

Global War on Terrorism

by

SGM Gary Martz

MSG Doyle McNeil

SGM Rahamon Phillips

MSG Julie Walter

SGM Edward Martinez


Group Room M12

18 March 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR Faculty Advisor, Group Room M12, USASMA, Fort Bliss, TX 79918

SUBJECT: Global War on Terrorism

1. Thesis Statement. America can win the Global War on Terrorism without the support of the International Community.
2. Discussion. America has the political power, military superiority, economic resources, and information technology to win the war on terrorism. Political leaders continuously propose and develop initiatives to advance US national security interests. The US military maintains its superiority over terrorist organizations through its force integration, advanced combat systems, and command control. America's economy provides economic resources to win the war on terror and helps to establish democracy and international security. America leads the world in gathering and analyzing information to capture, kill, and destroy terrorist.
3. Conclusion. Terrorists who kill innocent people will continue to do so until stopped. The International Community believes that they do not have an invested interest in stopping these terrorist organizations. Therefore, they hope by ignoring them, they will just go away. America will not stand by and watch these cowardly killings. America will win the Global War on Terrorism at any cost.
4. Counterpoint. America will never be able to contain Terrorist as long as they are willing to die for their beliefs. America alone does not have the resources to sustain the war against terrorism militarily, economically, or through its information. The International Community no longer accepts America's political leaders and government policies. Therefore, America cannot win the Global War on Terrorism without the support of the International Community.
5. Haines Award. We do not request that the Haines Award Selection Board consider this paper for the General Haines Award for Excellence in research. Writing Research Papers, 10<sup>th</sup> Edition by James D. Lester, is the guide used in the preparation of this research paper.

  
JULIE ANN WALTER  
MSG, USA  
Chairperson

SGM Gary Martz  
MSG Doyle McNeil  
SGM Rahamon Phillips

## Group Outline

Thesis: America can win the Global War on Terrorism without the support of the International Community.

- I. Introduction
  - A. Background
    - 1. The United States perceptive and military strategy concerning terrorism before September 11, 2001.
    - 2. The United Nations and international community perceptive and military strategy concerning terrorism before September 11, 2001.
- II. Body
  - A. Political (SGM Gary Martz / MSG Doyle McNeil)
    - 1. The United States derives its political power from permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council and by providing significant aid to foreign countries both of which results in the power to influence other nations and the war against terrorism.
    - 2. The United States cannot win the Global War on Terrorism without the political influence and support of the international community and therefore must build a coalition to advocate peaceful means to this cause.
  - B. Military (MSG Julie Walter / SGM Rahamon Phillips)
    - 1. The United States maintains military superiority and leads the assault on terrorism throughout the world.
    - 2. The United Nations and the United States must build a coalition force to combat terrorism militarily.
  - C. Information Technology (SGM Gary Martz / MSG Doyle McNeil)
    - 1. The United States possess leading edge information and satellite technology maintaining its operational advantage against the war on terrorism.
    - 2. The United States has vast information technology networks but has failed in achieving its goals in acquiring vital data to find the core that is central to terrorist leadership (al-Quada, Jihad, etc.)
  - D. Economics (MSG Julie Walter / SGM Rahamon Phillips)
    - 1. The United States economic power can be sustained throughout the war against terrorism.
    - 2. The United States cannot sustain its economic growth and advantages by supporting the war against terrorism alone.
- III. Conclusion
  - A. Summary
  - B. Questions/Answer
  - C. Conclusion

## Global War on Terrorism

### Introduction

Historically, nations declare war to protect their own national interest, whether political, military, information technology, or economical. In doing so, nations establish fundamental principles of war by which their Armed Forces execute offensives in support of these national interest. These principles of war guide the use of military forces and most importantly the conduct of these forces in relation to their adversaries. Unlike terrorist organizations, who do not consider humane principles of war. They use terrorism as an assault against noncombatants for the purpose of intimidating or coercing governments for their own ideological or political reasons. These terrorist organizations are not souvenir nations but a radical ideological group of individuals that justify their actions through their faith. They have a clear objective and will do whatever necessary to meet those objectives even if it means sacrificing their own life or the lives of their loved ones.

Terrorism exists throughout the world with the majority of acts committed against noncombatants of Asian, European, Middle Eastern, and South American countries. These terrorists acts are designed to disrupt societies ideological and political foundation. In North America, terrorism did not exist until the disastrous day of September 11, 2001. In fact before this fateful day, Americans did not concern themselves with terrorism or its organizations. Most never heard of a terrorist organization, al-Qaeda or Osama bin Ladin, but on September 11, 2001 every American across the nation would personally feel the effects of terrorism.

The days that followed September 11, 2001, the government and citizens of

America to include its allied nations viewed terrorism as a cowardly act of violence perpetrated against innocent people by fanatic religious organizations. Therefore, these nations, as the International Community, vowed to join along side America to fight the Global War on Terrorism. Unfortunately, this bond would not last long and many of the nations from the International Community would alter their commitments and retreat from direct involvement in the war against terrorism. These nations abandoned America in deterring terrorism throughout the world. Today, America stands committed and can win the Global War on Terrorism without the support of the International Community.

