

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

8 MAI 1945 UNIVERSITY / GUELMA

جامعة 8 ماي 1945 / قالمة

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES

كلية الآداب و اللغات

DEPARTMENT OF LETTERS & ENGLISH LANGUAGE

قسم الآداب و اللغة الانجليزية



**The United States Use of Soft Power in Combating Terrorism
after 9/11 Attacks
The Case of Afghanistan**

**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

Chairman: Mr. ALI ZOUÏ Mahfoud	(MA.A)	University of 8 Mai 1945 Guelma
Supervisor: Mr. ZEMMOURI Layachi	(MA.A)	University of 8 Mai 1945- Guelma
Examiner: Ms. TOULGUI Insaf	(MA.A)	University of 8 Mai 1945- Guelma

Submitted by:

BELLAZI Hanane

Supervised by:

Mr. ZEMMOURI Layachi

June 2018

Dedication

I dedicate this work to:

My parents, the most important persons in my life, who always encourage me to go after my dreams. Without their support and love I could not have gone this far.

My grandmother who taught me to trust Allah.

My dear brother Issam, and my lovely sister Nawel who are always standing behind me and encouraging me.

My dearest friends Imen and Sara, who always show up at the moments when I need them.

My sister in law and all my cousins and aunts, who have always been so supportive and encouraging.

Acknowledgements

The words cannot express my deepest thanks to Allah who granted me the good physical and mental health to accomplish this work.

I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to Mr. ZEMMOURI Layachi who has been a stimulating, enlightening and always demanding supervisor. His support, enthusiasm and availability gave me confidence and allowed me to move forward serenely.

My thanks are also directed to the members of the jury, who accepted to read and evaluate this work.

Abstract

On September 11, 2001, four suicide bombings hit the American soil, targeting their symbolic buildings such as the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York, and the Pentagon in Washington. In only two hours, nineteen members of the Al Qaeda Jihadist network controlled four planes and killed almost 3,000 persons. These attacks highly affected America and were immediately considered as acts of war by President George W. Bush. Thus, he declared the “War on Terror” and launched the “Operation Enduring Freedom” in Afghanistan. This operation, based on the use of military force, had bad consequences on Afghanistan leading to the death of hundreds of people and the destruction of the country. This fed anti-Americanism, seriously damaged the image of America, and worsened the relationships between America and some nations. For the sake of improving the US status, the Bush administration implemented another strategy known as “soft power” based on the power of persuasion and attraction. Since then, the US government, with the cooperation of NATO, began to change the Afghan society through a total reconstruction plan that did not only focus on rebuilding the material infrastructure of the country, but also concentrated on generating a society that embraces the American values to prevent any future terrorist acts. Humanitarian aids, exchange programs, and broadcasting activities were among many “soft power” tools applied to spread the American culture. It is then understood that the US did not use on kind of power, but rather mixed two sorts that are “hard” and “soft”. Eventually, combining these two types show a good flexibility in using different strategies together in a smart way. Thus, “soft” and “hard” powers are used jointly to be complementary in what is called “smart power”.

