

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria  
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University 8 Mai 1945 – Guelma  
Faculty of Letters and Languages  
Department of Letters and English Language

جامعة 8 ماي 1945 قالمة  
كلية الآداب و اللغات  
قسم الآداب واللغات



## **Obama's Approach to the War on Terror: a Comprehensive Analysis.**

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Letters and English  
Language in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master in Language and Culture**

### **Board of Examiners**

<b>Chair : Mrs. BARES MERIEM</b>	<b>(MAA)</b>	<b>University 8 Mai 1945 Guelma</b>
<b>Supervisor: Mrs. KRIBES AMINA</b>	<b>(MAA)</b>	<b>University 8 Mai 1945 Guelma</b>
<b>Examiner: Mrs. ZIYAYA RIMA</b>	<b>(MAA)</b>	<b>University 8 Mai 1945 Guelma</b>

### **Submitted by**

HAZZAR IHAB

AMIROUCHE SABRI

### **Supervised by**

Mrs. KRIBES AMINA

**June 2024**

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is dedicated to the unwavering support and love of my parents, whose belief in me has been a constant source of inspiration throughout this academic journey. To my friends, whose encouragement and camaraderie have made the challenges more manageable and the successes more meaningful. Your presence in my life has been invaluable, shaping me into the person I am today.

HAZZAR IHAB

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother and father, who have always been there for me, cheering me on and helping me through every step. To my friends, who have been like family, offering support and making tough times easier. Your love and friendship mean everything to me. Thank you,

AMIROUCHE SABRI

## **Acknowledgments**

All praise and thanks are due to Allah, the Almighty. Praise be to Allah, the All-Knowing, the Most Merciful, the Most Gracious, the Most Generous, the Exalted in Might and Power. We thank Him for His endless blessings, guidance, and for making this study a reality. We praise Allah at all times. May the peace and benefits of Allah be upon Prophet Muhammad, his family, and his friends.

We also offer our greatest thanks to our parents for their constant support and guidance throughout the preparation of this dissertation and throughout our lives. May Allah reward them with the best place in Al-Jannah.

We would like to express gratitude to our supervisor, Mrs. KRIBES AMINA, for going above and beyond to ensure that we had the necessary resources and support to finish our dissertation. Her readiness to fight for our needs and provide help when needed has been priceless. Your dedication to our success is deeply valued.

We are deeply thankful to the jury members for their amazing skill in the field and their desire to easily share their knowledge during the evaluation process. Their useful thoughts and critical feedback will greatly add to the quality and depth of our work. Additionally, we would like to show our deep thanks to them for taking the responsibility of reading and evaluating this doctorate. Their loyalty and commitment to the review of our works are greatly valued.

## **Abstract**

In the wake of 9/11 attacks, President George W. Bush launched his “war on terror” in an effort to fight global terrorism. When Barack Obama became the President of the United States, he pledged to start a new chapter in US foreign policy that departs substantially from Bush’s stringent policies. This research aims to understand the strategies and policies used by Obama in the areas of counter-terrorism, and describe the policies implemented in Afghanistan and Iraq as vivid examples to test his claims. The research also explores the legacy of Obama’s policies in shaping his approaches to national security and counterterrorism efforts. The research then draws a clear understanding to elements of continuity and change in Obama’s efforts to combat terrorism.

## المخلص

في أعقاب الهجمات التي وقعت في 11 أيلول/سبتمبر، تناول الرئيس جورج دبليو بوش "حربه على الإرهاب" في محاولة لمكافحة الإرهاب العالمي. عندما أصبح باراك أوباما رئيساً للولايات المتحدة، تعهد ببدء فصل جديد في السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة يخرج كثيراً عن السياسات الصارمة التي ينتهجها بوش. ويهدف هذا البحث إلى فهم الاستراتيجيات والسياسات التي استخدمها أوباما في مجالات مكافحة الإرهاب، ووصف السياسات المنفذة في أفغانستان والعراق كأمتلة حية لاختبار ادعاءاته. ويستكشف البحث أيضاً إرث سياسات أوباما في صياغة نهجه للأمن القومي وجهود مكافحة الإرهاب. ثم يستخلص البحث فهماً واضحاً لعناصر الاستمرارية والتغيير في جهود أوباما لمكافحة الإرهاب.

## List of Abbreviation

AQ	Al-Qaeda
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CVE	Countering Violent Extremism
DEA	Drug Enforcement Administration
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
GCC	The Gulf Cooperation Council
GWOT	Global War on Terror
ICCPR	The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ISR	Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
NSA	National Security Agency
NYU	New York University
OODA	Observe - Orient - Decide – Act
PDPA	People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan
SIGAR	Special Inspector General for Afghanistan
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
UN	United Nations
UNCS	United States Security Council
WMD	Weapon of Mass Destruction

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter One: Historical Background of the War on Terror.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Origins of War on Terror.....	5
1.1.1. Rise of Islamic Extremism.....	6
1.1.2. Soviet-Afghan War.....	6
1.1.3. 1.1.3. Rise of Al-Qaeda.....	8
1.1.4. Gulf War.....	10
1.2. Definitions and Conceptualizations of Terrorism .....	11
1.3. Theories of Counterterrorism.....	12
1.4. George W. Bush’s War on Terror: Tools, Techniques, Strategies.....	14
1.4.1 Military Interventions.....	15
1.4.2. Intelligence Gathering.....	16
1.4.3. Diplomatic Efforts.....	18
1.4.4. Enhanced Security Measures.....	19
1.5. Obama’s Campaign Promises and Initial Policy Shifts.....	20
<b>Chapter Two: Key Legislative and Executive Actions During Obama’s Presidency.....</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1. Introducing Obama's War on Terror .....	21
2.1.1. Military Interventions.....	23
2.1.2. Drone Warfare.....	25
2.1.3. Guantanamo Bay and Detention Policies.....	29
2.1.3.1. Obama's Efforts to Close Guantanamo Bay: Challenges and Failure.....	29
2.1.3.2. Treatment of Detainees and Adherence to International .....	30
2.1.3.3. Alternatives to Indefinite Detention: Policy Proposals and Debates.....	31
2.2. Surveillance and Civil Liberties.....	32



2.2.1. Expansion of Surveillance Programs under the Obama Administration.....	33
2.2.2. National Security Agency (NSA) Surveillance Controversies.....	35
2.2.3. Balancing Security Concerns with Civil Liberties.....	36
2.3. Diplomacy and Soft Power.....	37
2.4. Engagement with Muslim Communities and Allies.....	39
<b>Chapter Three: Assessment of Obama’s Overall Effectiveness in Combating Terroris.</b>	<b>40</b>
3.1. Expansion of Drone Strikes under Obama.....	42
3.2. Counterterrorism Partnerships and Alliances under Obama.....	44
3.3. Implications of Obama’s Counterterrorism Policies.....	44
3.4. Challenges and Limitations.....	46
3.5. Lessons Learned from Obama’s Approach to Counterterrorism.....	48
3.5.1. Intelligence Integration and Innovation.....	49
3.5.2. Use of Technology.....	50
3.5.3. Security V. Liberty.....	51
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Work Cited.....</b>	<b>55</b>

## Introduction

The War on Terror, a global campaign initiated in response to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, has profoundly shaped international relations and U.S. foreign policy. This dissertation provides a comprehensive examination of the historical background, key legislative and executive actions during Barack Obama's presidency, and an assessment of his effectiveness in combating terrorism. Through an in-depth analysis, this research aims to answer how the War on Terror evolved, what strategies were employed by the Bush and Obama administrations, and the implications of these actions on global security and democratic values.

The research aims to address several important questions, How has the history of the War on Terror shaped contemporary counterterrorism policies? What were the critical legislative and executive actions during Obama's presidency? How effective were these actions in combating terrorism? What were the perceptions and consequences of U.S. democracy promotion during this period? this research employs a qualitative approach, combining historical and policy analysis. Primary and secondary sources, including government documents, speeches, academic articles, and media reports, will be utilized to provide a comprehensive understanding of the subject.

The literature review encompasses works on the rise of Islamic extremism, the Soviet-Afghan War, the formation of Al-Qaeda, and the impact of the Gulf War, as well as theoretical perspectives on terrorism and counterterrorism. Key texts include Colin Dueck's "The Obama Doctrine: American Grand Strategy Today," Glenn P. Hastedt's "American Foreign Policy: Past, Present, and Future," Jeff Bridoux's "Democracy Promotion: A Critical Introduction," and Larry Diamond's "The Spirit of Democracy."

The first chapter delves into the historical background of the War on Terror. It examines the origins of the War on Terror, tracing back to the rise of Islamic extremism and

its significant milestones. This chapter explores the impact of the Soviet-Afghan War in the 1980s, which played a crucial role in the emergence of militant groups such as Al-Qaeda. The subsequent Gulf War further destabilized the region, exacerbating existing tensions and creating an environment conducive to extremist ideologies. This chapter also includes an analysis of various definitions and conceptualizations of terrorism, acknowledging its multifaceted nature and the complex challenges it presents. Furthermore, we will review the prevailing theories of counterterrorism that have informed U.S. strategies over the years. A critical examination of George W. Bush's War on Terror is provided, detailing the tools, techniques, and strategies employed, including military interventions, intelligence gathering, diplomatic efforts, and enhanced security measures. Finally, it will review Obama's campaign promises and initial policy shifts as they relate to the War on Terror.

The second chapter focuses on the key legislative and executive actions during Barack Obama's presidency. Building on the historical context established in the first part, this chapter scrutinizes the multifaceted nature of Obama's counterterrorism strategy. One notable aspect was the escalation of drone strikes, which sparked intense debates regarding their rationale and effectiveness. This chapter will investigate the complexities of drone warfare, balancing operational success against ethical and legal considerations. Additionally, it examines Obama's efforts to close the Guantanamo Bay detention facility, despite numerous challenges that impeded the closure. We will explore the treatment of detainees, adherence to international law, and the policy proposals and debates surrounding alternatives to indefinite detention. Another critical area under review is the expansion of surveillance programs during Obama's administration, with a particular focus on the National Security Agency (NSA) and the controversies it engendered. The balance between national security and civil liberties will be critically assessed, considering broader implications for privacy in the digital age. Moreover, this chapter addresses Obama's use of diplomacy and soft power as essential

components of his counterterrorism approach. The engagement with Muslim communities and international allies, along with public diplomacy efforts, aimed to counteract extremist narratives and foster global cooperation. The effectiveness of these strategies will be evaluated in the context of achieving broader counterterrorism objectives and promoting international stability.

The final chapter provides an overall assessment of Obama's effectiveness in combating terrorism. This section considers both the immediate outcomes and the long-term implications of his policies. By comparing Obama's strategies with those of subsequent administrations, we aim to identify lessons learned and best practices for future counterterrorism efforts. This comprehensive examination seeks to contribute to a nuanced understanding of the War on Terror, particularly during a pivotal period marked by significant policy shifts and evolving global threats. Through this exploration, the dissertation not only evaluates past actions but also informs future strategies in the ongoing fight against terrorism, providing valuable insights for scholars, policymakers, and practitioners alike.

By examining the historical background, key legislative and executive actions, and long-term implications, this dissertation seeks to enhance our understanding of counterterrorism efforts and their impact on global security and policy. It aims to offer a thorough and critical analysis of the War on Terror, with a particular emphasis on the strategies and policies implemented during Barack Obama's administration, thereby providing valuable insights for future policymakers and scholars in the ongoing struggle for democratic values worldwide.

## Chapter One

### Historical Background of the War on Terror

The chapter discusses the historical background of the war on terror. It delves into the context surrounding the decision to wage war against terrorism, particularly in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks. This shows this choice's uniqueness since war is usually seen as a national tradition. However, the war on terror was different. This chapter also discusses how the Bush administration made the U.S. an exception to some foreign law systems. This highlights how unique the war on terror is. Who says that the reaction to terrorism wasn't necessary and goes into the disagreements within liberal internationalism to show how controversial U.S. moves were in this area? The complexity of the war on terror is analyzed in this chapter, which also talks about the different points of view and conversations that arose in the wake of counter-terrorism activities.

Additionally, the chapter gives historical background by tracing the roots of modern terrorism to 19th-century revolutionary movements and the rise of anarchists, a collection of people who believe in and work towards a society without government or other hierarchical systems. They think people should be free to govern themselves without rulers, laws, or authorities, relying instead on voluntary cooperation and mutual aid, collectivist anarchists someone who want people to share resources and work together without any bosses or governments, believing this will create a fairer society, and anarcho-communist groups are people who aim to create a culture where everyone shares resources equally, there is no private property, and there are no governments or bosses. They believe in direct democracy and mutual aid, and the community should make all decisions collectively. It addresses scholarly arguments around labeling terrorist reasons and methods, such as the "wave theory" versus the "four strains" model. Overall, this chapter offers a critical analysis of the complicated historical factors and viewpoints driving the U.S. choice to start the war on terror in the wake of 9/11.