### **Background**

America's deterrence methods used by the government leading up to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 have been viewed as extremely passive. In fact some will testify that throughout the 1990s the Clinton Administration to include the intelligence community was incompetent and did absolutely nothing to protect Americans from these attacks. Likewise, the Bush Administration, beginning in 2001, was not able to correct the many problems that plagued the government and most importantly the intelligence agencies before the attacks. According to Bill Gertz author of Breakdown, How America' Intelligence Failures Led to September 11, states:

“The attacks succeeded despite the most formidable intelligence-gathering system in the world. How the U.S. intelligence community-the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and other agencies known for there three letter acronyms-missed the September 11 attacks is a story of a system hamstrung by

bad politics, poor leadership, and bureaucratic ineptitude. But the most important problem facing U.S. intelligence agencies today is the lack of accountability-the failure to hold people and institutions responsible for the billions of dollars taxpayers money spent each year on the stated goal of protecting America against just the type of horror that was witnessed so vividly on the fateful day” (5).

After the attacks, it was quite clear that America’s intelligence community was inept and needed a serious overhaul. In fact, the philosophy of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was that they are not always right but they are never wrong. This kind of attitude perpetuated for more than a decade and even during a hearing in February 2002 by the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet. His agency never took any kind of responsibility for the attacks even though intelligence reports were reaching his headquarters about an al-Qaeda planned attack.

Al-Qaeda is a network of extremists organized by Osama bin Ladin who uses terrorism as a means for driving Americans and their influences out of Muslim nations, especially Saudi Arabia. They are also committed to toppling Israel and all pro-democracy nations in the Middle East. According to Osama bin Ladin’s 1998 religious decree, Fatwa, “it is the duty of Muslims around the world to wage holy war on the U.S., American citizens, and Jews. Muslims who do not heed this call are declared apostates” (Hayes).

On February 26, 1993 followers of Umar Abd al-Rahman, an Egyptian cleric who preached in New York City, committed the first known al-Qaeda terrorist attack against Americans in the United States. A car bomb exploded in an underground garage of the World Trade Center killing six people and injuring 1,000 more. The Clinton

Administration did not pursue retaliation abroad, but decided to take a reactive approach and investigated those within the United States.

Al-Qaeda surfaced again with Osama bin Ladin at the helm on November 13, 1995 when a van exploded outside a Saudi National Guard building in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The United States Army used the building for training Saudi military personnel. The explosion killed seven people, including five Americans and injured 35 others. President Clinton responded to the attack by saying:

“We owe it to them (those killed in the attack) and to all of our citizens to increase our efforts to deter terrorism, to make sure that those responsible for this hideous act are brought to justice, to intensify and pressure the isolation of countries that support terrorism-and we must spare no effort to make sure our own law enforcement officers have what they need to protect our citizens” (Gertz 8).

Unknown to the United States this was Osama bin Ladin’s first deadly attack.

On June 25, 1996 Osama bin Ladin would strike again in Saudi Arabia with a fuel truck explosion parked 80 feet away from Khobar Towers, a United States Armed Forces barracks that housed hundreds of military personnel. The explosion killed 19 Americans and injured hundreds more.

By 1996 the CIA knew that Osama bin Ladin was trying to build his network of extremist from many nationalities. He was working with Sudan, Iraq, Iran and he traveled freely throughout the Middle East. The CIA set up a specific station within the Counterterrorist Center that was devoted to Osama bin Ladin. Unfortunately, most of the analyst did not speak Arabic nor had any field experience abroad and they still assumed that he was just a primary financier of terrorism instead of the mastermind. Nevertheless,

the link was there.

In early 1998 the CIA finally tracked Osama bin Ladin's movements back to his training camp in Afghanistan. President Clinton had the option of bombing the site, but declined for fear of killing women and children, which he thought would hurt America's interest. Another option was to insert operatives, but the administration did not have the regional support to do so.

Approximately two years after the last bombing Osama bin Ladin struck again on August 7, 1998. A truck bomb exploded in front of American embassies located in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. The bombings killed 220 people and injured more than 4,000 others including 12 American government employees and family members. There were a number of intelligence reports citing threats abroad against embassies to include the two that were bombed. A year prior, the Federal Bureau of Investigation would discover letters planning the bombings, but unbelievably the credible information was never put to use.

Finally the Clinton administration took military action against Osama bin Ladin for the Africa embassy bombings. Exactly 5 years 5 months and 24 days after the first strike by al-Qaeda and Osama bin Ladin against the United States, warships fired a series of cruise missiles from the Persian Gulf at four terrorist training camps in Afghanistan. The military also bombed a factory in Sudan that was supposedly making chemical agents. Unfortunately, this military action would prove to be disastrous. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Shelton stated, "We were not going directly after Osama bin Ladin. It was an attack on his network of terrorist groups, as I think you will see from the

targets. We will continue to go after that if we feel like it's appropriate and if the threats to Americans or American interests continue" (Gertz 18). Worse, the State Department ended up paying the Sudanese factory owner for damages because of miscalculation by the White House National Security Council.