ملخص

في 11 سبتمبر 2001 ، وقعت أربعة تفجيرات انتحارية على الأراضي الأمريكية، واستهدفت مبانيها الرمزية مثل البرجين التوأمين لمركز التجارة العالمي في نيويورك و البنتاغون في واشنطن. في غضون ساعتين فقط ، قام تسعة عشر من أعضاء شبكة القاعدة الجهادية بالسيطرة على أربع طائرات وقتلوا ما يقارب 3000 شخص. لقد أثرت هذه الهجمات بشدة على أمريكا، وفورا اعتبرها الرئيس جورج وولكر بوش بمثابة أعمال حرب. وهكذا، أعلن "الحرب على الإرهاب" وأطلق "عملية الحرية الدائمة" في أفغانستان. وكان لهذه العملية -التي اعتمدت على استخدام القوة العسكرية- عواقب سيئة على أفغانستان، أدت إلى موت المئات من الناس وتدمير البلد. لقد غذى هذا الأمر معاداة أمريكا حيث ألحق الضرر بشكل كبير على صورتها و أساء إلى علاقاتها مع دول أخرى. و من أجل تحسين وضع الولايات المتحدة ، طبقت إدارة بوش إستراتيجية أخرى تعرف باسم "القوة الناعمة" تقوم على الإقناع والجذب. منذ ذلك الحين، بدأت الحكومة الأمريكية ، رفقة حلف الناتو ، بتغيير المجتمع الأفغاني من خلال خطة إعادة إعمار كاملة. حيث لم تركز على إعادة بناء البنية التحتية المادية للبلاد فحسب، بل اهتمت أيضًا بإنشاء مجتمع يحتضن القيم الأمريكية، لتجنب أي أعمال إرهابية مستقبلاً. كانت المساعدات الإنسانية وبرامج التبادل الاجتماعي وأنشطة البث الإعلامي من بين العديد من أدوات القوة الناعمة المطبقة على نشر الثقافة الأمريكية. ومن ثم، يُفهم أن الولايات المتحدة لم تستخدم نوعًا واحدًا من القوة، بل مزجت نوعين "صلبًا" و "ناعمًا". في نهاية المطاف ، فإن الجمع بين هذين النوعين من القوة يظهر مرونة أمريكا في استخدام استراتيجيات مختلفة معا بطريقة ذكية. وبالتالي ، استخدمت القوتان، الناعمة والصلبة معاً لتكون مكملتين لبعضهما في ما يسمى "القوة الذكية".

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

ANA	Afghan National Army
BBG	Broadcasting Board of Governors
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CIMIC	Civil-Military Co-operation
EU	European Union
GPPO	German Police Project Office
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
KSM	Khalid Sheikh Mohammed
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PRT	Provincial Reconstruction Team
SSR	Security Sector Reform
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
US	United States
USA PATRIOT Act	Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct terrorism
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USSR	Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics
VOA	Voice of America
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter One: Soft Power Instruments and Their Usage	6
1. The Origin of Soft Power.....	6
2. Defining Hard and Soft Power.....	7
3. Instruments of Soft Power.....	9
4. Advantages and Disadvantages of Soft Power	10
5. Soft Power Resources.....	11
6. Soft Power and Public Diplomacy.....	12
7. Soft Power During the Cold War.....	14
8. The Rise of Anti-Americanism.....	15
9. Soft Power and the United States Foreign Policy.....	16
10. The United States Foreign Policy in the Middle East.....	17
Chapter Two: Bush’s War on Terror in Afghanistan: Reasons and Results	21
1. 9/11 Attacks: The Spark of the Conflict.....	21
1.1. Terrorism.....	21
1.2. Plan, Intelligence and Execution of the Attacks.....	23
2. Bush’s Global War on Terror in Afghanistan.....	26
2.1. Gaining Political Support.....	26

2.2. Reasons, Objectives and Results.....	29
3. A New Afghanistan Founded.....	33
Chapter Three: US Soft Power in Use: the Road to Rebuild New Afghanistan.....	36
1. Constant Changes of the United States Strategies in Afghanistan.....	36
2. Forms of the United States Soft Power in Afghanistan.....	38
2.1. Official Forms.....	39
2.2. Non-Official Forms.....	41
3. The United States Resources of Soft Power in Afghanistan.....	43
4. The Shift to Smart Power.....	46
Conclusion.....	51
Bibliography.....	54

Introduction

On the morning of Tuesday September 11, 2001, the United States was struck by a series of unprecedented terrorist attacks designed to cause mass casualties, civil as well as material. Four hijacked commercial planes crashed: two on the World Trade Center towers in Manhattan, which collapsed little after, one on the Pentagon, in Washington, D.C, and the last in Pennsylvania. More than 3,000 people were killed, including hundreds of lifeguards. These attacks made by Al Qaeda highly affected the United States of America. The symbols of their economic and military powers were attacked: the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. After this, the United States accused the “Axis of Evil” such as Iraq and Iran, of harboring terrorist networks and planning to build a network of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