Introducing Obama's War on Terror marked a significant shift in American foreign policy, characterized by a delicate balance of continuity and change. While inheriting the framework established by the Bush administration, President Obama sought to redefine the approach to combating terrorism, emphasizing diplomacy and multilateralism alongside military force. One notable development was the expansion of drone warfare, representing a technological evolution in targeted strikes against terrorist networks. This approach promised precision and reduced risk to American troops but raised ethical and legal questions regarding civilian casualties and sovereignty. Additionally, Obama's administration prioritized counterinsurgency strategies, recognizing the importance of winning hearts and minds in regions plagued by extremism. This entailed a comprehensive approach, combining military operations with development aid and governance reforms. However, despite these efforts, the complex nature of asymmetric warfare is a type of conflict where opposing forces differ significantly in military power or strategy. One side is usually much stronger or more conventional (like a national army). In contrast, the other side uses unconventional tactics, such as guerrilla warfare, to exploit the weaknesses of the stronger opponent. continued to pose challenges, highlighting the ongoing tension between security imperatives and humanitarian concerns.

### **1.1. Origins of War on Terror**

The term "*War on terrorism*" refers to the global counterterrorism operation started by the United States in response to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. The war on terrorism, in terms of its scale, financial resources, and influence on international relations, can be compared to the Cold War. It was designed to establish a new era in global political relations and has had significant implications for security, human rights, international law, collaboration, and governance. It was a vast and diverse operation, the counterterrorism efforts. The military side of this included large-scale battles in Afghanistan and Iraq, covert

operations in Yemen and other places, massive initiatives to offer military assistance to ally governments, and a notable increase in military spending. The first year of the War on Terror included many arrests of terrorist suspects around the world. The United States tries to protect its borders from terrorist attacks. Also, the removal of the Taliban in Afghanistan and the destruction of their camps play a major role in ruining terrorist operations (Jackson 8).

Generally, the War on Terror is the largest terrorist fight in history. Its scale and resource commitment are so large that, in a few years, it may well surpass the Cold War. Following the September 11, 2001 attacks, President George W. Bush announced on television that America had begun a "war against terrorism" launching the start of this global military campaign, also known as the "*world war*", in response to the 11 September attacks the united states under G.Bush leadership, launched a campaign that involves bombing Taliban in Afghanistan, Between 4,000 and 6,000 Taliban and Arab soldiers are thought to have died, while civilian casualties are estimated to be between 2,969 and 3,413. Some people think these figures might even be higher, though. The operation involved both US and British troops (Jackson 9).

### **1.1.1. Rise of Islamic Extremism**

Islam extremism is an ideology defined by a fundamentalist interpretation of Islam that aims to impose its practices and beliefs on society via force or violence, It is also referred to as Islamist extremism or it can be called radical Islamism. This ideology is against democracy and diversity. Instead, it calls for the creation of an Islamic state governed by Islamic Sharia.

### **1.1.2. Soviet-Afghan War**

Before the Soviet-Afghan War, Afghanistan had experienced a long history of political and military turmoil; it is the only state to have been invaded by Great Britain (twice in the nineteenth century), the Soviet Union (in the 1980s), and the United States (since 2001). In

April 1978, members of the PDPA were killed, creating the communist Democratic Republic of Afghanistan under the direction of Nur Muhammad Taraki. However, the PDPA lacked credibility, and the bulk of Afghans knew nothing about communism except that it was a godless philosophy and thus unacceptable to holy Muslims. Consequently, opposition to Taraki's rule grew, and Afghanistan soon fell into fierce civil unrest (Lowenstein 10).

On December 25, 1979, the Soviet military began a complete invasion of Afghanistan and placed a new government under the direction of Babrak Karmal.

Following the war, Afghanistan's different anti-communist, Islamic rebel groups united to form the anti-Soviet Mujahedin. Along with the Saudi Arabian and Pakistani governments, the US government secretly funneled millions of dollars in aid, as well as in military supplies and weapons (including Stinger missiles), to the Mujahedin, which ultimately enabled the guerrilla army to drive the Soviets out of Afghanistan in 1989. as in military supplies and weapons (including Stinger missiles), to the Mujahedin, which ultimately enabled the guerrilla army to drive the Soviets out of Afghanistan in 1989 (Lowenstein 11).

Beyond knowing the historical background of the Soviet-Afghan War, it is crucial to realize that US and Soviet involvement in Afghanistan has had drastic, long-term consequences. In addition to the millions of lives lost during the Soviet-Afghan War, the war strengthened the idea of global war, gave a stage for the development of al-Qaeda, and precipitated the rise of the Taliban government (Lowenstein 13).

The Soviet-Afghan War also set the stage for the rise of the Taliban, the Islamic fundamentalist government that ruled Afghanistan from 1996 to 2001. The Taliban was born in the late 1980s in Pakistan, just across the border from the Afghan region of Kandahar, by "veteran fighters in the anti-Soviet jihad."<sup>28</sup> Three years after the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan, the de facto communist government fell, leading to a deadly power struggle



between factions of the Mujahedin and networks of Afghan clans. Ultimately, given this power vacuum, Taliban leader Mullah Omar was able to grab power relatively easily in 1996, promising stability during a time of chaos. “Tragically, though, the Taliban, born out of a brutalized society, was to brutalize it further”<sup>29</sup>: throughout its rule, the Taliban government was immensely oppressive and abusive of its citizens, and especially of Afghan women, and harbored and cooperated with members of al-Qaeda. (Lowenstein 15).

### **1.1.3. Rise of Al-Qaeda**

The history of al-Qaeda is important for knowing the group's ideas and even its members' thoughts. Before it started, it happened in Afghanistan in 1979, when Soviet troops came to the country and brought with them rebels from all over the Islamic world. During the Cold War, the US and its partner in the region, Saudi Arabia, took advantage of the war by making sure that the rebels had weapons and money. Al-Qaeda, which means "base" in Arabic, was formed at a meeting in Peshawar, Pakistan, in 1988. This was the first known attempt to gather foreign fighters, most of whom were from Arab countries (Vasiliev and Zherlitsyna 2022).

Generally, Al-Qaeda is a broad-based radical Islamist group that was started by Osama bin Laden in the late 1980s. After the September 11 attacks, it became one of the most famous terrorist groups in the world. Al-Qaeda started as a way for Muslims to fight against the Soviet Union in the Afghan War to get supplies. Members were found all over the Islamic world. When the Soviets left Afghanistan in 1989, the group broke up, but its leaders kept fighting against what they saw as corrupt Islamic governments and foreign (U.S.) involvement in Islamic lands. Having its offices in Sudan for a while in the early 1990s, the group finally moved its headquarters back to Afghanistan (around 1996) with the help of the Taliban army.

Al-Qaeda went through three main stages of development including the formation between 1998 and 2000; the second stage beginning with the September 11, 2001, attack; and the third stage continuing to this day. Since its creation in 1988, al-Qaeda has gone through four stages of action. The first hit its peak in 2001 marked by the September 11 bombings in the United States. This was followed by a decrease because a large number of al-Qaeda fighters were caught or killed in Afghanistan, Pakistan, the United States, and other parts of the world. The second phase began in 2003 after the US invasion of Iraq and was marked by high-profile terrorist acts in Iraq, Casablanca, Madrid, London, and elsewhere. But al-Qaeda had been seriously weakened in Iraq by 2006 as British and American intelligence agencies stopped several plans and U.S. drones killed several high-ranking al-Qaeda fighters in Pakistan. The third phase ran from 2007 through 2009 stemming from the rise of al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. In January 2009, Al-Qaeda openly announced that its Saudi and Yemeni forces had joined under the name of a single group in Yemen. The end of this time was marked by the death of Osama bin Laden and other top leaders in 2011. Finally, the Arab Spring helped set the stage for a fourth phase of action when al-Qaeda took advantage of the Arab protests and increasing wars in Syria, Yemen, Libya, Somalia, and Afghanistan. During this time, al-Qaeda found itself in competition with ISIS (Vasiliev and Zherlitsyna).

It would be a mistake to believe that the global jihadist movement shares the same ideology. Originally the term jihad (zeal in the way of Allah, fight for faith) had not only a violent meaning but also meant the struggle in defense of Islam and for the spread of Prophet Muhammad's lessons throughout the world. The idea was radicalized gradually and Hassan al-Banna, the father of the Muslim Brotherhood association, made perhaps the most important addition to this process by declaring jihad to be the sixth pillar of Faith thereby making it a holy duty and responsibility of every Muslim. Ayman Azzam, an important Palestinian scholar, a teacher, and spiritual adviser to Osama bin Laden, stated that "Jihad must continue

until the Caliphate is reestablished from which Muslims must spread the light of Islam throughout the world. The main goal of the global terrorist movement has been widely considered to be the creation of an Islamic state. Perhaps one of the biggest misunderstandings about the differences between al-Qaeda and ISIS is that the latter supported the creation of a state shortly while the former postponed it to a later date. Both groups believe in the creation of a state, but each thinks it will happen on different dates. For al-Qaida, the building of a world state is part of the end win (Vasiliev and Zherlitsyna).

#### **1.1.4. Gulf War**

At the end of the Iran-Iraq War of 1980–1988, Iraq emerged with its state secure and a strengthened sense of national pride, but heavy with huge debts. Iraq had largely financed the war effort and owed some \$37 billion to Gulf banks in 1990. Iraqi President Saddam Hussein called on the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait to cancel the Iraqi debt they held, claiming that the funds should be considered payments to Iraq for protecting the Arabian Peninsula from Iranian expansionism, but his calls were ignored. The Gulf states' refusal to cancel Iraq's war debts added to Saddam Hussein's decision to make threats against Iraq's rich, but militarily weak, neighbor Kuwait. Iraq's leader, Saddam Hussein, ordered the attack and capture of Kuwait with the clear aim of gaining that nation's large oil stores, canceling a large debt Iraq owed Kuwait, and growing Iraqi power in the region ("Milestones in the History of U.S...").

But by late November, Kuwait was still under Iraqi control. The UNSC then approved the use of "all necessary means" to force Iraq out of Kuwait if its troops did not leave by January 15, 1991. In the meantime, US President George Bush sent troops to Saudi Arabia and formed a US-led international alliance to act if the deadline was not met. As the deadline passed with Hussein unable to leave, the US-led army began Operation Desert Storm on January 17, 1991, with the fierce bombing of targets in both Kuwait and Iraq. The 43-day

operation finished on February 27 after a 100-hour ground attack forced Iraq to remove its men. After nearly a seven-month occupation, Iraq had finally accepted all UN decisions – but only after suffering thousands of military and civilian deaths and significant damage to its infrastructure. In Kuwait, meanwhile, entire areas had been destroyed, hundreds of Kuwaitis were killed or abused and most of its oil wells had been set alight (Ibrahim).

Although US participation in the war came on top of a request from Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states for military help to stop Iraqi expansionism in the region, Washington had its clear interests. Bush was scared that Saudi Arabia and other GCC states could be next which would effectively disrupt oil production thereby causing a ripple effect for economies across the globe. Additionally, the Gulf War provided a geostrategic opportunity to expand the US military presence in the Gulf region and solidify its position as a superpower. The US benefitted economically from its expanded security role in the Gulf. Defense and military trade grew as the US started having more military-to-military relations with the GCC states (Ibrahim).

The Iraqi attack on Kuwait might result in the loss of oil sources around the world, Kuwait and Iraq were both big producers of oil. The price of oil went from 20\$ per barrel to over 40\$ per barrel, affecting many countries worldwide. Some countries have built up strategic oil stores, established ways for suppliers to work together, and created futures markets to help keep prices from going up too much when there isn't enough oil (Ufheil-Somers).

## **1.2. Definitions and Conceptualizations of Terrorism**

*Terrorism* refers, on the one hand, to a doctrine about the presumed effectiveness of a special form or tactic of fear-generating, coercive political violence and, on the other hand, to a conspiratorial practice of calculated, demonstrative, direct violent action without legal or moral restraints, targeting mainly civilians and non-combatants, performed for its

propagandistic and psychological effects on various audiences and conflict parties. *Terrorism* as a technique is deployed in three primary contexts: unlawful governmental repression; propagandistic agitation by non-state players in times of peace or outside zones of conflict; and as an illegal tactic of irregular warfare employed by state- and non-state actors (Schmid 22).

Although the term is not subject to a widely agreed meaning, *terrorism* can be broadly understood as a method of force that utilizes or threatens to utilize violence to spread fear and thereby achieve political or ideological goals. Contemporary terrorist violence is thus separated in law from “ordinary” violence by the standard terrorist “triangle”: A strikes B, to convince or force C to change its stance regarding some action or policy wanted by A. The attack spreads fear as the violence is directed, suddenly, against innocent victims, which in turn puts pressure on third parties such as governments to change their policies or stance. Contemporary terrorists utilize many forms of violence and randomly target people, military sites, and State officials among others (“United Nations Office...”).

