1 million, in Afghanistan around 220.000 and in Pakistan around 80.000. Out of which, only 5-10% are soldiers, civil contractors and humanitarian workers of the US and their allies, including the members of local pro-American security services, while all the other victims are members of the local populace. That is ten times the number then that it is being presented to the public. Besides, it doesn't include human casualties of other war zones, such as Yemen, Somalia, Mali, Kashmir, Philippines etc. According to the estimation of 2014, the financial expenses of the American "War on Terrorism" had reached 4.4 million dollars with the additional 8 trillion for interest rates in the next 40 years. The worst thing is that neither those casualties nor the expenses are final. Both wars, especially the one in Iraq, have turned up to be dragged, expensive, destructive and bloody, and even though they had been formally ended, not only they were continued with the establishment of the Islamic State, but they were expanded to Syria as well, with no clear chance of them ever ending.

The dynamics and results of American anti-terrorism strategy application have proven that it is more effective than the European one, but not entirely successful. Its main goal is the defeat of terrorism but this is not in our sights yet. The "terrorist regimes" in Afghanistan and Iraq have been brought down, and this has not lead to the destruction of Al-Qaeda. Hence, these areas are being terrorized by an even more powerful terrorist organization today (Islamic State) whose crimes are sickening the world and invoke fear.

Truth be told, even though terrorist groups and organizations have not been completely annihilated, that is, even though the terrorist threat in that area has not been eliminated, certain results are achieved when it comes to the destruction of terrorist power, especially if we examine the power and actions of Al-Qaeda in the beginning of the war and today. Numerous perpetrators of terrorist acts and their leaders have been successfully identified and neutralized, among them Osama bin Laden himself. American purposeful anti-terrorist forces have incapacitated about 80% of Al-Qaeda's leadership in the first years of the war alone. Moreover, terrorist camps for training have been located and destroyed because of direct presence on Afghan, Iraqi and Pakistani soil, and inflow of money to a decentralized terrorist network of Al-Qaeda, which had found a refuge in Pakistan after being chased out of the Afghanistan has been cut, but also almost bankrupt due to global economic crisis. However, in spite the potency of this terrorist network being minimized, the overthrowing of "hostile" regimes and establishing democracy in order to prevent the terrorist organizing and disabling

their actions has not proven effective especially when it comes to Iraq. While Afghanistan still, over a decade and a half, does not have a sustainable government and stabile institutions, Iraq has become the hotspot of terrorist actions.

What now?

After all, the US have, with their approach – repressive answer to 9/11 and military stepping up to the Middle East by which revenge was actively sought, protected their own territory, while the EU has become one of the main potential terrorist bases and targets, which represents a reason for concern of its political and legislative bearers, national security and intelligence agencies, as well as the entire public. In any case, this state represents the largest concern to those who bring political decision and strategy creators, who bear the most responsibility. It is therefore necessary for them to question their strategies and all measures and actions taken related to terrorism prevention because the present day testifies about their inefficiency in the cruelest manner.

Namely, *Jihadism* has, when viewed from geographic point of view, metastasized with this war, and Europe has become a central battlefield. Aside from the attacks in Spain and Great Britain, which are the subject of this analysis because they have taken place during the first decade of the "War on Terrorism", the EU has continued to pay dearly for its global anti-terrorist alignment with the US. Even though all the surprises were shut out due to a comprehensive anti-terrorist prevention, which has become a part of everyday life of every European and American since 9/11, and then was intensified after the Madrid and London attacks, merciless attacks, first in Paris and then Brussels, have testified differently. It was apparent that anti-terrorist mishaps of the EU have not been removed, especially in the sense of intelligence-security vulnerability of its member countries.