There are yet other instances of missed intelligence opportunities. The Philippines National Police authorities uncovered a terrorist cell. They obtained documents from a known terrorist, Ramzi Yousef, in January 1995. These documents revealed a major terrorist plot, Project Bojinka, using explosive packed American airliners flying from Asia to the United States. In addition, Philippine police interrogations of Abdul Hakim Al Hashim Murad disclosed that Murad attended several flight schools in the United States. Officials concur that this information was sent to CIA and FBI headquarters and state that their investigation focused on the plot itself and not the leads from Murad. Later on after September 11, 2001 investigations would link the attack back to this Philippine cell.

Osama bin Ladin's final attack against America before September 11, 2001 would take place in the port of Aden, Yemen on October 12, 2000. The USS Cole, a United States warship, was docked for refueling when a small boat containing explosives ripped a hole in the left side and almost sank it. The explosion killed 17 sailors and injured 39 others. Even though the required security procedures were not correctly carried out, the warships commander was relieved of any wrongdoing by the Chief of Naval Operations. Military action was not taken against Osama bin Ladin because the White House administration was changing. President Clinton would leave office in January 2001 and President Bush would wait for the investigation.

Throughout the 1990s and into 2000, both Presidential administrations and the intelligence community had reliable information of planned terrorist attacks against the United States on America soil. The Clinton administration repeatedly took a legalistic approach to deter terrorism, identify terrorist, capture them, and return them for prosecution. President Clinton's failing philosophy directly led to September 11, 2001. The Bush administration, unfortunately, would not make the necessary changes to correct the intelligence community until it was too late.

The United States would not be the only nation to take a passive stance against terrorism before September 11, 2001. America had a number of allied nations that had same philosophy to include the United Nations. Some of these nations thought that retaliation would bring more attacks and not be in their nations best interest. According to the United Nations Treaties Against International Terrorism fact sheet:

“the United Nations has long been active in the fight against international terrorism. Reflecting the determination of the international community to eliminate this threat, the Organization and its agencies have developed a wide range of international legal agreements that enable the international community to take action to suppress terrorism and bring those responsible to justice” (United Nations).

Although these treaties are in place, it is still the responsibility of individual nations to deter and fight against global terrorism.

### **Political (Pro)**

The United States, alone, possesses the political might to win the Global War on Terrorism. An opposing viewpoint may state that no one country can successfully

maintain the go it alone philosophy without suffering political backlash both internationally and domestically. A counterpoint to this argument is that the lone superpower must take the leadership role in the world community and make decisions that best serve all of us, whether these decisions are popular or not.

The United States played a leadership role in forming the United Nations following World War II and received permanent membership on the United Nations Security Council. The Security Council has 5 permanent members (United States, China, Russia, France, and England), and 10 rotating countries that serve for a two year rotation. Each month the Security Council Presidency is rotated between these 15 member countries. Under the United Nations charter, resolutions approved by this council must be accepted and carried out by all member nation states. Resolutions being considered must receive a nine-vote majority to pass. Any one or more of the permanent members can veto any resolution being considered. Any significant policy that is being considered by the United Nations must receive the United States' blessing or it cannot pass. If the United States interprets any resolution to be harmful to its interests, it can simply veto the resolution causing the motion to die regardless of how many countries may support it.

The United States provides over three times more foreign aid, approximately 16 billion in 2002, to countries throughout the world than its second place donor, Japan, with approximately 5 billion in 2002. In fact, the top four foreign aid donors, adding Germany and France exceeds all other countries of the world in providing foreign aid combined. This foreign aid wields much power and influence as we attach conditions to the foreign aid we provide and do not just blindly throw our money away. Our total foreign aid also only equals slightly less than one percent of our Gross National Product.

During the initial planning phases of Operation Enduring Freedom, the United States needed overflight, landing, staging, and logistical bases surrounding Afghanistan. Without these inroads, the United States could not have launched the campaign in Afghanistan that eventually destroyed the Taliban, closed terrorist training camps, and disrupted Al Qaeda operations. President Bush sent the Secretary of State, Colin Powell, to the Mideast to discuss these issues with foreign leaders. Secretary Powell was able to politically convince these leaders that it was in their best interests to support the United States in our Global War on Terrorism. Many of these leaders, while supporting the United States privately, asked that we keep secret our arrangements in order to avoid political backlash in their own countries. It is significant to point out that these leaders were willing to accommodate us to this great extent due to our political power and influence in the world.

As an added measure, President Bush dispatched General Tommy Franks, Combatant Commander for the Central Command, which covers Southwest Asia and a portion of Africa, to meet with these same heads of state and their military leaders. General Franks was at liberty to speak more freely with leaders in countries such as Pakistan, Oman, Uzbekistan, Turkey, Jordan, Turkmenistan, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and others as well informing them of our intentions and plans to launch an offensive operation in Afghanistan to meet our objectives. Each of these countries was provided foreign aid and other considerations for their cooperation. These countries proved loyal to their private agreements with the United States.

The United States exerted its national power as described using its political power to gain cooperation in Afghanistan's neighboring countries to successfully launch Operation

Enduring Freedom. In short order, using the United States' high superiority in satellite technology, the Taliban was defeated, Al Qaeda was on the run, and a democratic interim government was installed. Even though some of our close allies participated in this operation, make no mistake about it, the United States took the lead without polling for world opinion and accomplished its objectives. Therefore, today President Karzai is Afghanistan's democratically elected president and terrorism camps are a thing of the past.