### **1.3. Theories of Counterterrorism**

We seem to be living in the age of terrorism. In the news, on TV, on the internet, at the airport, in schools, in academics – terrorism seems inescapable. Indeed, since 9/11 2001 the danger of terrorism has come to be seen as the most serious threat to international security, and vast resources have been put into ways of fighting it. These efforts, in a general sense, are most widely known collectively as the Global War on Terror, and it has been marked by overwhelming and cruel violence. Central in this violence are the military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, with pictures of torture and abuse of prisoners from Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib as stark examples of a failed security model. The Abu Ghraib scandal in 2004 was central to the development of Critical Terrorism Studies (CTS), and Richard Jackson wrote in his book from 2005 that the threat of political violence in all its forms, be it

terrorism, counterterrorism, war, insurgency, revolution, ethnic cleansing, is real and pervasive. Therefore ‘we need to discover real answers that go beyond the reactive application of huge counter-violence’ (Jackson 2005, 4). Thus, terrorism and counterterrorism have never been just topics of academic study for CTS. Instead, there is a dose of activism involved, and the cause is to prevent avoidable human suffering by producing knowledge that not only can lead to a better understanding of how some people perpetrate acts of terrorism but also why counterterrorism-violence helps create and perpetuate the cycles of violence (Lindahl 1).

Counterterrorism corresponds to actions to lessen the danger and consequences of terrorism. These acts can be taken by states, military forces, foreign groups (e.g., INTERPOL), private companies, or private people. Counterterrorism comes in two basic varieties: defense and offensive means. Defensive tactics protect possible targets by making strikes more costly for attackers or lowering their chance of success. When, however, successful terrorist strikes follow, defense steps also serve to limit the resulting losses to the target. Defensive measures have generally been reactive, introduced after some successful or innovative terrorist strikes. Defensive or safe counterterror measures may require more than technology hurdles. Other examples of defensive measures include target strengthening, such as defensive perimeters around government buildings or missions, or guards at key parts of a country’s infrastructure. Defensive measures can also take the form of issuing terrorism alerts, enacting stiffer punishments for terrorism crimes, enhancing first-responder capabilities, and storing medicines and antidotes for biological and chemical terrorist strikes. This list of defensive moves is by no means exhaustive (Sandler 12-13).

The Global War on Terror (GWOT) is still the most extensive counterterrorism campaign in history, and some might say it is a counterterrorism model. It commands vast resources, and it has had a deep impact on people’s lives since 2001. The most conspicuous

aspects of the GWOT are the military campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq, institutionalized torture and abuse in Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib, the media's insatiable appetite for all things related to ISIS, and the Snowden revelations of widespread government surveillance and bulk data collection. In other words, the 17 years that have passed since the 9/11 attacks in 2001 have been flooded with violence and counter-violence, and the trend is continuing. Jackson has described the war on terrorism as 'simultaneously a set of real practices – wars, secret operations, agencies and institutions – and a matching series of assumptions, beliefs, explanations, and narratives – it is an entire language or discourse' (Jackson). In other words: Countering terrorism is closely linked to knowing the nature of the terrorist event and how it fits into the greater security context. How we think of terrorism decides to a great extent how we go about countering it and what resources – money, people, institutional framework time range – we give to the effort. This quote from Crelinsten shows the relationship between the language and practice of counterterrorism, and this chapter starts by describing how the threat of terrorism was built as a fundamental evil that wiped the page clean of all that we thought we knew about terrorism. It marked a 'ground zero' for terrorism research and turned it into a growing business. While it is, by no means, meant to be a complete account of the rhetoric on terrorism, it adds important background to the second part of this chapter, which looks at the empirical consequences of the GWOT. Now, almost 17 years after the 9/11 attacks, we are in a situation where we can watch and analyze the effects of the GWOT. This talk is particularly important because it delineates vast avoidable human suffering due to the war on terrorism, and thus why a Critical theory of security is needed (Lindahl 8).

#### **1.4. George W. Bush's War on Terror: Tools, Techniques, Strategies**

After the September 11 attacks, President George W. Bush initiated a huge campaign termed the War on Terrorism. These policies include adopting laws such as the USA Patriot Act, stationing military personnel in countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq, and participating

in diplomatic operations such as the Six-Party Talks with North Korea to settle nuclear concerns. Furthermore, there was a deliberate attempt to strengthen military power and promote the spread of democratic values abroad. The main objectives were to stop terrorist attacks, strengthen security measures, and promote the ideas of freedom and democracy worldwide.

### **1.4.1. Military Interventions**

After the September 11 terrorist strikes, the George W. Bush government made clear that it had set a clear goal for the war. There was uncertainty about whether to give dominant priority to the AQ or the Taliban or to focus on both equally. Rumsfeld insisted that he did not want to send large numbers of ground personnel to Afghanistan so as not to disrupt the fighters' lives of the local population (Salt 106).

The U.S. Army needs to prepare troops to provide to regional leaders following major combat actions. Regardless of whether the United States will ever want to pursue actions like those in Iraq or Afghanistan again, the Army must be resourced and prepared to provide the skills and ability to perform such activities, if directed. Thus, an understanding of what happened in Iraq is key to training the U.S. Army for dealing with post-regression change actions. Particularly important is understanding that it will be the Army's duty to provide the majority of the capacity and skills in the wake of a regime change to avoid the slide into chaos that happened in Iraq in 2003 (Johnson et al. 3).

The United States began a big military attack on Iraq, marking the second time it fought a war in that country in a little more than a decade. It was the start of an eight-year war that ended in the deaths of more than 4,000 U.S. servicemembers and hundreds of thousands of Iraqis. By early 2002, with U.S. troops already fighting in Afghanistan, a large majority of Americans supported the use of military force in Iraq to oust Hussein from power and to destroy terrorist groups in Somalia and Sudan. These views marked "a strong endorsement of



the prospective use of force compared with other military missions in the post-Cold War era,” Pew Research Center stated at the time. Bush and top members of his administration then spent more than a year describing the risks that they claimed Iraq posed to the United States and its friends. Two of the administration’s arguments proved especially powerful, given the public’s mood: first, that Hussein’s regime possessed “weapons of mass destruction” (WMD), a shorthand for nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons; and second, that it supported terrorism and had close ties to terrorist groups, including al-Qaida, which had attacked the U.S. on 9/11 (Nadeem and Nadeem).

### **1.4.2. Intelligence Gathering**

The President's main job is to keep the American people safe and secure. Everything in the government has worked together since September 11 to strengthen airport and border security, store more medicines to protect against bioterrorism, make it easier for intelligence agencies to share information, and put more resources and people in place to protect our critical infrastructure. The changing nature of the dangers facing America needs a new government framework to protect against unseen enemies that can strike with various tools. Today no single government agency has national security as its main goal. Duties for homeland security are dispersed among more than 100 different government groups. America needs a single, unified homeland security system that will improve defense against today’s threats and be flexible enough to help meet the unknown threats of the future. The President proposes to create a new Department of Homeland Security, the most significant transformation of the U.S. government in over a half-century by largely transforming and realigning the current confusing patchwork of government activities into a single department whose primary mission is to protect our homeland. Creating a Department of Homeland Security is one more key step in the President’s national plan for homeland security (“The Department Of Homeland Security...”).

The NSA's domestic spying program, known in official government papers as the "President's Surveillance Program," ("The Program") was implemented by President George W. Bush shortly after the attacks on September 11, 2001. The US Government still considers the Program officially classified. Still, a tremendous amount of information has been exposed by various whistleblowers, admitted to by government officials during Congressional hearings and with public statements, and reported on in investigations by major newspapers across the country. Our NSA Domestic Spying Timeline has a full list of important dates, events, and reports, but we also want to explain—to the extent we understand it—the full scale of the Program and how the government has applied it. In the weeks after 9/11, President Bush allowed the National Security Agency (NSA) to perform a range of monitoring operations inside the United States, which had been banned by law and agency policy for decades. When the NSA's spying program was first exposed by the New York Times in 2005, President Bush admitted to a small aspect of the program—what the administration labeled the "Terrorist Surveillance Program"—in which the NSA monitored, without warrants, the communications of between 500-1000 people inside the US with suspected connections to Al Qaeda ("How The NSA's Domestic ...").

President George W. Bush and his government in turn mistreated the agency once proudly run by his father, turning it into a militia police force abroad and a crippled bureaucracy at headquarters. Bush lightly delivered a political death sentence upon the CIA in 2004 when he said that the agency was "just guessing" about the course of the war in Iraq. No president had ever openly rejected the CIA that way. Its importance in the American government ended with the closure of the office of the Director of Central Intelligence in 2005. Now the CIA must be rebuilt if it is to live. That job will take years. The task of knowing the world as it is has swamped three generations of CIA officers (Weiner).

### 1.4.3. Diplomatic Efforts

Diplomacy touches at least as many areas of security as any other tool. Although U.S. diplomats hardly get the opportunity to apply their diplomatic skills directly on terrorists, the essence of diplomacy—articulating policy to foreign interlocutors, persuading them, and reaching understandings or agreements with them—clearly must be part of efforts that necessarily rely so heavily on engagement with foreign groups and states. Diplomacy is linked with all the parts of security. Through peacemaking and the building of pictures of the United States, It affects the roots of terrorism. Persuasion of foreigners bears on aims, Because persuasion of foreign governments may be aimed at stopping the activity of terrorist groups or state supporters, it also bears on capabilities. And because it is often aimed at getting foreign governments to provide better safety to U.S. interests, it also pertains to defenses (Zelikow and Pillar 73-74)

The counterterrorist strategy that counts most is mutual. Even issues of larger application, such as penalties against state supporters, largely come down to the key interests of key states. Some very successful counterterrorist cooperation does involve more than two states, but usually, it is just three or four states and nearly always as random, with diplomacy playing only a supporting part to actual police or intelligence work. Examples are the move with U.S. help of an escaped terrorist from one state to another (not the United States) where he is wanted for his crimes, or the use of information provided by one country to destroy terrorist groups elsewhere (Zelikow and Pillar 74).

Overall, Throughout the Bush era, foreign attempts played an important part in his plan to fight terrorism and damage his banking networks. Through constant dedication, the government has built relationships and partnerships around the world, supporting peace and cooperation between countries. Using negotiation, he pushed for firm action to stop terrorist funding, working with foreign groups, and ensuring information sharing. Bilateral and

international relationships have allowed law enforcement agencies to cooperate and build capacity, boosting shared power to identify and stop terrorist networks. By combining security goals with wider diplomacy efforts, the government tackled the root causes of terrorism while building international support for a unified reaction to terrorism. Therefore, its diplomacy efforts have played a critical role in bettering the global reaction to terrorism and backing shared security.

#### **1.4.4. Enhanced Security Measures**

In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, President Bush oversaw the passing of the Patriot Act, which gave the government a lot of new tools to fight terrorism. He also redesigned the American national security system. During Bush's presidency, both projects, but especially the Patriot Act, caused a lot of disagreement among Americans. In 2002 and early 2003, Bush pushed for an early war against Saddam Hussein's Iraq because Iraq had weapons of mass destruction because he was afraid of more terrorist attacks. Even though the first attack and invasion were very successful and well-received, no weapons of mass destruction were found anywhere in the country. Instead, a violent uprising began that killed more than 4,000 Americans over the next eight years. When the Democrats won the elections in 2006 and 2008, they used the war as a big wedge issue. Two years later, they took control of Congress and the White House. A lot of people didn't want the war to happen (Gregg).

In the days following September 11, strong attention was placed on airport security and steps were put in place aimed at stopping similar acts from happening again. Among the new rules, only people with tickets to fly that day would be allowed past the security screening. Sharp items would be banned from carry-on bags. Vehicles could pull up the curbside only for active loading and unloading (Gerace).

## 1.5. Obama's Campaign Promises and Initial Policy Shifts

The 2008 presidential race was a unique trip for Barack Obama. Propelled by a message of hope and change, Obama's charming and inspiring talks connected with a diverse audience. Securing the Democratic nomination, he went on to run a lively and groundbreaking campaign, ending in a clear victory in the 2008 presidential election. His win not only made history as the first African American president but also showed broad support for change and togetherness in the United States (Mamchii).

Obama's recent moves seem aimed at recapturing principles he outlined five years ago as a candidate crusading against what he described as President George W. Bush's overreliance on executive power and failure to defend American ideals like human rights. "I'll turn the page on the imperial presidency," Obama promised in 2007. "We'll be the country that credibly tells the dissidents in the prison camps around the world that America is your voice, America is your dream, America is your light of justice." In his first term, various events pulled Obama into a realistic realpolitik as he greatly increased the use of armed drones, acquiesced in crackdowns on opposition in countries like Bahrain, and ignored Congress to continue a military operation in Libya. Obama hasn't admitted to big mistakes in national security policy in his first term, but he has accepted risks in some of his policies and called for America to open a new chapter in the fight against terrorists. "With a decade of experience now to draw from, this is the moment to ask ourselves hard questions about the nature of today's threats and how we should confront them," he said in May. "America is at a crossroads. We must describe the nature and scale of this fight, or else it will define us." Obama also seemed to be admitting to a degree of overreliance on tools like drones, when he declared: "The very precision of drone strikes and the necessary secrecy often involved in such actions can also lead a president and his team to view drone strikes as a cure-all for terrorism." Some experts see Obama recalibrating in part out of worry that his foreign policy

and national security legacy was at risk of being described in jargon as “drones and surveillance.” “In every administration, the first term is about the election and the second term is about legacy,” said former State Department spokeswoman P.J. Crowley. “At the midway point, the White House did look at what was promised in 2008, what we will be judged on in 2017, and what remains on the to-do list (“Obama’s Foreign Policy Shift”).