In order to protect America, President George W. Bush took new measures and announced a “war on terror”. The enemy is terrorism, the awful use of violence and intimidation against innocent civilians for the pursuit of political aims. America’s fight against this stateless phenomenon is different from any other war in history. At the end of 2001, the United States and other countries waged a war in Afghanistan against the Taliban Islamist regime. Although victorious, the pacification of the country was a failure. This operation based on the use of “hard power” undermined the image of the United States and fed Anti-Americanism. This pushed the United States to a new strategy based on the use of “soft power” to eliminate terrorist organizations and preserve its national security.

In order to enhance its interests, the US used “soft power”, a method that helps to fight the long-term terrorist threats, on the contrary of “hard power”, which is used to fight short-term threats. After the 9/11 attacks, the United States waged a military operation in Afghanistan. Nevertheless, this operation could annihilate only short-term terrorist threats against the US. Therefore, in 2002, with the Enduring Freedom Operation, the US sent forces to Afghanistan,

with the goal of capturing Al Qaeda leaders. It joined a “soft power” strategy to its “hard power”, by providing humanitarian assistance, enhancing education, rebuilding the country, etc. This strategy aimed at making the US more attractive in the eyes of the whole world; especially the Afghans; and thus ameliorating its relations with other nations that were in disfavor with its previous policies.

The term “soft power” was first coined by the Harvard professor Joseph Nye in 1990 in his book *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. In this book, Nye tries to reply to some scholars and politicians who stated that the US was in decline, claiming that it is still the dominant power of the world. Then, he published another book entitled *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, in which he gave a clear explanation of the term “power” with its two main forms, “soft power” and “hard power” clarifying the meaning of each and explaining how both work together, or separately. The book also sheds light on the importance of a country’s culture and ideology in attracting others, and reducing resistance to its wishes. Moreover, Nye clarifies the main sources of soft power: culture, political values, and foreign policies, and provides practical suggestions to wield them effectively. In addition, this book focuses on the American experiences with “soft power” and the way in which the country used it as a means to reach its political aims.

In her article entitled “The Power Politics of the Bush Doctrine: International Security and the War on Terrorism” Toonchie examines George W. Bush’s new policies after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, stating that they influenced the United States to take more preventive measures. Indeed, the president made up a National Security Strategy for combating terrorism. This strategy aimed at destroying terrorist organizations and winning the “war of ideas”. It is composed of two main components: “soft power” and “hard power”, based on the promotion of human rights and international values, and the inclusion of military actions against states facing threats respectively. These components aimed at reinforcing each other.

Nevertheless, in her article, Totoonchie shows that the opposite happened. Due to the government's focus on the use of "hard power", neglecting some of the core values of the United States, this led to the decrease of attraction and cooperation from other states, a cooperation that the United States needed for its war against terror.

In his article entitled "United States Soft Power- Free and Open Media to Bolster Afghan Democracy" Taylor Smoot depicts the main instruments of "soft power", and explains how the United States made use of both the non-official and official forms in Afghanistan. Due to the fact that most of Afghan citizens are illiterate, isolated, and with no interest in television, the US found non-official ways to attract them such as humanitarian assistance. In addition to official ways such as aid programs and exchange programs which represent a major role in making new relations and commitments between the US and the rest of the world.

The main objective of this work is highlighting the conditions under which the United States re-used "soft power", and providing a clear picture on the ways the attacks of 9/11 weakened the most powerful country in the world. In addition, this research aims to provide more explanations about the different ways that the US followed in order to ameliorate its image and influence the world especially the Middle East to get the desired outcomes, and then analysing the impact of these plans used by the American government on Afghanistan.