The United Nations Security Council unanimously approved UN Resolution 1441, which stated that Saddam Hussein, President of the Republic of Iraq, was in violation of UN Sanctions from resolutions drafted after the Gulf War in 1991. Major violations included Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) violations, supporting terrorism, and diverting funds from the Oil for Food Program. President Bush gave a speech before the UN General Assembly demanding a coalition be formed to remove Saddam Hussein and leaders of his Baath Party from power.

The United States introduced a resolution before the UN Security Council for severe punishment and immediate action against Iraq's government. Of the permanent members of the UN Security Council, only Great Britain supported our position. Russia, China and France failed to support our position. President Bush was undeterred by the world opinion of containing Saddam Hussein and decided it was better to be on the offensive fighting the GWOT, rather on the defensive, and that containment had not been effective in the past and would not work in the future either. To protect the United States from terrorism, President Bush authorized the execution of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) without the United Nations support. Its objective was to rid Iraq of Saddam Hussein and

install a democratic government that might serve as an example to its neighbors in the region. The United States, with support from Great Britain, Spain, Poland, Ukraine and a few others in minor support roles, launched OIF in March 2003. In less than three weeks, the United States had met its objective of ridding Iraq of Saddam Hussein's oppressive government and is providing the internationally recognized interim government state security and assisting in the preparation for full democratic elections in Iraq.

### **Political (Con)**

The United States of America has powerful political influence in many countries, but maximizing this asset without support of the international community is winless in fighting the Global War on Terrorism. The uses of the United States politics are limited without assistance from the international community. There will be a need for the United States to use as a minimum: foreign and international geographic for air space, waterways, landing zones, and the occupation of land masses for total its military operations. These types of operations need the support of foreign dignitaries, mediators, and liaisons. In contrast, our current strategies are not working with the support of the international community.

I will prove my points by introducing United States politics on the Global War on Terrorism, a US State Department perspective beginning in 2002. A conflicting view from Richard Clarke, former Anti-Terrorist Chief, on why we will not win the Global War on Terrorism, and additional articles outlining why the Global War on Terrorism is a failing essentially on the way the United States acquires information. Why political strategies continue to foster failing results.

In March 2002, the Secretary of State, Colin Powell, released the comments to

the nation: WASHINGTON DC, USA: Mar 15 (PNS) - US Secretary of State Colin L. Powell Thursday said the US budget provides \$395 million for Pakistan, \$657 million for Afghanistan, \$460 million for Jordan, \$255 million for Turkey, \$136 million for Indonesia and \$87 million for Philippines. "Our number one priority is to fight and win the global war on terrorism," he said in his remarks before the House Appropriations Committee, Export Financing and Relations Programs. The budget furthers this goal by providing economic, military and democracy assistance to key foreign partners and allies, "including \$4.7 billion for countries that have joined us in the war on terrorism," he added. Powell observed that the 2004 budget proposes several initiatives to advance US national securities interest and preserve American leadership. The 2004 foreign operations budget that funds programs for the Department of State, USAID, and other foreign affairs agencies are \$18.8 billion. In Afghanistan, he said the funding will be used to fulfill the US commitment to rebuild Afghanistan's road network. "In addition, it will help establish security through a national military and national police force, and our assistance will establish broad-based and accountable governance through democratic institutions in an active civil society."

Richard Clarke tells Berkeley audience, "U.S. still isn't safe", San Francisco Chronicle September 8, 2004. The Bush administration has bungled the war on terrorism, doing little to provide security at home while breeding legions of new enemies abroad, the government's former anti-terrorism chief, Richard Clarke, told a large Berkeley audience Tuesday night. Clarke, who made international headlines last spring when he emerged as the highest-ranking whistle-blower from inside the White House's war on terrorism, painted an alarming picture of a White House still pursuing a losing

strategy while America's safety hangs in the balance. "The pool of people who really hate us is so much greater than it was on 9/11 because of this needless and counterproductive war in Iraq," Clarke said to applause from nearly 2,000 people at UC Berkeley's Zellerbach auditorium.

On the home front, except for improved airline safety, little or nothing has been done to protect the many other vulnerable targets such as trains, chemical plants, walmart stores and financial headquarters, said Clarke, who served as counter-terrorism czar under both Presidents George W. Bush and Bill Clinton. Shortly after the Sept. 11 attacks, he and other counter-terrorism officials urged a wide range of protective actions, such as security for commuter trains vulnerable to the type of backpack bombs that later blew up a train in Madrid. "That could happen in the BART system today," he said. He described most homeland-security measures in the past three years as "token efforts." He also called the war on terrorism a misnomer. "We're not engaged in a war on terrorism, a war against a tactic," he said. "We're not concerned here with all terrorist groups." There are many terrorist organizations around the world that the U.S. government is not actively fighting, he noted.