In brief, different American governments have tried different ways to spread freedom worldwide. It is clear that support for democracy has been an important part of American foreign policy for many years, but the success of that strategy remains a topic of debate. Many governments have focused on using armed forces to remove authoritarian governments, while others have used political and economic pressure to force democratic changes.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Key Legislative and Executive Actions During Obama’s Presidency**

During Barack Obama’s presidency, from 2009 to 2017, his government dealt with various complicated problems related to military operations, imprisonment policies, spying practices, and foreign efforts. This time was marked by major legislative and presidential actions and arguments over the balance between national security imperatives and civil rights. Obama's response to these problems showed a commitment to defending American values while managing the challenges of global security risks. This study looks into key aspects of Obama's leadership, including his increase in drone strikes, attempts to close Guantanamo Bay, growth of monitoring programs, and political interactions with Muslim groups.

#### **2.1. Introducing Obama’s War on Terror**

Obama’s War on Terror reflects a combination of stability and change, emphasizing changing tactics to confront new threats. A central element of this method is drones, which allow targeted strikes against enemy leaders while reducing troop deployment. However, this method has sparked debate about its legal and social implications, especially about innocent

deaths. In addition to this, Obama has deployed military tactics in war zones such as Afghanistan in an attempt to secure territories and develop local capacity. However, his policies have been open to review and questions have been asked about the value and longevity of such steps. By combining security imperatives with moral and legal considerations, Obama's war on terrorism shows the challenges inherent in handling the global fight against terrorism.

Obama came into office determined to end a seemingly endless war on terrorists. Obama pledged to make his security strategies more agile, open, and ethical than the ones adopted by the George W. Bush administration. Obama wanted to get away from the overreliance on the force that characterized the Bush era, which led to the disastrous U.S. attack on Iraq in 2003. That war, in turn, weakened the U.S. operation against al Qaeda. During the past six-plus years, Obama has led a method that relies on a mix of targeted killing, security assistance to military and intelligence forces in partner and ally countries, and intense electronic monitoring. He has also started, although in a tentative way, a vital attempt to find and treat the root causes of terrorism. Overall, these steps amount to a gain over the Bush years. But in many important ways, the link between Bush's and Obama's security policies is marked by stability as much as by change (Stern).

After Obama became president, it soon became clear there would be more stability than a change in US counterterrorism policies. Part of this was because the new president and his aides were now reading the same daily danger files that George W. Bush once read. Part of it was because the second-term Bush administration had already changed multiple terrorist practices, under strong pressure from Congress, interest groups, and the nation's judges (Dueck 100).

Obama received two military battles, a war on terror, and a financial problem from the previous president. He also received, and in time accepted, the means to face them. George

W. Bush approved a military surge in Iraq to tame the war there. Obama finished the pullout of troops from Iraq but also approved a military surge in Afghanistan before starting a pullback of troops that is scheduled to be completed at the end of 2014 (“Obama and Bush: Distinct...”).

Some of the changes Obama has made have been mostly verbal or have reflected a shift in focus rather than a truly substantive move. Ironically, the parts of U.S. security to which he has made the last major changes are the very ones that he was originally most eager to alter. The Bush administration’s “global war on terrorism” has been replaced by a program known as “countering violent extremism” which serves as the main U.S. plan to fight international Salafi jihadist groups such as al Qaeda and ISIS. But the new phraseology hides many parallels. The “kinetic” fight the use of killing force by the U.S. military and intelligence agencies has continued unchecked, mostly in the form of drone strikes, since Obama took office. According to figures gathered by The Long War Journal, the United States has fired approximately 450 such attacks in Pakistan and Yemen during Obama’s term, killing some 2,800 accused terrorists and around 200 civilians (Stern).

### **2.1.1. Military Interventions**

Since 2001, direct military action has been the primary strategy in the international War on Terror, distinguishing it from traditional law enforcement approaches. The Department of Defense defines military intervention as the deliberate act of introducing military forces into an existing controversy, differentiating between direct and indirect armed actions. Direct military involvement includes deploying troops, conducting air strikes, and occupying territories, as seen in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as drone campaigns and Special Forces operations in various countries. Indirect military involvement involves supporting third parties through information, weapons, training, and financial aid, exemplified by U.S. support for Syrian rebel groups and the Saudi operation in Yemen. Nonmilitary tools, such as



economic sanctions, diplomatic negotiations, and financial asset freezes, offer alternative strategies. Additionally, interventions like nation-building and democracy promotion involve significant American political and financial efforts to influence outcomes in other nations, often accompanied by military presence (Thrall and Goepner).

The use of drones, in particular by the Obama administration has allowed the War on Terror to move into the shadows from the overt military actions of George W. Bush in Afghanistan and Iraq, whilst still having a damaging effect on citizens and the security of the states it targets. The human rights abuses of the United States both in the Middle East and at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base question the validity of the invasions and goals of the democratic state by breaking the rule of law and have also added to the rise in religion-inspired terrorism (Morris 2).

Under President Obama, Afghanistan had become the US military's top focus in the war against al-Qaida and the Taliban. The number of men rose to over 100,000; however, the war was unwinnable. Obama's promises, including physically protecting all areas and provinces of the country, rebuilding the nation's infrastructure, changing the corrupt government system, and lowering all American troops by the end of 2016 were ignored. Obama took the light footprint method to "train, advise, and assist" Afghan boots on the ground while pushing drone strikes and targeted killing against the Taliban and al-Qaida. When Obama left office, the Taliban held more land in Afghanistan than at any time post-9/11, causing the president to leave 8400 American armed personnel there (Cutler ).

After 9/11 greater military operations, especially in Afghanistan and Iraq, led to not only the deaths of armed forces people but also the deaths of countless citizens. The effects of the isolation and deliberate killing of the local people can be said to have boosted anti-American feelings and also support for radical beliefs. Also, the reason for the attacks and conflict in the Middle East was to bring those responsible for the crimes to justice, however,

the use of lethal force to remove the danger of terrorism stopped this from being met. Furthermore, the use of armed drones not only leads to breaches of international law but also extra-judiciary killings of suspected terrorists and citizens as collateral damage remember the following text: "The ideals that the U.S. claims to be spreading.", such as democracy and freedom, are false excuses when the human rights mistreatment of prisoners is considered. The abuse and mishandling of suspected terrorists eliminate all validity of the United States as an active force when the rule of law is broken and those ideals that it is spreading are not honored. The abuse of inmates in Guantanamo, Bagram, and Abu Ghraib has been used as a terrorist marketing tool for further stirring violence and spreading radical speech. The loss of rights from those who are involved in terrorism is a dangerous example to set when the United States itself carried out state terror in Sudan and Japan (Morris 199-200).

### **2.1.2. Drone Warfare**

Drones came of age in the US war on terror, specifically during the war in Iraq. Ironically, that war was itself sold to the American people and the international community in part based on the supposed danger posed by drones in the wrong hands. The war in Iraq gave the US military a stage for improving its killer drones. In 2003 and 2004, the Army flew UAVs about 1,500 hours a month, according to *USA Today*; by mid-2006, that number had risen to about 9,000 hours a month.<sup>94</sup> In the eyes of many outside the studios of Fox and CNN, that is the US, not Iraq, had become the madman armed with flying death robots. (Medea and Benjamin 40).

In Afghanistan, by 2010 the Air Force was flying at least twenty Predator drones over areas of unfriendly Afghan land each day, providing a daily dose of some five hundred hours of video.<sup>96</sup> Most drones were used for spying reasons. "For example, every day we're analyzing imagery that includes the need to distinguish between normal agriculture and poppy production," one military officer told the *Christian Science Monitor*.<sup>97</sup> (41).

As the *New York Times* reported and President Obama acknowledged in January 2012, US monitoring drones continued to fly through Iraq's nominally independent skies well after the last Americans were supposed to have left the country. The excuse protecting all the State Department staff the US was leaving behind to meddle in the country's affairs. And the kicker the UAVs were being controlled not by the military, but by the State Department itself, that arm of the US government that once upon a time was linked with diplomacy, not drones (41).

The way US officials see drones as the best way to deal with violent extremists. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta called drone attacks the "only game in town in terms of confronting or trying to disrupt the AlQaeda leadership." (298). Perhaps this is reasonable when coming from the head of the military, but what has happened to the other parts of government? What happened to the old-fashioned idea of negotiations? Diplomacy? Peace talks? Reconciliation? Did they all suddenly disappear post-9/11? (Medea and Benjamin128).

After Obama took office, Afghanistan became the military's top focus in the fight against al-Qaida and the Taliban. There were a lot more troops, and fighting insurgencies and building up the country quickly became the main goals. Obama's main goal had been to improve the local people's view of good government and credibility. Obama's plan was based on refusing to refuge the insurgents by training local security forces to hold land so the insurgents could not return (Cutler 14).

According to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Rebuilding (SIGAR), from 2002 to 2013, the US government appropriated \$104 billion for the Afghanistan rebuilding project. About \$7 billion of the \$10.6 billion in spending for 2012–2013 was marked as waste, including schools that fell, hospitals where there were no doctors, and roads that fell apart (Cutler 16).

Using drones in an armed battle is an attractive choice for Western states, compared to standard forms of warfare with boots on the ground. Technological breakthroughs now allow

governments like the US to collect information on and carry out targeted killings of people using robotic drones firing hellfire missiles and other weapons and bombs. This type of warfare is far less risky for US military troops and significantly less expensive than traditional warfare. The Obama administration has been strongly attacked for the negative effect of its drone activity on local people and the number of innocent deaths. Linked to this is the problematic choice by the administration to classify all able-bodied males as military fighters or legal targets when killed in drone strikes. This means that they can report a smaller number of innocent deaths. It also makes drone strikes appear more efficient and surgical than the pictures drawn by NGOs and UN reports (Devereaux and Kush 201).

It is believed that a total of 3,341 people were killed by drone strikes in Pakistan between 17th July 2004 and 1st September 2015 (“Out of Sight Out of Mind 2015”). The number of officially unnamed deaths is 2,565, men classed as military fighters according to the administration’s description. This policy of “guilty until proven innocent” is highly troublesome as it suggests that the US government has little respect or care for the lives of citizens in their areas of action. This particular meaning of fighters may add to an unjustified loss of life, according to an Amnesty International Report (*Amnesty International* 2018:3-5). As these deaths have not been publicly named, it will never be known if they met the necessity of direct involvement in combat as outlined in the IHL standards.

The US uses what is called the “near certainty principle”. The principal means that drone operators must be nearly certain that no bystanders are likely to be hurt or killed if the strike is carried out. If this standard is met in all or the majority of US strikes, then how is it that only 1.6 percent of those killed between July 2004 and September 2015 were 'high-value' or planned targets (Out of Sight Out of Mind 2015)? An inside source who gave the Intercept with highly classified materials on US drone strike operations, says that flawed and unreliable information is the key reason for the high number of civilian deaths and injuries. Mobile

phone SIM cards and other types of information are widely collected and used to track targets in Pakistan and Afghanistan. The data is combined with local information, gathered from citizens and the troops. The intrinsic problem of using metadata from a laptop or a mobile phone to identify and then launch a deadly strike is that the target may not be at the location at the time of the strike or the metadata may not be theirs. The target may be using the same mobile phone for some time, however, that does not mean that he will always be where the phone is, nor that he will not give it away or lose it. The Intercept's, source claims that information is not dependable enough for targeted kills by drones, and the high number of civilian deaths can be seen as a strong sign of this (*Why Barack Obama...*).

Drones are a key tool for surgical strikes by which the CIA can quickly and effectively action information. By watching cellphones and satellite phones, the CIA can locate, target, and strike al Qaeda and group leaders with speed and accuracy using drones. This ability results in a highly effective system of ways. It means that the CIA can conduct secret irregular warfare and track, target, and kill the most elusive Qaeda and partner terrorist leaders in their safe havens to gain tactical, operational, and strategic edge in the GWOT.

Drones have proven their usefulness in the areas of ISR and strike and the intelligence part of the CIA allows al Qaeda and branch networks to be mapped and analyzed to show their high-value leaders. These high-value targets are the focus of the CIA drone program and are targeted for tracking and possible strike; especially those leaders nested in their rural tribe towns and safe havens. The ability to quickly and covertly action real-time intelligence is a tremendous advantage of CIA drone strikes as the CIA can effectively get inside al Qaeda's observe, orient, decide, and act (Observe - Orient - Decide - Act) loop and systematically disrupt and eliminate key leaders before they can plan attacks – this is a critical measure of the effectiveness of CIA drone strikes. drone strikes are an effective means by which the CIA performs secret irregular warfare as they do not put friendly forces at risk, require a much

smaller number of deployed people, and are equipped with modern precision-guided weapons. Drone strikes have proven to be particularly successful in Afghanistan and in the tribal areas of Pakistan where hilly terrain, isolation, and threat conditions make it difficult to send ground troops safely. Within the enemy's safe havens, drones provide the unique capability to track, observe, and hit elusive, unknown, and scattered adversaries in harsh and remote territory (Humphrey 8-9).