Due to failures of its own anti-terrorist prevention, and especially after the double attacks in Paris, debates of efficiency and the necessity of new Security and Anti-Terrorism Strategy of the EU were well under way. As far as the Security Strategy goes, it is necessary to adjust it in accordance with the changes in global and regional surroundings considering that present day altered circumstances, as well as a new list of threats. The Anti-Terrorism strategy of the Union is also necessary to adjust to the altered circumstances in such a way to redefine its existing apparatus and implement a new, more effective one, so that the EU could face a terrorist threat more efficiently in the future. The most important role is being played by national-security and intelligence institutions of member countries, some of which have apparently not shown the ability to identify causes of their own anti-terrorist prevention laps. It should have alerted leadership a long time ago, in the mean of establishing what benefits terrorists to act in their territories, and further to remove all acknowledged failures to that those actions could be prevented in the future.

As far as the future of European opposing to terrorism is concerned, one can expect a progress via bilateral activities and a more integrated approach of member countries, but it is also realistic to expect numerous challenges, as well as upcoming problems when cooperating

those activities in the national legislations, firstly considering, the diversity and complexity of the law of member countries. A big step has been taken by passing of the first European Security Strategy, which has finally shaped a security-defensive policy of the EU and put its first security operations and peace missions into actions. However, to guarantee progress, the realization and operationalization of the pre-established and authentic security policy of the Union, a further development of its foreign political strategic planning and a unanimous consensus of member countries are necessary.

At the same time, the US must question the principles of their actions and project their own goals more realistically, when it comes to the global combat against terrorism. It is necessary for them to sincerely accept a multilateral approach and revitalize the efforts of international community which had intensified the fight against terrorism after 9/11, by siding with America, but also realizing that modern terrorism threatens the safety of almost all countries. In other words, world headed by the US must be unanimous not only when judging terrorist actions but also in the fight against terrorism, because it undermines and threatens the values of modern civilization and society. Hence, international obligations, as well as the standards of the fight against terrorism are necessary to be constantly adapted to the changing structure and nature of the threat. It is evident that most countries have given adequate effort when it comes to as efficient disabling of terrorists as possible, as well as those significant results in this area have been achieved. The terrorist threat has not been removed, however, on the contrary, the modern international terrorism is constantly growing, while the war against it in its original, military form, has taken into a dimension of infinity.

A complete destruction (by military force, peace agreements etc.), that is, the elimination of international terrorism is merely an unrealistic desire of international community, lead by the US. Unfortunately, after more and more frequent terrorist attacks, which are being successfully executed in spite of the constant improvement in the efforts of international community and the measures taken in order to suppress terrorism on a global scale, we've realized that there is no absolute protection from it, nor there will ever be. Besides, another terrifying fact is that, thanks to the factors that are generating it, the international terrorism is being renewed and perfected on higher technological levels, and not only do the effects of this type of political violence are not being diminished, but the number of victims, primarily, the innocent ones, is constantly on the rise over the recent years, as well as the destructiveness of the attacks. In addition to that, the population is being abhorred and angry over the outcome (the aggressive brutality and non-consideration) of military interventions in the Middle East, which makes it easy for terrorist organizations to acquire followers, proof of which is the establishment of the Islamic State, as well as its development and persistence. It's unlikely that the situation is going to improve in the near future. That is why it is necessary to thoroughly analyze and critically evaluate all anti-terrorist measures that had been implemented so far, in order to determine their effectiveness, as well as to identify the flaws of internal anti-terrorist prevention in order to efficiently remove them, primarily regarding the EU. Subsequently, it is necessary to find a way to demoralize and discourage potential terrorists from joining the terrorist organizations. In fact, aside from direct opposing

and prosecution of its bearers, it is necessary to prevent terrorism, that is, to suppress the indoctrination and radicalization that lead to extremism.

Namely, it has become clear that the terrorism cannot be completely eliminated nor localized, but that it can be efficiently suppressed and put under control by significantly reducing its intensity, and hence the threat that it poses. That is why it is necessary that the response to it should be the combination of the initial American relying on military power, and the European, and later American non-violent method of resolving conflicts, which would be implemented in practice. Also, aside from efficiency, the response must be socially acceptable, that is, in accordance with the democratic principles and norms, in order to produce the adequate reaction of the whole society and public.