The major concern of this research is to find answers to the following questions: Why did America stop using "soft power" after the Cold War and why did it re-use it after the 9/11 attacks? Why does "soft power" matter and how can it be used effectively in order to eliminate terrorism and prevent its spread? What are the different strategies used by the US to regain the sympathy of the world? To what extent did the tragedies of September 11th, 2001, affect the Americans and how did they recover from it? What was the role of AlQaeda in the attacks? What is the role of "soft power" in enhancing international cooperation in combating

terrorism? What strategies did the US use in Afghanistan and in what way did it use “soft power” to stop terrorist groups and isolate them? Why was combating terrorism so hard for the US, and did it succeed in its fight?

The research requires the use of both historical and qualitative methods aiming at explaining the US use of “soft power” after the attacks of 9/11. The qualitative method used to give a deep explanation of the different procedures the US used to fight against the September 11, 2001 attacks especially “soft power”. The historical approach as well, is followed to explore different facts and reasons of the subject through a detailed investigation of the intervention of the United States in Afghanistan. These are the two predominant approaches used to achieve this research work.

In order to provide a deeper understanding of the topic, this dissertation is divided into three chapters. The first entitled “Soft Power Instruments and their Usage”, provides the main differences between the two types of power, “soft” and “hard” and clarifies how they both work. It also explains in details the term “soft power” and depicts its main instruments, that can be implemented either in official or non-official forms. Moreover, the chapter explores the history of “soft power” during the Cold war era and after the 9/11 events and sheds light on the way the US used it as a strategy to fight against terrorism in the Middle East.

“Bush’s War on Terror in Afghanistan: Reasons and Results” is the title of the second chapter which focuses on the 9/11 attacks, their plan of execution and their impact on the United States. In addition, it sheds light on the United States declaration of the “war on terror”, and its military invasion of Afghanistan. The end of the chapter shows the damages done to Afghanistan and the ways the United States, with the cooperation of many other nations, tried to rebuild the country.

“US Soft Power in Use: the Road to Rebuild New Afghanistan” is about the different strategies implemented by the United States in Afghanistan after the attacks of 9/11. The chapter provides a clear explanation of the US shift of strategies in the country starting by “hard power” based on the use of military force that caused a real harm to the country. This led the Bush administration to implement new approaches based on the use of “soft power” to reconstruct Afghanistan and ameliorate the US image. Then, the chapter shows how the Obama administration concluded that the best strategy for the US is the use of “smart power”, a combined power. A strategy based on the combination between military and economic power along with the power of attraction.

Chapter One

Soft Power Instruments and Their Usage

Theorized by Joseph Nye in his book *Bound to Lead*, published in 1990, the concept of “soft power” opposes “hard power” as it qualifies an indirect influence of a State on another. It is about persuading or seducing the actors without the use of force or threat, but rather through the use of positive images, attractiveness and influence around the world. In this sense, while the United States has not always hesitated to use arms, it is nonetheless true that they have also spread a good image under the title of democracy, with the creation of a new world order based on their liberal ideas, sometimes subject to strong oppositions.

1. The Origin of Soft Power

Over the years, human history has usually been defined by allocation of power. Considerable number of scholars and analysts such as Joseph Nye and Paul Kennedy have studied this concept, and tried to give it a clear definition. However, Power is a complex notion, and perceptions and interpretations differ. In 1987, Paul Kennedy examined the rise and fall of the great powers between 1500 and the 1980's, he tried to understand the reasons behind the decline of certain empires, then he drew an analogy between these past empires and the United States, ending up with the conclusion that the American empire was in decline. According to him, a country that represents alone one third of world military spending, and whose share in world industrial production has been declining since 1945, will never be able to maintain its status as a hegemonic power (Zagacki 376-377).