### **2.1.3. Guantanamo Bay and Detention Policies**

Guantanamo Bay detention created a lot of debate due to how prisoners are treated there and the problems with shutting it down. During the Obama campaign, the president promised to close it, however, he couldn't make it happen. The following paragraphs look at why it was so difficult for him to do that. It talks about how prisoners in Guantanamo detention were treated whether international laws were followed and what are other choices available instead of keeping prisoners held up there forever additionally what people say should be done and why Guantanamo is still open despite all the arguments.

#### **2.1.3.1. Obama's Efforts to Close Guantanamo Bay: Challenges and Failures**

The Guantanamo detention center was built on a forty-five-square-mile U.S. Navy base, located on land that has been occupied by Cuba since 1903, It was built, without U.S. laws, where foreign prisoners could be held without access to family or lawyers, and probed however their jailers saw fit. Prisoners were brought there after 9/11 to remove any danger they may cause. Obama faced many challenges to close Guantanamo Bay and ended up failing to keep his campaign promises during his presidency. When Obama began his first Presidential campaign, in 2007, the idea of closing the jail facilities at Guantánamo seemed to be gathering political force. For Obama, ending Guantánamo was an important shift from the

Bush era. On January 22, 2009, his second day in office, he gave an executive order, ordering that the jail should be closed down within a year (Bruck).

President Obama's goal of closing Guantanamo in a year was inspiring but it was impossible. Closing Guantanamo was one of the first decisions President Obama announced. It is considered an important issue, but just closing the holding center and moving prisoners somewhere else will not deal with the issue or solve the real problem the administration has not done a good job explaining why ending Guantanamo is so hard although, it is going to take a long time to deal with the remaining prisoners. It will take years because the problem is not just Guantanamo, it's the 645 prisoners held at the main prison center. The United States needs to decide who will go on trial and where they will go on trial. Additionally, it has not been decided who will qualify for a public hearing and who will go before a military court ("Guantanamo's Impact on U.S...").

The opposition to its shutdown includes two key problems that Obama has been unable to resolve. One is finding host countries to take in all the prisoners. The other problem concerns whether some of the prisoners can be moved to "supermax" prisons within the United States. It becomes a potential problem for the White House. How would the president legally defend keeping prisoners forever on US land? The US government has not explained how they would get around US law – something it has been able to do in Guantanamo Bay. The president's opponents went on rumors that a moved prisoner returned to the fighting after being released. In late 2010, The US Congress passed a law requiring the US minister of defense to personally swear to Congress that a freed prisoner cannot engage or re-engage in any terrorist activity which will prove almost impossible to police (Wazir).

### **2.1.3.2. Treatment of Detainees and Adherence to International Law**

In January 2002, the first men were violently moved to Guantánamo Bay from Afghanistan, chained, diapered, blindfolded, and thrown into dog cages. One of the first

orders made by President George W. Bush was that the Geneva Conventions which govern the rights of those held and the duties of the holding power would not work in the new jail camp. This order came as a shock to the officers on the land including the then-commandant of the jail, who had been trained on international humanitarian law. The U.S. government decided to jail "war on terror" prisoners at Guantánamo Bay specifically because the base was the only place completely under U.S. control where the government could say that neither local nor foreign legal rights for detainees applied. Over nearly 22 years of detention at Guantánamo, the United States repeatedly said that the men it arrests are free from nearly every law reflecting democratic values and has tried to avoid every court decision finding otherwise. Prisoner torture and abuse at Guantanamo is well-documented, with one detainee being refused trial due to the seriousness of his torture. About 780 men held at Guantánamo since 2002, just a few have ever been convicted of a crime, and no government has yet accepted the application of the ICCPR, instead claiming strongly that the ICCPR does not apply outside of the territory, to include Guantánamo. Also, the treaty contains a large number of agreements that directly involve Guantánamo; it forbids torture, illegal imprisonment, and due process crimes ("The United States Faces...").

### **2.1.3.3. Alternatives to Indefinite Detention: Policy Proposals and Debates**

The hardest single question in ending Guantánamo is what to do with those prisoners whom the government thinks to be too dangerous to set free yet who could not reasonably face trial before any judge of which America could stand proud. If Obama has ruled a new detention law, he has only three choices for dealing with the group of extreme prisoners. He can then let them go and try to control the risk they pose in ways other than arrest. He can keep holding them under current arrest powers, based on the laws of war. If he follows this second way, then the shutdown of Guantánamo will be something a sham. The third option is



to move lots more prisoners to the care of other countries, which might do anything from freeing them to killing them (Wittes).

In January 2011, the Guantanamo group selected forty-eight prisoners for preventative detention, and thirty-six for trial, and ordered 121 to be moved to another country. In addition, thirty Yemeni prisoners were ordered for conditional detention based. Originally, the White House planned to adapt a jail in Illinois for the transfer and continued detention of some Guantanamo prisoners, but plans were delayed by congressional bans on related aid as well as transfer limits. If the Pentagon decides a prisoner is no longer a major threat to U.S. national security, he may be moved to a place outside the United States. The majority of prisoners that have passed through Guantanamo were moved to third countries for continued detention or final freedom. According to the New York Times, six hundred prisoners have been moved to over fifty countries since the jail opened in 2002. More than half have been sent to Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, or Yemen. Some critics claim the stolen files prove simply faults in Guantanamo policies that continue besides changes used by the Obama administration. Karen Greenberg, executive head of the Center on Law and Security at NYU, says the United States needs a better system for measuring and handling the dangerousness of people in prison. She also mentioned that the U.S. has no plans for rehabilitation of prisoners, and all detention were put in protective jail in a group that they can never get out of, with or without evidence (Masters).

## **2.2. Surveillance and Civil Liberties**

The surveillance practices of the U.S. government, especially under the Obama administration, have been a subject of significant debate and controversy. The use of monitoring technologies, such as drones, and the collection of personal data through programs like the National Security Agency (NSA) have raised worries about the possible infringement on civil freedoms and privacy rights (“NSA Surveillance American...”).

The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, an independent agency charged with ensuring that the federal government's counterterrorism efforts respect Americans' civil liberties, recently issued a major report on one of the government's primary surveillance authorities. The board members noted how Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act has been used to spy on Americans and suggested that Congress adopt major changes if it chooses to renew the controversial law when it expires at the end of this year. The report vindicates privacy, civil liberties, and civil rights advocates, who have long argued that monitoring changes are both necessary and practical conclusions that the board directly supported ("The Privacy and Civil...").

Narrowing the breadth of monitoring would ensure that national security services could only spy on people who are likely to have information of intelligence value. This would reduce the chances of innocent Americans' messages being collected "incidentally." Moreover, it would help American businesses by making it easier for them to comply with European data privacy rules when moving EU citizens' data to the United States, thus reducing the risk that they will be subject to billion-dollar fines for regular business practices ("Privacy and Civil Liberties...").

### **2.2.1. Expansion of Surveillance Programs under the Obama**

#### **Administration**

The government of President Barack Obama has just finished making rules that will make it easier for the country's intelligence agencies to share information about innocent people without any checks or balances. According to a report released by the *New York Times*, the Obama administration's Executive Order includes new rules that allow the NSA to share the raw streams of communications it intercepts directly with the FBI, the DEA, and the Department of Homeland Security. The NSA collects information under this authority with little oversight, transparency, or privacy concern. What a big and scary change that is in how

those intelligence organizations get information that the NSA gathers. More privacy rights apply to domestic agents like the FBI, such as the need for warrants. Before, the NSA only gave this information to these other agencies after screening it and getting rid of any needless personal information. This included information about innocent people whose communications were caught up in the NSA's huge spying operations (Tummarello).

The Obama administration presented Countering Violent Extremism as a community-led method of handling terrorism and strongly rejected that it was a monitoring scheme. But law enforcement agencies charged with investigating and prosecuting terrorism such as US attorneys, the FBI, and local police sit at the center of these programs and see them as a way to collect information about Muslims who are not suspected of any crime,” said Faiza Patel, the lead author of the Brennan Center study. In the Obama era, CVE was framed as a neighborhood relationship with the government. With grant money and government backing, local leaders were pushed to spot the warning signs of radicalism and prepared to prevent at-risk youth from going over the edge into violence, allegedly as an alternative to punishment. Administration officials strongly denied both an outsized focus on Muslims and that CVE functioned as an intelligence effort (Ackerman).

Obama starts to answer questions about how national security and privacy affect each other while he is running for the Senate. His speech to the Democratic National Convention says, "We don't like federal agents poking around our libraries. Obama wants to stop the government from spying on people. In 2005, he backed a bill that would make it harder for federal officials to get business records without a court order using a national security letter, a type of subpoena. In the same year, he votes with Democrats to extend the Patriot Act and make it last longer. They want to enhance civil rights (Breslow).

### **2.2.2. National Security Agency (NSA) Surveillance Controversies**

Many individuals were astonished to find exactly how much access the National Security Agency (NSA) had to the personal email and phone data of regular residents. Those disclosures about the breadth and depth of monitoring by American intelligence agencies have triggered a national debate over civil rights in an era of modern technology that allows the government to both gather and retain large quantities of personal information about its inhabitants. The topic is also rising in local communities where technology enables police enforcement to indiscriminately gather information on law-abiding citizens information that is gathered, retained, and shared with little to no supervision, or understanding by the broader public. Today, new technologies are redefining the relationship between the citizen and the state, with the government and law enforcement able to access our information and view our private actions, presenting serious civil liberties problems (School).

Obama's remarks will be based, at least in part, on recommendations he solicited in August from a panel consisting of CIA veteran Michael Morrell, former national security official Richard Clarke, University of Chicago constitutional law specialist Geoffrey Stone, Harvard University law professor Cass Sunstein and Peter Swire, a privacy law scholar at the Georgia Institute of Technology. Last month, that group released a 304-page study that includes 46 ideas covering a range of security problems ("Liberty and Security in a Changing World").

Perhaps the most important suggestion is a call for the federal government to stop keeping big telephone records and adopt a system in which a third party a telephone company or other business holds such information and allows the government to search it when necessary for national security. Other key ideas support greater controls over data collection and keeping it. This method includes raising the bar for approval when the government wants to investigate phone records as well as putting the onus on it to reveal more information about

such investigations unless such a disclosure presents a national security threat. Another suggestion calls for the government to consider building software that would allow intelligence agencies to do more focused data searches rather than grab data in bulk (Greenemeier).

In 2014, Obama described changes for the NSA's telephone information program, admitting worries about privacy and the possibility of aggressive mass collection programs. The planned changes tried to address complaints and improve privacy rights by changing how phone data was saved and accessed. The speech by Obama in 2014 mirrored attempts to provide more openness and monitoring of government surveillance programs, including the need for court approval to access Americans' phone information and changes to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) (Ackerman and Roberts).

### **2.2.3. Balancing Security Concerns with Civil Liberties**

President Obama's farewell speech was a way of establishing guidelines. Offering a clear message to his replacement, he spoke about the value of civil rights and refusing discrimination against Muslims. He claimed that protecting the American “way of life” stands “against a weakening of the values that make us who we are,” (“President Obama’s Farewell Address”). stressing his administration’s work “to put the fight against terrorism on a solid legal footing.” He went on: “That’s why we’ve ended torture, worked to close the facility, and reformed our laws governing surveillance to protect privacy and civil liberties.” (“President Obama’s Farewell Address”) He used versions of the word “democracy” 27 times (Green).

In the Spring of 2013, Edward Snowden was living in Hawaii, doing work for the NSA as an employee of consulting company Booz Allen Hamilton. He became disillusioned with what he viewed as the illegal actions of US spy organizations. So he leaked thousands of secret papers about NSA spying programs to friendly journalists. The United States government charged Snowden with spying in June 2013, and he has been stuck in Russia ever

since. Traditionally, the NSA has focused its spying activities overseas, whereas US law puts few limits on its activities. But the Snowden papers show that the NSA and other intelligence agencies have increasingly spied on Americans on American soil. One NSA program revealed by Snowden gathered information about phone calls made by tens of millions of Americans. Another program called The Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM), gives the NSA the ability to gain private information from the customers of major Internet companies, including Google, Facebook, Apple, and Microsoft. The Snowden papers also show that the NSA has participated in offensive hacking operations, abusing weaknesses in popular consumer software to install complex malware on targets' computers. Snowden's leaks sparked public outcry and greater government investigation. Debates over NSA spying ended with President Obama signing the USA Freedom Act on June 2, 2015. The bill re-authorized three controversial sections of the Patriot Act that had ended on May 31 while putting a new limit on NSA spying operations (Lee).