The enemy, he said, consists of about 100,000 members of about 14 jihadist groups, loosely linked to al Qaeda and representing "a virulent strain of Islam." This strain, he said, is a violence-embracing form of the Sunni fundamentalist movement known as Wahabism. America needs to confront such enemies directly, but it also needs to wage a "war of ideas" with the hundreds of millions of Muslims who currently support the hard-core fanatics, he said. Clarke was a senior White House adviser to the last three presidents and was the government's "foremost expert on al Qaeda," in the words of U.S.

court of Appeals Judge Richard Posner writing in the New York Times last week. Clark's bombshell book earlier this year, "Against All Enemies: Inside America's War on Terror," became a No. 1 New York Times best seller. The book says the Bush team failed to give sufficient attention to the al Qaeda threat both before and after Sept. 11, focusing instead on a preoccupation with Saddam Hussein and invading Iraq.

Clarke, who left the White House in frustration in February 2003, issued high-profile criticisms as a star witness before the national Sept. 11 commission and on CBS News' "60 Minutes," both in March this year. He had been dissatisfied before he left. In what Clarke viewed as a sign of the Bush administration downgrading counter-terrorism, for example, national security adviser Condoleezza Rice told him that he could stop attending the "principals" meetings of the National Security Council. His book provoked strong reactions from the White House, with Vice President Dick Cheney saying Clarke hadn't been "in the loop," and others suggested he resented working for Rice.

### **Military (Pro)**

The United States Armed Forces can win the Global War on Terrorism over any potential adversary, whether there are conventional ground forces or terrorist insurgency. America's Armed Forces are "Second to None" due to its joint force integration concept. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines assimilate providing dominance over the enemy through its advanced combat systems and seamless command and control. These capabilities combined with tough realistic digital training and the warrior spirit of the Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines are unparalleled to any adversary.

The United States Armed Forces has superior capabilities, which are derived from science and technology advances of weapon and platform systems. The following

examples of these systems are extracted from the Office of the United States Army, Weapon Systems publication. The M1A2 System Enhancement Program (SEP) Abrams tank provides our forces with heavy armor superiority on the battlefield by closing with and destroying any heavy armor enemy on the battlefield using its mobility, firepower, and shock effect. The Abrams tank lethality is maintained through its thermal sights and digital command and control capabilities. Although a small number of allied nations possess some sort of counterpart to the Abrams tank, no nation or organization possesses any system that is considered superior to the M1A2 SEP.

Another example of America's military superior capabilities is the AH-64D Longbow Apache helicopter which is equipped with the HELLFIRE missile. The Longbow provides unprecedented survivability, firepower, and precision strike capable of maneuvers at night under adverse weather conditions and obscured battlefields. The Longbow maintains a fire-and-forget missile system. Its fire control radar is capable of locating, classifying, and prioritizing targets with immediate masking procedures minimizing exposure to the enemy.

The Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (TUAV) is an exceptional intelligence gathering capability that is utilized by all services of the Armed Forces. It provides reconnaissance, surveillance and target acquisition capabilities at real-time, day or night and in adverse weather. The TUAV is equipped with a ground control station that collects, analyzes, and distributes digitized battlefield information to Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (C3I) systems. The TUAV is able to scan areas where human intelligence cannot. Some allied nations have TUAV capabilities, but no known adversaries.

Lastly, the Army Battle Command System (ABCS) is a combination of all Army Command and Control Systems, which are digitized, that provide near real time situational awareness of the battlefield operating space to the individual, the crew and command and control at every level, both horizontally and vertically.

These various capabilities are just a sample of America's military superiority that allows decisive action against the enemy without needing the support of allied nations military. In fact, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines collectively have won every engagement with terrorist insurgence and will continue to do so until the war is won against terrorism.

### **Military (Con)**

America's Armed Forces cannot maintain military superiority over terrorist organizations without the support of other allied nations. In 1991, when the United States and allied forces claimed victory in the Persian Gulf, it showed the world a devastating combat capability through combined force operations. The US government convinced the world that future wars must involve combined operations to preserve hope and democracy worldwide. Knowing this bit of information, the Army took the first step towards downsizing its forces from 950,000 to 435,000 active Soldiers. 10 years later, the military and allied forces faced a different and more versatile enemy.

In order to fight the war on terrorism effectively, the Active Army, National Guard and US Army reserve had to commit all resources and personnel on-hand. Initially, the Pentagon declared 100,000 troops for a ground force invasion while retired General Eric Shinseki and Former Army Secretary Thomas White insisted on 200,000 troops for stability and support operations. As of today, Iraq has approximately 160,000

Soldiers and Afghanistan accounts for 17,000 Soldiers, totaling 177,000 Soldiers deployed in 20 different countries combating the Global War on Terrorism. This commitment does not include Operations Other Than War (OOTW) e.g.; Korea (20,000 Soldiers), Kosovo (2,500 Soldiers), Sinai, Egypt and continuous operations not published.

A strong coalition force brings power to the cause and extends a united effort when fighting a global problem. The United States began building a coalition force on September 12, 2001, with 69 nations and 16,000 international troops supporting the global war on terrorism. 19 NATO Allies and 9 NATO "aspirants" began providing airspace approval, seaports, and land base access, refueling assistance, and increased law-enforcement operations. Currently 29 countries and 28,600 international troops are participating in the Central Command Theater of Operations.

A successful operation begins and ends with combined partnership. The invasion in Iraq shows a lack of partnership partly blamed on the US government and arrogance towards war instead of diplomatic solutions. Underestimating our enemy has become a legacy in US military history. If we continue this trend all efforts towards building a strong alliance will erode future support and lessen US respect throughout the international community.