Accordingly, every future anti-terrorism strategy should be significantly more oriented towards multilateralism in order to create the biggest possible coalition for dealing with terrorism, and then towards identifying and elimination of its causes, as well as relying on the "soft power", enabling military interventions only if there is irrefutable evidence about the actions of a certain terrorist organization or group. Truth be told, the terrorism isn't only a military problem and it cannot be dealt with by using only militaristic approach, but with an entire set of political measures that can, primarily, suppress causes of terrorism, which are various social problems. The United Nations have both, the experience and global capacities for dealing with this type of problems, such as poverty, social disorders, the lack of democracy and the adequate state management, that is, they can help with building free and prosperous democratic societies. In addition to that, it isn't necessary, and, from the point of view of international law, it shouldn't be allowed to have preamption as a fundamental principle of government strategy in international relations, which had been referred to as the "***Bush's Doctrine***", because it's difficult to prevent its misuse, considering that "*Preventive War*" is equally as pointless and misused term as the "*Humanitarian (**armed**) Interventions*". However, thanks to the significantly altered international relations and the increase of global threat from international terrorism and the weapons of mass destruction, it can be considered that sometimes it is necessary to act preamptively, but not always, that is, unless it is an absolute necessity, and not a main mean of intervening. In fact, the preventive actions of the international community as a whole in the combat against terrorism should stop terrorists from obtaining the weapons of mass destruction.

As said before, the United Nations can be a useful instrument for combating terrorism through their approval of military actions and even more intense sanctioning of countries which sponsor terrorism, as well as through the establishment and coordination of new types of multilateral cooperation, which is why it is necessary to enhance their role by, at the same time, reforming the whole international law and security systems – equipping the institutions lead by the UN with all the means and instruments necessary for the opposing of international terrorism and the establishment of real integral safety. In other words, the UN should establish strategically-operative centre for unification and coordination of anti-terrorist combat, because they, traditionally, have the greatest international credibility, and the most legitimacy and potential for the peaceful settlement of disputes in the world. It is also necessary that the UN adopts a universally accepted definition of terrorism, because the

numerous definitions and disputes over emphasizing certain causes, features and goals of this security-political phenomenon have lead to the pluralism in responses to terrorism, instead of identification of an effective practice and the establishment of effective international standards and norms for its suppression.

In spite the fact that the enemy in this global war is more of a criminal than a classic soldier, who doesn't follow any rules of warfare (conventions) nor has any consideration, it is necessary for the anti-terrorist coalition to hold on to the defined goals of actions – discriminative powers, as well as the legal and moral bindings related to the means used for their realization. Also, special attention must be paid to human rights and civil liberties.

It is clear, from the aforementioned, that repressive anti-terrorist measures can greatly affect the country's internal democratic system, because, in the state of emergency, its actors can greatly expand their authorization at the expense of their own people, which negatively affects that country's democratic principles. Therefore, the key question is: can democracy, in its present form, give a democratic response to terrorism, without compromising its own nature? The response which would be in accordance with the values and principles of the 21st century, preservation of the rule of law and respect for human rights and liberties, and which would, at the same time, give concrete results in the combat against terrorism. Of course it can, but it is necessary to pay great attention on keeping the balance between the security and human rights and liberties. In fact, the security of democratic country, unlike the absolute country, must not be more important than the rights of its citizens, and let alone the condition for the civil wellbeing in general, like it is often presented. The rights of individuals are the foundation of democratic societies and the thing which makes them different from non-democratic dictatorships this war is fighting against, in which there's no rule of law. That is why one of the biggest absurd is the expectation that the factors that are contributing to the development and preservation of terrorism will be suppressed by even greater democratization, by diminishing or eliminating socially-political causes that are enabling its renewal and expansion, while, at the same time, the repression in those countries in intensified by declaring and artificially keeping the state of emergency, then expanding authorities of country's security apparatus, which can jeopardize basic human rights of its own citizenry.