In brief, the debate over balancing security concerns with civil liberties in the context of government surveillance programs under the Obama administration involves critiques of a lack of transparency, potential for abuse, and chilling effects on civil liberties, as well as responses in the form of proposed reforms, legislation, and ongoing debates. The challenge remains to strike a balance between national security needs and the protection of individual privacy and civil liberties in the digital age.

### **2.3. Diplomacy and Soft Power**

President Obama tried a new way of talking to Muslim countries and their supporters. Instead of just focusing on problems like wars in Afghanistan, and Iraq, and issues with Iran, he wanted us to work together more honestly and cooperatively. He believed in building respect and finding shared goals with Muslim groups abroad. Obama's team also wanted to help local people and groups in Muslim communities make progress. They used negotiation

and programs to make societies where people could join and be treated fairly. At the same time, they used a mix of strong and friendly tactics in their public relations. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton led the way in using things like culture, education, and modern technology to show a better side of the United States to the world. They also helped out in difficult areas, trying to fix problems like poverty and lack of simple things like schools. The aim of all of this was to make the world safer and to prevent radicalism.

During Obama's first term, American Public Diplomacy turned into a "smart" tool to face the challenges of the twenty-first century and to gain back American leadership after years of wars abroad. With Hillary Clinton at the head of the Department of State, the first Obama administration supported a more equal use of hard and soft tools and began new strategies of "smart engagement" through connection and public-private relationships. H. Clinton tried to define a new public diplomacy for the twenty-first century and aimed to present the U.S. as a friendly leader. By using the power of people to support American objectives and interests Clinton created her unique style of American soft power (Maud).

In the case of American public diplomacy, the US government uses several different ways. These include bringing American artists, musical groups, art and film collections, and speaking abroad, to show parts of American culture. American public diplomacy and soft power goals are additionally supported by American libraries, book programs abroad, and book versions as well as exchange programs that bring foreign students and workers to the United States to see for themselves parts of American society and culture. Public diplomacy officials at US offices abroad and the State Department are using modern technology to connect with people worldwide. They made blogs, and personal Twitter accounts, and used YouTube to share good messages about the US to foreign audiences (Rugh).

Giving help providing supplies and making projects in troubled areas are essential to stop terrorism, poverty and the lack of schools make terrorism something common. By

solving these problems the government wants to make communities better and stronger. Also, the government wants to support human rights, freedom, and equal law. By supporting those ideas the extremism will be hard to grow (“The Role of Diplomacy ...”).

#### **2.4. Engagement with Muslim Communities and Allies**

President Obama’s speech worked on several levels. First, the President discussed all of the key problems that currently create the relationship between the U.S. and Muslims – Afghanistan, Iraq, and Iran in beginning these problems, Obama was very clear and direct in asking for a new starting in the relationship between Muslims and the United States.

Generally, Obama was honest in discussing differences and similarities between the U.S. and the Muslim world, and he called on all Muslims to focus on cooperation and reduce the differences between peoples (“Project on U.S. Relations...”).

The United States today has an excellent chance to build a new framework that involves Muslim groups abroad. As the new government tries to combat the histories of the past and break down current stereotypes, Obama started a new method of working together with mutual respect and shared goals. The new Obama office will connect directly with Muslims worldwide -- discussing with nongovernmental leaders and people inside different groups to find solutions to the challenges they face (“Muslim Engagement Obama...”).

Obama administration knows the importance of supporting local activists and helping them to change their communities, this includes making their voices heard and giving direct help to civil society groups, the goal of the Obama administration was to empower Islamic citizens to make a positive change in their communities, besides that the government, by diplomacy and programs, to create social and political settings that form active citizens, and help civil activity and the protection of human rights (“America’s Engagement With Muslim...”).



In conclusion, Barack Obama's presidency left a lasting effect on various fronts, especially in the areas of military operations, imprisonment policies, spying practices, and diplomacy. His administration's increase in drone strikes, despite claims of success in targeting terrorist threats, raised major ethical and legal issues. The failure to close Guantanamo Bay showed the challenges in balancing security imperatives with international law and human rights values. Similarly, the growth of monitoring programs sparked discussions about the trade-offs between security and civil rights. However, Obama's efforts to connect with Muslim groups and push a "soft power" approach to diplomacy marked a concerted attempt to rebuild relationships and foster global unity. As the United States continues to manage these complicated problems, the impact of Obama's leadership acts as a point of reference for future policy talks and choices. Balancing security concerns with respect for human rights and democratic ideals remains an ongoing challenge for lawmakers in the pursuit of national security and global peace.

### **Chapter Three**

#### **Assessment of Obama's Overall Effectiveness in Combating Terrorism**

The chapter dives into the details of President Obama's security strategies, thoroughly reviewing his success in fighting terrorism. This chapter examines the victory and flaws of Obama's approach, giving a balanced view of his administration's efforts to address global terrorist threats. It then discusses the long-term effects of his policies, studying their impact on national security and foreign terrorist frameworks. Finally, the chapter compares Obama's tactics to those of later administrations, drawing important lessons and insights to guide future counterterrorism efforts. Through this thorough study, the Chapter aims to shed light on the development of counterterrorism policies and their lasting impact on global security.

During Obama's presidency from 2009 to 2017, the United States faced danger from al-Qaeda and its related groups. Al-Qaeda killed plenty of Americans including the 9/11

attacks, and they continued to try to hit a failure to bomb a Detroit-bound plane on December 25, 2009, By al-Qaeda. To defeat terrorism the US government is going to follow certain safety goals, it aimed to protect the country by constantly reducing weaknesses and strengthening defense efforts including stopping, slowing, and eventually destroying al-Qaeda wherever it forms itself. Also, it is committed to preventing attackers from getting or making weapons of mass destruction. Additionally, the Obama administration tried to remove the refugee camps that al-Qaeda uses for teaching, planning, and starting strikes against the U.S. By weakening the connection between al-Qaeda, its branches, and its followers, additionally, it tried to damage its network. The U.S. also works on fighting al-Qaeda's ideology and its reasons for killings. Furthermore, it wants to deny al-Qaeda and its followers of their supportive means, such as illegal funds, organizational support, and online communications ("Fact Sheet: National ...").

There were no significant attacks in the U.S. and the main part of al-Qaeda has been greatly weakened. Obama should also be praised for leading the dangerous 2011 raid in Pakistan that killed Osama bin Laden. However, there were still arguments about the advantages and disadvantages of Obama's method, which was based mainly on drone strikes and kept many anti-terrorism policies from the Bush administration, despite some language changes (Stern).

Obama administration made a strategy change from the Iraq war to put all efforts on Afghanistan after realizing that al-Qaeda had rebuilt the Pakistan-Afghanistan border. This includes more than 50.000 soldiers being sent to Afghanistan, to weaken the Taliban and forbid any establishment from al-Qaeda. However, even with the increasing of American soldiers, the Obama administration did not make clear results and Obama began a slow leave of the U.S. forces in 2011 (Cutler).

### 3.1. Expansion of Drone Strikes under Obama

The government relied on a mix of targeted killings and security aid to partner countries. Drone strikes in Afghanistan and Yemen killed multiple al-Qaeda and Taliban leaders, significantly disrupting their operations. These targeted actions were part of a broader counterterrorism strategy aimed at weakening terrorist leadership and capabilities.

Additionally, the Obama administration sought to transition its efforts from predominantly armed operations to incorporating advanced technology methods, including cyber capabilities and enhanced surveillance techniques, to preempt and counter terrorist threats more effectively. This shift reflected an adaptation to the evolving nature of global security challenges, aiming to reduce the reliance on conventional military force while addressing both immediate and long-term security needs (Stern).

Obama administration used a lot of drone strike operations, especially in Pakistan and Yemen. The U.S. carried more than 500 drone strikes during the presidency of Obama, ten times as many during the Bush administration. The government used the strategy of signature strikes which targeted a group of men based on how they behaved without knowing their names, besides that the CIA added bases in Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and other locations. Furthermore, the Obama administration claimed that drone strikes were a successful way to kill terrorists, and many al-Qaeda members were killed by drone attacks (“How Drones Became...”).

Obama’s government continued to rely heavily on drone strikes, with figures saying that the United States fired around 450 attacks in Pakistan and Yemen during his term, resulting in the deaths of approximately 2,800 alleged terrorists and 200 bystanders. This approach has been faulted for its potential to produce long-term anger and drive further extremism.

The core problem with Obama's extension of the drone strike campaign is the legal challenge caused by circular terrorist policy based on the theory of global war, a rhetoric originally set up by the AUMF post 9/11. The PPG, as well as the drone strike program as a whole, set unseen standards for future security policy, as well as a confusing domino effect on the growing frequency of terrorism. Alongside the need for decreased privacy and release of public information, a clear legal reasoning that undergirds drone strikes as a security strategy is essential and necessary (Shafiei 47).

The Obama administration targeted al-Qaeda leadership via drone strikes, leading to the death of Oussama Ben Laden in 2011. The death of Oussama Bin Laden was very controversial due to its secrecy. The operation was carried out in complete secret, with only a small group of U.S. leaders aware of the plan. This lack of openness sparked worries about such secret actions' legal and social effects (Chiesa and Greenawalt).

The armed drones the CIA has been flying over Pakistan didn't kill Osama bin Laden, but drones played a key role in finding him, preparing the way for the raid that got him, and launching the raid itself. The debate over the CIA's drone missile strikes in Pakistan tends to mask the fact that the main role of robotic aerial vehicles in this war has been to act as a nearly invisible eye in the sky that can circle a target area for hours on end. In addition to weapons, these planes carry video and infrared cameras, radar, and devices that can capture electronic conversations. All this makes them ideal for what is called "forensic intelligence," in which experts review the video and other data drones have gathered over days or weeks and use it to work backward in time, tracking the comings and goings of known or suspected terrorists. The Predator drone was used in that way to track down bin Laden follower Abu Musab al-Zarqawi in Iraq in 2006 and helped guide the fighter planes whose bombs killed him. The details of how drones were used in the operation that killed Osama bin Laden may

take a while to come out, but it's a good bet they played a big role in it ("In Bin Laden's Death...").

### **3.2. Counterterrorism Partnerships and Alliances under Obama**

Obama administration tried to make a global partnership to fight counterterrorism as a part of its strategy. This includes sharing information and cooperation with foreign organizations like the UN, NATO, and the European Union. Also, train with partners against any terrorist group. Nato aims to ensure shared knowledge of the terrorist threat and weaknesses among Allies and partners. This helped Allies and partners to prepare properly and take possible remedial action to prevent and react to terrorist acts. NATO also promoted a common understanding of its security role as part of a larger international effort through involvement and strategic messaging. Activities offered to partners in this area include partner talks to Allies in different forms staff talks with visiting delegations and engaging partner experts from academia or think tanks to share expertise and opportunities for information and data sharing (*NATO COUNTER-TERRORISM*).

### **3.3. Implications of Obama's Counterterrorism Policies**

The long-term implications of Obama's counterterrorism policies are multifaceted. Despite Obama's efforts to shift the focus from the Bush administration's "global war on terrorism" to a strategy of "countering violent extremism," there have been both continuities and changes in the approach to combating terrorism.

The President's top concern is keeping the American people safe. He is dedicated to ensuring the United States is true to its morals and goals while protecting the American people. The President is committed to protecting the country against 21st-century threats by stopping terrorist strikes and other threats against our homeland, preparing and planning for emergencies, and investing in strong response and recovery capabilities. It also helps ensure that the Federal government works with states, local governments, and the business sector as

close partners in a national approach to prevention, reduction, and reaction. The National Security Strategy, released May on 27, 2010, lays out a strategy plan for achieving American interests, including the security of the American people, a growing U.S. economy, support for our principles, and an international order that can meet 21st-century problems. The Administration also plans to provide \$5 billion in help through the Shared Security Partnership over the next several years to strengthen the ability of our partners to improve their security and work with us to fight terrorists worldwide (“Homeland Security”).

Obama thinks that democratic political systems respecting human rights act more peacefully. The long-term security and welfare of the United States rely on the growth of these ideals and they can achieve their national goals more easily in a democratic world. The Obama administration also paid attention to having the approval of the majority of the foreign society for the actions made under the framework of the democracy development mission. Although the United States declared that it would continue to defend the rights of nations all around the world, the administration underlined the falsity of imposing democracy from the outside since they were respecting their right to choose the right path that is appropriate to their unique culture and tradition according to their political developments. This statement can be taken as the Obama administration accepted that the Bush administration’s policy concerning democracy development was flawed (Telatar 49).