### **Information Technology (Pro)**

The United States' possesses superior information technology over all countries in the world, proving that the international community is not needed in winning the Global War on Terrorism. Our satellite technology, ran from 24 strategically placed satellites,

enable us to capture both sight and sound of every square meter on Earth. We share this technology with our allies, but can cut the link to others if we choose.

During Operation Enduring Freedom, these satellites proved invaluable working in synch with Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) that were armed with missiles that could be fired remotely from either the United States or in the CENTCOM AOR. The United States was able to fire these precision guided missiles and surgically strike Taliban and Al Qaeda positions that were in close contact against the Northern Alliance and Special Operations Forces (SOF) with minimal damage to friendly forces. In short order, the Taliban was defeated, Al Qaeda was on the run, and a democratic interim government was installed in Afghanistan.

In the initial stages of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the United States developed a digital technology display that could track friendly and enemy forces, weapons, and equipment in real time mode. This encrypted data was broadcast to the CENTCOM (FWD) in Qatar, and to each of the Component Commanders. This technology enabled the CENTCOM Combatant Commander and the Component Commanders the ability to make informed decisions with up to the minute operational data throughout the theater of operations. The United States is always seeking breakthroughs in information technology and Congress has allocated sufficient funding for IT research and development. One of these highly successful programs belongs to the Department of Defense (DOD).

The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) is the central research and development organization for the DOD. It manages and directs selected basic and applied research and development projects for DOD, and pursues research and technology where risk and payoff are both very high and where success may provide

dramatic advances for traditional military roles and missions. DARPA recently hosted a three day symposium that brought together more than 2,000 members of the academic, industry, and military communities to learn more about DARPA's portfolio of innovative technologies and to explore revolutionary ideas for bridging the gap between today's capabilities and tomorrow's military challenges.

The DOD's commitment to bringing the brightest and technologically advanced personnel together will keep us on the leading edge of today's information technology, enable our continued superiority over others, and ensure our success in the future.

### **Information Technology (Con)**

The United States of America has the most advanced information technologies in the world, but maximizing these assets without support of the international community is a winless situation in the Global War on Terrorism. The use of the United States vast information networks is limited without assistance from the international community.

There will be a need to employ Information Technology infrastructures around the globe and the authority for these actions to occur remains with those Host Nations. Another ever-increasing important element on the Global War on Terrorism is the way we acquire 'Information'.

The actions in Afghanistan highlighted two essential aspects of this topic. The first is the importance of a "networked" operations capability. We have continued the process of connecting sensors, shooters, and command and control elements with a single network of voice and data links, without regard to platforms or individual Services. We do not yet have this capability complete, but we are making steady progress. For example, in Afghanistan Special Operations Forces (SOF) on the ground guided strikes

from both US Navy and Air Force aircraft. Additionally, Navy and Air Force Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) platforms were able to feed sensor outputs to Marine and SOF ground units, as well as other airborne platforms. We were also able to link real-time inputs from unmanned aerial vehicles to orbiting AC-130 gun ships, which then provided responsive and pinpoint fire support to ground operations. These Afghan operations provide a hint of the operational advantages we will gain when this element of the transformation process matures.

The second aspect of information operations highlighted by the Afghan campaign is the importance of a well-integrated information campaign. To that end, the Department of Defense (DOD) activated an information operations task force focused on winning the information campaign against global terrorism. This task force is committed to developing, coordinating, deconflicting, and monitoring the delivery of timely, relevant, and effective messages to targeted international audiences.

### **Economics (Pro)**

America's strong global economy also contributes to winning the Global War on Terrorism. America is the largest trading nation in the world and has the fastest growing economy. Over the past year, America's economy grew 4.8% in comparison to Europe at 2%. America's stock market is on the rise with the Dow Jones Industrial Average up 25% and the NASDAQ up 56% from more than a year ago. Additionally, 2.4 millions jobs have been created within the last year leaving the unemployment rate at a low 5.4%. Today, American incomes are greater and home ownership for all is higher due in part to sustained low interest rates. Overall the American economy is on the up swing and looks

to continue. On September 11, 2001 one of the terrorist missions was to destroy America's economic power, these stated facts prove that they have only made her stronger.

Last year, President Bush proposed a very aggressive budget for FY 2005. His vision is to increase spending were needed for homeland security and to win the war against terrorism while growing the economy and refraining from internal Federal growth. The FY 2005 Omnibus Appropriations Bill allocates 40.2 billion to Department of Homeland Security (DHL) and 401.7 billion to Department of Defense (DOD). These two agencies are at the core of the War on Terrorism. DHL will increase internal programs such as port, border, immigration, and aviation security, biomedical countermeasures, and state and local first responders programs. DHL will also provide 10.3 billion towards a homeland missile defense program. DOD will focus on modernizing the entire force through advanced training and equipment. They will also ensure that Armed Forces members are well taken care of through quality of life programs such as pay, medical, housing, and insurance benefits. Not only do these two agencies help protect the nation, but they also stimulate and help grow the economy. Increasing the capabilities of both these agencies creates millions of jobs internally and externally, which create millions of dollars in government revenues.