The US anti-terrorist strategy as a whole had predicted the implementation of various, and in every way, expensive measures for combating terrorism, which had required certain reforms of the security system, the modification of old and implementation of new laws, and domestic support for the implementation of those measures. Thanks to the destructiveness and deadliness of suicide attacks in 2001, the American people had, blindly lead by the political elite, generously accepted unpopular reforms as extremely necessary and purposeful. However, they hadn't realized their real price, nor that they would be long-term. The authorities at that time had taken advantage, that is, abused human weakness – irrational survival instinct – in which all of us, if helplessly facing major security threat that represents real threat to our existence, as modern mega-terrorism is being projected, are prepared to give up almost everything, including our own freedoms and rights that, in those moments, seem like privileges, but are also being presented that way, in exchange for a "safe" life for us and

our loved ones. The fact is that an individual, whenever there are serious threats with a real chance of happening, turns, but also with real expectations, towards the state, expecting its protection. With that in mind, the White House had no doubts that, at least at the beginning of a comprehensive "War on Terrorism", it's citizens would be ready to disregard their rights and mutual equality due to the strong urge for revenge. That is how the state, the former protector, had been transformed into a dangerous rival of citizens and their rights and interests. This level of state's dominance and the disregard of the rights of its own citizens only confirm that modern country – the instrument for the greatest wellbeing of the community – still represents, primarily, an instrument for the protection of ruling elite and their interests, and only after that, the rest of citizens. Conversely, the state should aspire toward the greater good – the one that is achieved if the majority of population is content regarding their own interests, and not only individuals – the bearers of authority, and only a minor part of population. That is why it had been necessary to, at the very beginning, set boundaries and establish independent, and not regime supervision authorities for the implementation of new repressive anti-terrorist measures, because the alleged violation of security and/or national interests can easily be used as a cover-up for deliberate violation of human rights, and even their total neglect, especially when it comes to civil liberties. This was not only the case with the US, whose actions had the attention of almost all of the international community during the global anti-terrorist war, which had, naturally, been completely justified, considering that the US were the initiators of that armed conflict. Similar tendencies towards the limitation of human rights that the authorities had been implementing after 9/11 had been noticed around the world. The issue in those cases is the devastating fact that those repressions, with the use of legal sanctions and measures that are relying on the police and other services, have been directed, not towards terrorist, but political opponents, then the people of different religions and nationalities, and even the refugees and the ones seeking asylum. One of the most famous international organizations that focuses on the protection and promotion of human rights, „*Human Rights Watch*", in its report from 2002, titled „***Opportunism with a face of tragedy: Repression in the name combat against terrorism***", has published that „aside from the US, Australia, Belarus, China, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Israel, Jordan, Kirghistan, Macedonia, Liberia, Malaysia, Russia, Syria, Uzbekistan and Zimbabwe had also abused the tragic 9/11 for their dealing with political opponents, separatist and religious groups, thinking that in that situation, their practice won't be condemned".[6]

Unfortunately, the fact is that the American institutions have historically had the tendency of looking for fast-paced solutions for certain problems, especially the ones regarding the security and other national interests, but it is necessary for the US politicians to understand that the threat from terrorism is long-term, if not eternal, and that if Congress keeps adopting similar anti-terrorist laws, the Americans will be completely deprived of their privacy and who knows what else. The long-term strike on traditional American values is the domestic price of the official American response to 9/11. The democratic values on which the

---

[6] **Source:** *Opportunism in the Face of Tragedy: Repression in the name of anti-terrorism*, Human Rights Watch, New York, 2002 (Internet: https://www.hrw.org/legacy/campaigns/september11/opportunismwatch.htm, 20/01/2017).