The Obama administration tried to fight terrorist groups more effectively by including the Taliban in Afghanistan’s political life, putting more pressure on them by sending more American soldiers there, going after Al-Qaeda's organization in Pakistan, and killing Osama bin Laden, the leader of Al-Qaeda. The government also tried to make the fight against terrorist groups morally and legally acceptable again by trying to close the Guantanamo detention center and making torture and other harsh questioning methods illegal. As part of its goal to promote democracy, the government tried to get the support of people worldwide by

not doing anything that would make them angry. The government also didn't make any decisions that would hurt the United States' economic, military, or political interests to promote freedom. For this reason, the Obama administration tried to carry out the goal of promoting democracy without hurting American dominance. Lastly, the Obama administration has taken the following steps to eliminate the threat of WMD against the US and its allies: they signed the New START treaty with Russia; worked to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty; used multilateral diplomacy to control Iran, and North Korea's nuclear activities; led the way in international cooperation to make sure the safety of nuclear materials; and made it possible to build a missile defense system to protect Europe from a possible nuclear attack. The government worked together with its partners to achieve favorable outcomes (Telatar 53-54).

The long-term implications of Obama's security policies will likely be formed by the continuing development of the terrorist threat, as well as the reactions of future U.S. governments and the international community. The impact of Obama's approach will be discussed by historians and politicians for years to come, with some saying that it marked a major improvement over the Bush era, while others will see it as a missed chance to change U.S. terrorist policies (Stern).

### **3.4. Challenges and Limitations**

The Obama administration faced significant challenges in addressing the terrorist threat, including the rise of the Islamic State (ISIS) in Iraq and Syria. The premature withdrawal from Iraq in 2011 was seen as a contributing factor to the emergence of ISIS, highlighting the difficulties in balancing short-term political considerations with long-term strategic goals.

Obama's response to security has been a step in the right way. The next U.S. president would do well to view the combination of targeted killing, security assistance, and intensive

surveillance as a relatively effective, low-risk tool kit, and he or she should also continue to experiment with preventive policies, which potentially represent the best way to combat jihadism in the long term. Violent Islamist terrorism cannot be overcome through force, but neither can it be handled by soft power alone. The threat is constantly changing, and it needs a continually evolving reaction. If nothing else, one lesson the next president should learn from the Obama years is to avoid the urge to change security policy simply for the sake of change, or to help separate him- or herself from the previous occupant in the White House. In the fight against terrorism, as Obama found, the dynamics of terrorist violence limit Washington's room to shift, the ongoing draw of radical ideas, and the limits of state power in facing the complicated social and political movements such ideas produce (Stern).

The Obama administration targeted al-Qaeda leadership via drone strikes, leading to the death of Oussama Ben Laden in 2011. The death of Oussama Bin Laden was very controversial due to its secrecy. The operation was carried out in complete secret, with only a small group of U.S. leaders aware of the plan. This lack of openness sparked worries about such secret actions' legal and social effects (Chiesa and Greenawalt).

The armed drones the CIA has been flying over Pakistan didn't kill Osama bin Laden, but drones played a key role in finding him, preparing the way for the raid that got him, and launching the raid itself. The debate over the CIA's drone missile strikes in Pakistan tends to mask the fact that the main role of robotic aerial vehicles in this war has been to act as a nearly invisible eye in the sky that can circle a target. In addition to weapons, these planes carry video and infrared cameras, radar, and devices that can capture electronic conversations. All this makes them ideal for what is called "forensic intelligence," in which experts review the video and other data drones have gathered over days or weeks and use it to work backward in time, tracking the comings and goings of known or suspected terrorists. The Predator drone was used in that way to track down Bin Laden follower Abu Musab al-



Zarqawi in Iraq in 2006 and helped guide the fighter planes whose bombs killed him. The details of how drones were used in the operation that killed Osama bin Laden may take a while to come out (“In Bin Laden’s Death...”).

### **3.5. Lessons Learned from Obama’s Approach to Counterterrorism**

Examining the lessons learned from Obama’s approach to security shows a delicate balance between armed action and strategic diplomacy. Obama's government stressed the value of accuracy in security operations, especially raising the use of drone strikes to target particular terrorist leaders while trying to reduce civilian deaths. This method showed the success of leveraging technology in modern fighting but also raised ethical and legal arguments about sovereignty and collateral damage. Additionally, Obama's attention to international teamwork and intelligence-sharing showed the importance of global partnerships in fighting terrorists. These lessons underscore the difficulties of modern terrorist efforts, stressing the need for a diverse strategy that combines technological breakthroughs, social considerations, and international cooperation.

The Obama administration’s experiences show the importance of matching military action with preventive tactics and treating the root causes of terrorism. Future governments will need to deal with these issues and build more effective long-term security policies that balance short-term needs with long-term goals.

According to the White House Archives, with the nuclear deal, Iran wouldn’t be able to build a bomb, while without the limits of the nuclear deal, it could do so within two to three months. Future leaders ought to look at Obama’s ability to make an important deal with the potential for war looming. Trump pulled from the deal on May 8, 2018, nevertheless, President Joe Biden plans to restore the nuclear deal (Di Meo and Writer).

The most serious duty of any President is keeping the American people safe. In carrying out that job. In this context; the President stated:

I've visited troops around the world. I have met our wounded heroes, and I've cried with Gold Star families. I know better than most that it is because of your service and your sacrifice that we have been able, during these eight years, to protect our country, to strike crushing hits against terrorist networks, and strengthen our friends and our partners. So today, I'd like to reflect on that work and talk about the framework that we will leave for the next government. I came to this job with a set of core beliefs that have led me as Commander-in-Chief. I believe that the United States military can achieve any task; and that we are, and must stay, the best fighting force the world has ever known. (Applause).

I believe that we must never pause to move when necessary, including independently, against any immediate danger to our people. But I have also argued that it is foolish and unstable to ask our military to build countries on the other side of the world or settle their internal conflicts, especially in places where our troops become a draw for terrorists and insurgencies. Instead, I have believed that even as we focus relentlessly on destroying terrorist networks like al Qaeda and ISIL, we should ask friends to do their share in the fight, and we should support local partners who can provide lasting security ("Remarks by the President...").

### **3.5.1. Intelligence Integration and Innovation**

Intelligence cooperation and creativity are key components of modern business and national security. Effective merging of AI, big data analysis, and competitive intelligence allows companies to stay competitive and react to changing market conditions. However, it also presents difficulties that require strategy application, cultural change, and social concerns.

Six months after his 2009 election, President Obama spoke at Cairo University in Egypt and called for a new starting in ties between the United States and Muslim-majority

countries, marked by partnership in science and technology. Innovation, according to the president, is the “currency of the 21st century” and how the United States and its partners would create new jobs and face the global problems of climate change, hunger, and disease. The U.S. Department of State engaged famous U.S. scientists, to serve as envoys to connect and work with their peers in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. The White House created high-level joint committees on science and technology with Brazil, China, India, Japan, Russia, and South Korea. The U.S. Department of Energy started a co-funded, \$150 million United States–China Clean Energy Research Center to support cooperation, defense of intellectual property, and advanced technology creation. The Obama Administration created networks of foreign-born U.S. researchers, engineers, and businesspeople to encourage teamwork and to support the spread of scientific ideals, such as equality and openness, in their countries of origin. An increased staff of Environment, Science, and Technology, and Health officers at U.S. missions support these foreign efforts (Bollyky and Bollyky).

### **3.5.2. Use of technology**

The President raised the required standard for science, technology, and innovation talent working in his Administration with five Nobel Laureates in science and 28 other members of the National Academies of Sciences, engineering, and medicine in his initial batch of appointments. Through the U.S. Digital Service, and the Presidential Innovation fellows program each created by this administration more than 450 engineers, designers, data scientists, and product managers have signed on for a tour of duty to serve in over 25 agencies alongside dedicated civil servants to improve how government delivers modern digital services to the American people. Because of the efforts of these digital teams, for example, it now takes a fraction of the time it used to take for residents to renew their green cards and for prospective college students to identify which schools provide the best value for them, and all

Americans can enroll in health insurance plans online. The President also introduced the Presidential Management Fellows (“Impact Report: 100 Examples”).

In the face of enormous challenges, technological improvements can provide a strong engine for pushing economic growth and new chances. It needs policy leadership that knows the great transforming power of technology and creativity. Harnessing the full power and promise of new technologies can improve the lives of all Americans. Creating a policy environment that supports technological innovation can help create new jobs, improve the environment, help solve our energy problem, lower healthcare costs, drive economic growth, offer chances to a new generation of Americans, and help make Americans more safe and secure (“Technology and Innovation”).

### **3.5.3. Security V. Liberty**

The actions by the Obama administration against terror have brought out an obvious fight between security demands and the preservation of people’s rights alongside civil freedoms and normal lawfulness. Between a Rock and a Hard Place, heavy protest awaited the Obama administration following its huge application of drone strikes, which saw noncombatant lives lost and law alongside morals uncertain. "future counterterrorism strategies should balance the haste in which it is fighting terrorism against international human rights standards and norms. Also, It is important to establish clear legal frameworks for counterterrorism operations with effective oversight mechanisms to be able to ensure the necessary transparency and accountability, which entails dealing with concerns over the confinement and treatment of alleged terrorists including the ongoing operation of Guantanamo Bay detention facility (Scheuerman).

The government of President Obama, like that of his direct predecessor, is focused on trying to improve the quality, and use of, performance data. The federal government has been pursuing performance-informed budget changes for more than 50 years. Most recently, the

Bush administration reforms included the President's Management Agenda and the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART). The Obama administration changes include: measuring the effects of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act; reducing or removing poorly-performing programs; setting a limited number of short-term, high-priority performance goals; and funding thorough program reviews. The administration is taking a more agency-driven approach than the Bush administration but continues to find it challenging to move beyond the production of performance data to its use. There should be chances to show how successful information can be used for decision-making, given the change in the political environment and the need to cut spending and debt. Historically, there has been little interest in Congress for evidence-based decision-making. The government, however, can continue to show how federal departments can use success information to more effectively run programs (Joyce 356).

The chapter offers a full study of President Obama's defense strategies, highlighting both their successes and limits. By examining Obama's general usefulness in fighting terrorism, this chapter finds key strategies that led to major wins as well as areas that needed further development. The study of the long-term consequences of his policies shows how his administration's choices have shaped current terrorist methods and international security dynamics. The compared study with later administrations offers critical lessons and insights, stressing the importance of flexibility and continuous evaluation in terrorist efforts.

Ultimately, this chapter underscores the complexity of maintaining national and global security in an ever-evolving dangerous environment and stresses the need for educated and flexible policies to effectively fight terrorism.

## Conclusion

This dissertation has explored the multifaceted dimensions of the War on Terror, focusing on its historical roots, legislative and executive actions during Barack Obama's presidency, and the long-term implications of his counterterrorism policies. Through a detailed examination of the rise of Islamic extremism, the impact of key historical events, and the evolution of counterterrorism strategies, we have gained a comprehensive understanding of the complex challenges and responses that have shaped global security over the past few decades.

In the historical context, we traced the origins of the War on Terror back to pivotal events such as the Soviet-Afghan War and the Gulf War, which contributed to the emergence of militant groups like Al-Qaeda. The analysis of George W. Bush's War on Terror highlighted the initial tools, techniques, and strategies employed by the United States, setting the stage for understanding the subsequent shifts in policy and approach under Barack Obama.

During Obama's presidency, several significant legislative and executive actions were undertaken to combat terrorism. The escalation of drone strikes, a hallmark of Obama's counterterrorism strategy, was critically examined, revealing the complex balance between operational effectiveness and ethical considerations. Despite efforts to close Guantanamo Bay, the administration faced numerous challenges, raising important questions about the treatment of detainees and adherence to international law. The expansion of surveillance programs under the Obama administration also sparked controversies, highlighting the tension between national security and civil liberties.

Obama's use of diplomacy and soft power was another crucial aspect of his counterterrorism approach. Engaging with Muslim communities and international allies aimed to counteract extremist narratives and foster global cooperation. The effectiveness of these

strategies was evaluated, offering insights into the broader implications for international stability and security.

The assessment of Obama's overall effectiveness in combating terrorism revealed both successes and limitations. By comparing his strategies with those of subsequent administrations, we identified valuable lessons and best practices for future counterterrorism efforts. This analysis underscored the importance of a multifaceted approach that integrates military, diplomatic, and socio-political tools to address the root causes of terrorism and promote long-term stability.

In conclusion, this dissertation has provided a thorough and critical analysis of the War on Terror, with a particular focus on the strategies and policies implemented during Barack Obama's administration. By examining the historical background, key legislative and executive actions, and long-term implications, we have enhanced our understanding of counterterrorism efforts and their impact on global security and policy. This study contributes to the ongoing discourse on terrorism and counterterrorism, offering valuable insights for scholars, policymakers, and practitioners as they navigate the complexities of combating terrorism in an ever-evolving global landscape.