Caterpillar, DRS Technologies, and Perini Corp. are just a few of the external American companies, as stated above, that have seen an increase in profits due to the growing economy and war against terror. According to Forbes magazine dated January 10, 2005, Caterpillar's third-quarter 2004 net income was 498 million an increase of 276 million a year earlier. It is estimated that Caterpillar's revenue for 2005 will reach 33

billion once again an increase from 22.7 billion in 2003. Expansions within the trucking industry, economic ties with China, rebuilding Iraq, and DOD contracts account for the company's growth. Again this is just an example of hundreds of companies prospering today.

The future of America's economic power is endless. Although as a nation, we are transitioning from a manufacturing state to a service state that does not degrade or hinder our economic capabilities. There are a number of under developed countries in the world that want to bring prosperity to their citizens. America can provide the economic structure and foundation that these countries need to forge ahead and Iraq is an example of that. On February 13, 2004, the World Trade Organization (WTO) voted unanimously to support Iraq and give them observer status within the organization. This is a huge economic step for Iraq and America.

### **Economics (Con)**

America cannot maintain its strong economic power without financial support from other nations in the fight against terrorism. On 25 February 2004, Federal Reserve Chairman Allen Greenspan urged Congress to deal with the country's escalating budget deficit by cutting benefits for future Social Security retirees because the government's budget is over committed. He quoted, "Without this action, he warned long-term interest rates would rise, seriously harming the US economy". Professor Johan Galtung a Norwegian scholar and international analyst predicted the collapse of the Soviet Empire. According to his predictions on 9 April 2003, he said the Global War on Terrorism would put the US economy on the same path of the Soviets within two decades.

The Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan was a huge ideological and costly mistake, according to the former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. The 10-year war put a heavy toll on the Soviet economy, siphoning some five billion rubles a year. I believe the US government is following the same destructive path of Israel and Palestine.

Douglas Holtz-Eakin director for the Congressional Budget Office estimated the war in Iraq and the GWOT would cost America \$392 billion over a period of 10 years. Through these valuable and notable examples, the U.S. government understands failure in Iraq or Afghanistan is not an option. When Middle-Eastern terrorists attack our way of life, they had two goals in mind, disrupt the U.S. economy and prove to the world that we are vulnerable. Let me explain how important the Middle Eastern resources are viable to the U.S. and global economy.

For almost two decades in which US oil import dependence rose rapidly, three US Administrations (Republican and Democrats) paid little attention to the issue of rising oil demand and import dependence. When the International Energy Agency (IEA) projected US, oil imports to rise from 14.3million barrels to 16.7million barrels in a period of 10 years it raised a few eyebrows in Washington. Oil supply security was a minor policy issue in the US until the attack on September 11, 2001. Since then, the Administration was determined to increase the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) and reduce oil import dependence from the Middle East and favor imports from West Africa, Latin America, Canada, Russia and the Caspian region.

In the current low oil demand, high oil price world, demand for OPEC and Middle East oil is rising at a snail's pace. However, even in this low growth world and with steadily rising non-OPEC production, 22% of global oil production came from the

Middle East. There is no way the world could adjust to a scenario without the Middle East for any length of time short of facing an economic calamity.

Many global oil supply assessments conclude that incremental non-OPEC production will slow, if not decline, later in this decade even at currently prevailing prices. All scenarios point at sharply rising demand for Middle East oil in the next decade (2010-20). Both the IEA and EIA show significant growth in demand for oil from the Middle East even in this decade. Although their timing and extent of dependence on Middle East oil differs, all analysts agree that the importance of the region to meet future global oil demand will steadily rise. PEL estimates demand for Gulf crude oil in 2010 at between 17mn b/d (high price scenario) to 22mn b/d (low price scenario).

Best-case scenarios suggest that along with rising US oil imports, imports from the Middle East will increase in the coming decade. However, rising oil production in the Atlantic basin, a determined effort by Russian companies to export oil to the US, and a government policy aimed at reducing oil imports from the Middle East, could reduce oil imports from the region later in the decade. Those who argue in favor of further reducing the share of oil imports from the Gulf region maintain that this would enhance US supply security, an argument I hope we have already thoroughly squashed. Saudi Arabia has until now had a strategic interest in remaining one of the largest (if not the largest) oil exporters to the US (for export diversification and strategic reasons). If US refiners were to import more oil from the Atlantic Basin and less from the Middle East in the future, some Saudi exports may divert to Asia. Such a move would not have any noticeable positive affect against US oil supply security instead it builds stronger Asian economies.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, measuring America's success on winning the Global War on Terrorism is nearly impossible to do. Some will argue that it is establishing freedom and democracy in every known country. While, others will say that it is measured by preventing of any additional terrorist attacks within American. Even others will state that it is when we restore our economy and reduce our national deficit. Therefore, is America winning the Global War on Terrorism? The United States of America without argument has one of the youngest histories throughout the world. Warfare has become its legacy through preservation of freedom and the rescuing of oppressed human beings from mass genocide. The Global War on Terrorism underscores a part of American history; and it stands vertical for any nation who challenges freedom. Our nation has become the centerpiece of humanity, liberty, and the promise to others who want a brighter future over tyranny and oppression. America provides hope for those who live in bondage and deliver a new meaning of restoration of independence between citizens. If victory is to be proclaimed through bloodshed, then American Soldiers stand ready as the guardians of freedom worldwide. Yes, America is winning the Global War on Terrorism for the simple fact that we stand committed in preserving the freedoms of our children and who can not stand for themselves.