American society is based upon, including the *Rule of Law*, which requires strict respect of human rights together with the protection of an individual, as well as the dignifying and humane treatment of war prisoners, had been deeply betrayed.

The harmony between individual and national security, unfortunately, doesn't seem to be important for modern state, that is, for the bearers of its authority. They are the ones who keep persuading us that with the beginning of this century, the century of expansion of terrorist threat and an almost invisible enemy, it is impossible to raise the level of security without the violation of rights and liberties of individuals. Thereby, that violation doesn't represent only a temporary limitation of the rights guaranteed in the Constitution, but a complete loss of certain rights, especially the ones regarding privacy, because there's great possibility that these limitations will remain in effect within the eternal *State of Emergency*.

The state authorities, as directly responsible for the overall security of the country, citizens and national interests, are implementing, as they claim, the most efficient preventive and absolutely necessary repressive methods for protection from terrorism, as well as for the suppression of all the other criminal activities. It is expected that, nowadays, in modern liberally-democratic societies such as American, the state's repressive measures would disappear; losing their purpose and justification, but it is evident that that will not happen in the near future. That's because, not only that preventive and repressive measures have always been necessary, but they have complementarily and functionally been connected within the concept of social self-protection. However, what is most important, and what their correlation shows, is that it must not come to the absolutization of one or the other method of action, because that would have negative consequences, especially in crisis situations when the democracy is being suppressed and everything, even the most negative, is being authorized by the urge of revenge.

A long before 9/11 and the security measures it resulted in, Benjamin Franklin had warned his fellow citizens about the possibility and the level of risk when balancing between civil liberties and national safety. In his public address in 1759 he stated: "People willing to trade their freedom for temporary security deserve neither and will lose both!"[7]

Therefore, there should not be any dilemma about whether the human rights are to be respected during the combat against terrorism, even though it is being posed from time to time by the seriousness of terrorist threat. As it is possible to efficiently act against other security threats, it is also possible to successfully suppress terrorism and, at the same time, keep the balance between freedom and security.

---

[7] Friedman S. Lauri, *The Patriot Act: An Opposing Viewpoints Guide*, Thomson Gale, Farmington Hills, 2006, op. cit., str. 11.

The List of Recommendations for Enhancing International Efforts in Combating Global Terrorism

1. An introduction of a universal, that is, globally in-tuned (international, comprehensive and generally accepted) definition of terrorism through its adoption in the UN.

2. Strengthening of the UN role and the reaffirmation of the entire international legal and security system.

3. Discontinuation of current double standards practice when debating terrorist acts, as well as identifying terrorists and their organizations, along with the suppression of the aforementioned.

4. An adoption and in practice non-selective and complete implementation of international anti-terrorist agreements.

5. Creation of an international anti-terrorist network, headed by the US, together with the Russian Federation and the EU, because the fight against terrorism requires an unreserved and completely coordinated cooperation of all international actors, as well as all institutions of international law and security.

6. Creation of an effective Global Anti-terrorism Strategy, and its efficient application.

7. The list of terrorist organizations and groups, along with any and all of their highly and lowly ranked members that are known to the security services has to be available to the public, and all the information has to be exchanged between all of the agencies involved.

8. Sanctioning of the countries that are advocating and supporting terrorism must be clearly defined in advance, and of course, conducted without prejudice and with "zero tolerance" policy.

9. Reducing publicity and media accessibility of terrorist groups.

10. Identification of all causes of terrorism, and all conditions that benefit its creation, development, spread and survival.

11. Demoralization and deterrence of those vulnerable and susceptible to becoming terrorists - suppression of terrorist recruitment, radicalization, indoctrination and extremisation.

12. Reaffirmation of basic principles of international relations of worlds superpowers towards smaller countries, that are constantly being incriminated, and often exploited by them - respecting smaller countries as actual subjects of international political relations.

13. Preventing the gap of economically-social differences from broadening between rich and poor countries through building righteous economic relations in the world.