## Work Cited

- “Obama & Bush: Distinct Men with Policy Overlaps - CBS Texas.” *W*ww.cbsnews.com, 24 Apr. 2013, [www.cbsnews.com/texas/news/obama-bush-distinct-men-with-policy-overlaps/](http://www.cbsnews.com/texas/news/obama-bush-distinct-men-with-policy-overlaps/). 17 May 2024.
- Ackerman, Spencer, and Dan Roberts. “Obama Presents NSA Reforms with Plan to End Government Storage of Call Data.” *The Guardian*, 17 Jan. 2014, [www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jan/17/obama-nsa-reforms-end-storage-americans-call-data](http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jan/17/obama-nsa-reforms-end-storage-americans-call-data). 18 Jan.2024
- Ackerman, Spencer. “Documents Support Fears of Muslim Surveillance by Obama-Era Program.” *The Guardian*, 16 Mar. 2017, [www.theguardian.com/world/2017/mar/16/obama-countering-violent-extremism-muslim-surveillance](http://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/mar/16/obama-countering-violent-extremism-muslim-surveillance). 17 Jan.2024
- Al-Qaeda | History, Meaning, Terrorist Attacks, & Facts.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 2018, [www.britannica.com/topic/al-Qaeda](http://www.britannica.com/topic/al-Qaeda). 2 Jun 2024.
- Bollyky, T. J., and P. L. Bollyky. “Obama and the Promotion of International Science.” *Science*, vol. 338, no. 6107, Nov. 2012, pp. 610–12, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1230970>.19 Jan.2024
- Britannica. “Persian Gulf War | Definition, Combatants, & Facts.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9 Jan. 2019, [www.britannica.com/event/Persian-Gulf-War](http://www.britannica.com/event/Persian-Gulf-War). 19 Jan.2023
- Bruck, Connie. “Why Obama Has Failed to Close Guantánamo.” *The New Yorker*, 2019, [www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/08/01/why-obama-has-failed-to-close-guantanamo](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/08/01/why-obama-has-failed-to-close-guantanamo).19 Jan.2024



Chauvin, Noah. "Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board Embraces Surveillance Reforms | Brennan Center for Justice." *Www.brennancenter.org*, 11 Oct. 2023, [www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/privacy-and-civil-liberties-oversight-board-embraces-surveillance-reforms](https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/privacy-and-civil-liberties-oversight-board-embraces-surveillance-reforms). 19 Jan.2024

Comparison of the Obama, Trump, and Biden Administration Immigration Enforcement Priorities - Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force." *Leitf.org*, 21 May 2021, [leitf.org/2021/04/enforcement-priorities](https://leitf.org/2021/04/enforcement-priorities).21 Jan.2024.

Cutler, Leonard. "President Obama's Counterterrorism Strategy in the War on Terror." *Palgrave Macmillan US EBooks*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, [doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-56769-7](https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-56769-7). 21 Jan.2024.

Doherty, Carroll, and Jocelyn Kiley. "A Look Back at How Fear and False Beliefs Bolstered U.S. Public Support for War in Iraq." *Pew Research Center - U.S. Politics & Policy*, Pew Research Center, 14 Mar. 2023, [www.pewresearch.org/politics/2023/03/14/a-look-back-at-how-fear-and-false-beliefs-bolstered-u-s-public-support-for-war-in-iraq/](https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2023/03/14/a-look-back-at-how-fear-and-false-beliefs-bolstered-u-s-public-support-for-war-in-iraq/). 21 Jan.2024

Fact Sheet: National Strategy for Counterterrorism." *Whitehouse.gov*, 29 June 2011, [obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/06/29/fact-sheet-national-strategy-counterterrorism](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/06/29/fact-sheet-national-strategy-counterterrorism). 24 Jan.2024

Green, Emma. "Obama Built an 'Infrastructure' for Civil-Liberties Violations That Trump Will Inherit." *The Atlantic*, 11 Jan. 2017, [www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/01/obama-civil-liberties/512864](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/01/obama-civil-liberties/512864). 27 Jan.2024

Gregg, Gary. "George W. Bush: Impact and Legacy | Miller Center." *Miller Center*, 10 July 2017, [millercenter.org/president/gwbush/impact-and-legacy](https://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/impact-and-legacy).4 Dec.2024

- Guantanamo's Impact on U.S. National Security." *Carnegieendowment.org*,  
 carnegieendowment.org/posts/2010/01/guantanamos-impact-on-us-national-  
 security?lang=en&er=global. 6 Dec.2024
- Homeland Security." *Whitehouse.gov*, 27 May 2015,  
 obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/issues/homeland-security. 7 Dec.2024
- How the NSA's Domestic Spying Program Works." *Electronic Frontier Foundation*, 10 Aug.  
 2014, [www.eff.org/nsa-spying/how-it-works](http://www.eff.org/nsa-spying/how-it-works). 9 Dec.2024
- In Bin Laden's Death, CIA Drones Played Their Part | Wilson Center." *Www.wilsoncenter.org*, 2 May 2011, [www.wilsoncenter.org/article/bin-ladens-death-cia-drones-played-their-part](http://www.wilsoncenter.org/article/bin-ladens-death-cia-drones-played-their-part). 12 Dec.2024.
- Invisible Precedents: The U.S. Drone Strike Program under the Obama Administration." *Swarthmore International Relations Journal*, no. 2, 2017, pp. 42–49,  
<https://doi.org/10.24968/2574-0113.2.8>. 28 May 2024.
- Jackson, Richard. "War on Terrorism." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 19 Nov. 2018,  
[www.britannica.com/topic/war-on-terrorism](http://www.britannica.com/topic/war-on-terrorism). 14 Dec.2024.
- Jcsp, Major. *SHADOW WARFARE: THE EFFECTIVENESS of CIA DRONE STRIKES in CONDUCTING COVERT IRREGULAR WARFARE*. 11 May 2014,  
[www.cfc.forces.gc.ca/259/290/301/305/humphrey.pdf](http://www.cfc.forces.gc.ca/259/290/301/305/humphrey.pdf). 14 Dec.2024.
- Johnson, David E., et al. "The U.S. Army and the Battle for Baghdad: Lessons Learned — and Still to Be Learned." *Www.rand.org*, 12 June 2019,  
 www.rand.org/pubs/research\_reports/RR3076.html. 3 Feb 2024.
- Joyce, Philip G. "The Obama Administration and PBB: Building on the Legacy of Federal Performance-Informed Budgeting?" *Public Administration Review*, vol. 71, no. 3,

- May 2011, pp. 356–67, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02355.x>. Accessed 12 Oct. 2020. 10 Feb 2024
- Lee, Timothy B. “The NSA Spying Debate, Explained.” *Vox*, 1 June 2015, [www.vox.com/2015/6/1/18093692/nsa-and-ed-snowden](http://www.vox.com/2015/6/1/18093692/nsa-and-ed-snowden). 15 Feb 2024
- Lindahl, Sondre. “A Critical Theory of Counterterrorism.” *Www.taylorfrancis.com*, 29 June 2018, [www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781351121279/critical-theory-counterterrorism-sondre-lindahl](http://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781351121279/critical-theory-counterterrorism-sondre-lindahl) 21 Feb 2024
- Lindahl, Sondre. *A Critical Theory of Counterterrorism: Ontology, Epistemology and Normativity*. Routledge, 2018, [www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9780815359234](http://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9780815359234). 28 Feb 2024
- Lowenstein, Julie. *EliScholar -A Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale US Foreign Policy and the Soviet-Afghan War: A Revisionist History*. 2016, [elischolar.library.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1045&context=applebaum\\_award](http://elischolar.library.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1045&context=applebaum_award). 3 May 2024
- M, Destler I., et al. “The Obama Doctrine: American Grand Strategy Today.” *The SHAFR Guide Online*, Oct. 2017, [https://doi.org/10.1163/2468-1733\\_shafr\\_sim290020019](https://doi.org/10.1163/2468-1733_shafr_sim290020019). Accessed 15 June 2024. 7 May 2024
- M. Breslow, Jason. “Obama on Mass Government Surveillance, Then and Now.” *FRONTLINE*, 13 May 2014, [www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/obama-on-mass-government-surveillance-then-and-now/](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/obama-on-mass-government-surveillance-then-and-now/). 8 May 2024
- Masters, Jonathan. “Closing Guantanamo?” *Council on Foreign Relations*, 2009, [www.cfr.org/background/closing-guantanamo](http://www.cfr.org/background/closing-guantanamo). 11 May 2024

Meo, Vittoria Di. "Lessons Future Presidents Can Learn from Barack Obama." *The Standard*, 8 June 2021, [standard.asl.org/18457/opinions/lessons-future-presidents-can-learn-from-barack-obama/](https://www.standard.asl.org/18457/opinions/lessons-future-presidents-can-learn-from-barack-obama/). 13 May 2024

Obama, Barack. "President Obama's Farewell Address." *The White House*, 10 Jan. 2017, [obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/farewell](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/farewell). 22 May 2024.

Obama's Egypt Speech: What He Said to the Muslim World." *Brookings*, 4 June 2009, [www.brookings.edu/articles/obamas-egypt-speech-what-he-said-to-the-muslim-world/](https://www.brookings.edu/articles/obamas-egypt-speech-what-he-said-to-the-muslim-world/).

Office of The Historian. "Milestones: 1989–1992 - Office of the Historian." *State.gov*, 2019, [history.state.gov/milestones/1989-1992/gulf-war](https://history.state.gov/milestones/1989-1992/gulf-war). 22 May 2024.

Pradhan, Alka. "The United States Faces a Test on Guantánamo Bay in Geneva." *Default*, 2023, [www.lawfaremedia.org/article/the-united-states-faces-a-test-on-guant%C3%A1namo-bay-in-geneva](https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/the-united-states-faces-a-test-on-guant%C3%A1namo-bay-in-geneva). 22 May 2024.

Reform, Why U. S. Policy Should Focus on Real, and Farah Pandith. "Muslim Engagement: The Obama Administration's Approach | the Washington Institute." *Www.washingtoninstitute.org*, 27 July 2009, [www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/muslim-engagement-obama-administrations-approach](https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/muslim-engagement-obama-administrations-approach). 23 May 2024.

Renner, Michael, and Paul Aarts. "Oil and the Gulf War." *MERIP*, 11 July 1991, [merip.org/1991/07/oil-and-the-gulf-war/](https://merip.org/1991/07/oil-and-the-gulf-war/). 24 May 2024.

Rugh, William. "American Soft Power and Public Diplomacy in the Arab World." *Palgrave Communications*, vol. 3, Jan. 2017, p. 16104, [doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2016.104](https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2016.104). 25 May 2024.

- Sandler, Todd. "Terrorism and Counterterrorism: An Overview." *Oxford Economic Papers*, vol. 67, no. 1, Nov. 2014, pp. 1–20, doi.org/10.1093/oeq/gpu039. 27 May 2024.
- Scheuerman, William, and Barack Obama's War. *Barack Obama's War on Terrorism Recommended Citation*. 2012, scholarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2163&context=concomm.
- Shafiei, Ava. "Invisible Precedents: The U.S. Drone Strike Program under the Obama Administration." *Swarthmore International Relations Journal*, no. 2, 2017, pp. 42–49, doi.org/10.24968/2574-0113.2.8. 27 May 2024.
- Stanford Law School. "Civil Liberties and Law in the Era of Surveillance | Stanford Law School." *Stanford Law School*, Stanford Law School, 14 Nov. 2014, law.stanford.edu/stanford-lawyer/articles/civil-liberties-and-law-in-the-era-of-surveillance/. 28 May 2024.
- Stern, Jessica. "Obama and Terrorism." *Foreign Affairs*, Foreign Affairs Magazine, 2 Oct. 2015, [www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/obama-and-terrorism](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/obama-and-terrorism). 29 May 2024.
- The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica. "Al-Qaeda | History, Meaning, Terrorist Attacks, & Facts." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 2018, [www.britannica.com/topic/al-Qaeda](http://www.britannica.com/topic/al-Qaeda). 29 May 2024.
- Tummarello, Kate. "Obama Expands Surveillance Powers on His Way Out." *Electronic Frontier Foundation*, 12 Jan. 2017, [www.eff.org/deeplinks/2017/01/obama-expands-surveillance-powers-his-way-out](http://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2017/01/obama-expands-surveillance-powers-his-way-out). 2 Jun 2024
- Vasiliev, A. M., and N. A. Zherlitsyna. "The Evolution of Al-Qaeda: Between Regional Conflicts and a Globalist Perspective." *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences*,

vol. 92, no. S13, Nauka, Dec. 2022, pp. S1240–46,  
doi.org/10.1134/s1019331622190091. 4 2 Jun 2024.

Why Barack Obama Ramped up Drone Strikes from George W. Bush | Ústav Mezinárodních  
Vztahů - Expertise to Impact.” *Www.iir.cz*, 12 May 2020, [www.iir.cz/why-barack-  
obama-ramped-up-drone-strikes-from-george-w-bush](http://www.iir.cz/why-barack-obama-ramped-up-drone-strikes-from-george-w-bush). 5 Jun 2024

Wittes, Benjamin. “The Challenges of Closing Guantánamo.” *Brookings*, 13 Jan. 2009,  
[www.brookings.edu/articles/the-challenges-of-closing-guantanamo/](http://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-challenges-of-closing-guantanamo/). 6 Jun 2024.

Zelikow, Philip, and Paul R. Pillar. “Terrorism and U.S. Foreign Policy.” *Foreign Affairs*, vol.  
80, no. 5, Jan. 2001, p. 156, doi.org/10.2307/20050261. 3 Jun 2024.