### Works Cited

Central Intelligence Agency, The World Factbook. International Community debt owed to the U.S. Government. 2004. <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/fields/2079.html>

Fight And Win Global War On Terrorism, U.S.' Number One Priority: Powell: PAK NEWS 2002, <http://paknews.com/PrintPage.php?id=2&date1=2003-03-15&news2=main1>

Franssen, Harold Dr. Malfroum Press. Arab and US energy needs. Washington, D,C, 16 September 2002. <http://www.mafhoum.com/press3/111E18.htm>

Franks, Tommy. American Soldier. New York: Harper-Collins Publishers Inc, 2004.

Frontline "The future of war Interviews". General Shinseki's Initial estimates on securing Iraq. <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/iraq/attack/consequences/2003/0228pentagoncontra.htm>

Gagnon, Bruce K. New Pentagon Vision Transforms War Agenda. Arlington, VA 6 Jan 2005. <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/GAG501A.html>

Gertz, Bill. Breakdown-How America's Intelligence Failures Led to September 11. Washington DC: Regnery, 2002.

Gilmore, Gerry J. Globalization trends from the Special Operations Community. Washington, D.C. 27 July 2004. <http://globalspecops.com/wot2.html>

Global Policy Forum, War on Terrorism Articles, USA Patriot Act 2001, <http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/terrorwar/analysis/index.htm>

Global Policy Forum, War on Terrorism Articles, To Defeat Al Qaeda, US Must Build Trust of Moderate Muslims (September 20, 2004), <http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/terrorwar/analysis/index.htm>

Global Policy Forum, War on Terrorism Articles, War Against Terror is a Failure, Ex-White House Official Says (September 8, 2004), <http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/terrorwar/analysis/index.htm>

Global Policy Forum, War on Terrorism Articles, War Against Terror is a Failure, Ex-White House Official Says (September 8, 2004), Richard Clarke, <http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/terrorwar/analysis/index.htm>

Global Policy Forum, War on Terrorism Articles, Why al-Qaeda Is Winning (September 11, 2004), <http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/terrorwar/analysis/index.htm>

Global Spec Ops, Global War On Terrorism Information Resources, <http://www.globalspecops.com/wotportal.html>

### Works Cited

- Global War on Terrorism, No Author, [http://www.dtic.mil/jcs/chairman/Posture\\_Statement.html](http://www.dtic.mil/jcs/chairman/Posture_Statement.html)
- Hayes, Laura. Osama bin Laden's Network of Terror. 7 Jan 2005.  
<http://www.infoplease.com/spot/terror-qaeda.html>
- Nowlin, David V., and Ronald J. Stupak. War As An Instrument Of Policy. Maryland: UP of America, 1998.
- Mouawad, Jad. Sydney Morning Herald. Petroleum prices hurting economies. 14 October 2004. <http://www.energybulletin.net/2533.html>
- National Priorities Projects. Local cost of the Iraq war. May 2004.  
<http://www.nationalpriorities.org/Issues/Military/Iraq/CostOfWar.html>
- Pike, John. Coalition Forces in Iraq. Alexandria, VA. 19 Jan 2005.  
[http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/iraq\\_orbat\\_coalition.htm](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/iraq_orbat_coalition.htm)
- Smillie, Dirk. "Caterpillar Roaring Tractors." Forbes 10 January 2005: 136+.
- The Threat of Globalization, Edward S Herman, April 1999,  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/define/hermantk.htm>
- The World Bank Group, Aid and Statistics (September 8, 2004),  
<http://www.worldbank.org/data>
- This War on Terrorism is Bogus, Michael Meacher, Guardian Newspapers Limited 2004,  
September 6, 2003, <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4747953-111381,00.html>
- "Time to deliver the goods." The Economist 8 January 2005: 63-64.
- United Nations. United Nations Security Council. United Nations Treaties Against International Terrorism. 9 Jan 2005 <http://www.un.org/News/dh/latest/intreaterror.htm>
- United Nations Security Council Membership (January 9, 2005),  
[http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc\\_members.html](http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc_members.html)
- United States. Congressional Budget Office, Paying For Military Readiness And Upkeep: Trends In Operation And Maintenance Spending. Washington DC: GPO, 1997.
- United States Embassy Fact Sheet. International Contributions to the War against Terrorism. 22 May 2002. <http://www.state.gov/coalition/cr/fs/12753.htm>
- United States. Office of the United States Army, Weapon Systems. Washington DC: GPO, 1998.

### Works Cited

United States. United States Department Of Defense, Office of Public Affairs.  
International Contributions to the War Against Terrorism. 14 Jun 2002. 16 Dec 2004  
<http://www.state.gov/coalition/cr/fs/12753.htm>

United States. Department of State, Office of the historian Bureau of Public Affairs.  
Significant Terrorist Incidents: A Chronology 1997-2001. 31 Oct 2001. 4 Jan 2005

Webber, David. Professor Johan Galtung on the US economy and post-war Iraq. 9 April  
2003. <http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2003/s828529.htm>