14. As far as the US is concerned, the international community has long been convinced that their primary goal in the Middle East region has been and remained the control over its rich energy resources, because among other things, the world's major oil finds are mostly situated in the Shiite areas - Saudi Arabia, southern Iraq and Iran. Therefore, the creators and bearers of American foreign policies must persuade the world, and especially the Muslim population that, if they really want to revitalize their international image and global leadership, not only their "Humane Interventions" and "Preemptive Warfare" are not rendered senseless, but also bear no ill will. Moreover, that their main reason and political motive of the American-British invasion of Iraq had not been establishing control over their rich oil finds, but also a strategic control of an offensive position in their conquest of Iran and other Arabic countries. Also, they must become wary of the fact that the Islamic terrorism would be a lot more successfully suppressed if their attention would be more effectively diverted to the Palestinian problem and other allegations that are being made towards the American nation by the Islamic world.

An Excerpt from a Scientifi Review

Dr. Nikša Nikodinović's doctoral dissertation represents a complete entity in the scientific, professional and methodological sense. The text of the dissertation is enriched by the necessary valid argumentation. The basic starting points are based on extensive literature, and in the text Dr. Nikodinovic calls and refers to various and numerous relevant sources.

Research on contemporary terrorism and the American strategic response to it, as well as comparisons with those in the European Union, has scientific and social justification. The significance and results of the work represents a certain contribution to the understanding of the international fight against global terrorism, as well as a better understanding of modern terrorism in general. In that sense, Dr. Nikodinović's doctoral dissertation not only fills in the gap in our scientific dealings with global terrorism and international struggle against it, but also offers knowledge that can be of significant practical application in foreign policy, strategic and other analyzes of competent state institutions and research centers.

Prof. dr Dragan R. Simić
Dean of the Faculty of Political Science
at the Belgrade University

About the Author

Dr. Niksa Nikodinovic was born on July 20th 1981 in Travnik, Bosnia and Herzegovina. In 1997, after the Bosnian War, he moved to the United States with his family. Two years later, in Phoenix, Arizona he graduated from Sunnyslope High School with an Advance Studies Diploma.

In 2004 Dr. Nikodinovic graduated with Bachelor's Degree in Criminal Justice & Criminology from Arizona State University and in 2008 he received his Master's Degree from Boston University, also in Criminal Justice & Criminology. After that he graduated from Michigan State University with Postgraduate Specialized Studies Certificate in Homeland Security.

In 2010 Dr. Nikodinovic was awarded a full scholarship by Serbian Government for his doctoral studies at the Belgrade University. Once accepted the scholarship, he moved back to Serbia and started working for the Police Union of Serbia as a Special Advisor to its president. He has been employed by the Union until the end of 2017, when he graduated from the Faculty of Political Science at Belgrade University with a Ph.D. in International Relations and European Studies, and when he decided to move back to Chicago, where he resides now.

During his career with the Serbian Police Union Dr. Nikodinovic was handling its entire international relations and managing all of the research. He was also responsible for project management and the coordination of cooperation between the Serbian Police Union and the European Police Union.

He is the author of several scientific and professional publications and articles, which are published in domestic and foreign journals. Dr. Nikodinovic is the author of the book titled "**Contemporary Global Terrorism:** *the First Decade of the U.S. War against Terrorism*".

His work and academic experience provided him with unique experience, knowledge and skills, and exposed him to a mixed and specific working environment where it was important to produce high-quality, innovative and original work. He has strong analytical and management skills, developed primarily through his work experience. Additionally, he is fluent in English and Serbian (Bosnian & Croatian) languages.

Dr. Nikodinovic has been awarded several times in the area of labour and policing by domestic, foreign and international institutions, in particular for a comprehensive contribution to the development of social dialogue and trade unionism in the security sector in the Balkans and for his scientific research contribution. He is also an active participant in a number of international professional and scientific conferences and projects in the area of policing, security and antiterrorism.