Kennedy perceived power just as coercive, neglecting its persuasive side. As a reaction, Nye published a book *Bound to Lead* in which he contradicts Kennedy stating that “these historical analogies are misleading and the diagnosis wrong” (4). He also provided a new term “soft power” which is intangible and based on ideology and culture as resources, he argued that power does not only come through the use of force, but also through attraction. For this

reason, he distinguished between two types of power “hard” and “soft” which are based on influencing others’ behaviours by means of coercion and appeal respectively (32).

2. Defining Hard and Soft Power

According to Nye, the power of a state or a group of states is nowadays more characterized in terms of the ability to influence, by promoting its power of attraction rather than using military means. “Soft power” aims at persuading instead of forcing and attracting instead of obliging. He claims that in order to get the outcome you want from others, you can use attraction and appeal, without necessarily using threat or force (*Means to Success*5-6). He argues that if a country’s culture and ideology are more attractive to others, it will decrease the resistance to its wishes; and if it shapes international rules which are consistent with its values and interests, this will make that country’s actions more legitimate in the eyes of others, that is to say, more attractive, without needing the use of coercion (11-12).

First of all, others’ behaviour can be influenced through coercion, “you can command me to change my preferences and do what you want by threatening me with force or economic sanctions” (Nye, *Means to Success*6). In foreign affairs, a state coerces another to do what it wants through two different ways: either economic control or military force. In order to get what it wants, the United States uses economic sanctions, such as the case when it obliged Iran to give up its program of 2010; conducted to produce nuclear weapons; by imposing massive trade restrictions on the nation. In addition to that, it menaces some nations with the deployment of military force (Smoot 10).

Indeed, the United States did not use only economic sanctions to oblige Iran to stop its nuclear weapons program, it also threatened it to use a military action in case they do not abandon the business (“Bush Threatens Iran with Military Action”). Inducement is another way of influence, it necessitates the use of payments and bribes “you can induce me to do what you want by using your economic power to pay me” (Nye, *Means to Success*6-7). For example,

the United States provided Pakistan with \$ 4.5 million in unspecified foreign aid. This help aimed at influencing the country to support US foreign policy goals. These Three types of power are characterised by Joseph Nye as “hard power”. Payments, force, sanctions and bribes are the main power resources of a nation. Tanks, soldiers, jets, fighters and other military units are the main instruments to exert these resources (Smoot 11-12).

Secondly, others’ behaviours can be altered through the use of “soft power”, which means “getting others to want the outcomes you want” (Nye, *Means to Success* 5). Firstly, through seduction and attraction, this aims at pushing others to modify their preferences and behaviours due to their desire of imitation. “Soft power” relies on the ability to seduce and persuade other states without the use of threat or force; “A country may obtain the outcomes it wants in world politics because other countries – admiring its values, emulating its example, aspiring to its level of prosperity and openness – want to follow it” (5). Therefore, the positive image and reputation of a state (often economic or military performance), or the degree of openness of a society and the attractiveness of its culture (religion, traditions, etc.) are crucial factors for “soft power”. In more simple words, “soft power” is the ability for one state to influence the behaviour of another state to push it to adopt the same point of view through cultural and/or ideological means (5-6).

“Soft power” and “hard power” are interconnected since they both aim at reaching goals through influencing the behaviour of others. The difference between the two lies in the nature of the behaviours or the tangibility of the resources, which are either to dominate or to control which can be done through coercion and threat, or to co-opt which can be done through the charm of culture or values. As Nye points out; “to think about the difference between hard and soft power is to consider the variety of ways you can obtain the outcomes you want” (*Means to Success* 6).

3. Instruments of Soft Power

“Soft power” can be implemented either through non official forms by the civil society or official forms by the state. Many scholars and politicians agree that popular culture is among the most effective non official instruments for the exertion of “soft power”, it is the gathering of attitudes, images and ideas which are favoured by other nations (Smoot 18). Popular culture is what helped the United States to achieve its foreign policy objectives, by spreading its ideologies and affecting other countries’ preferences,

American popular culture embodied in products and communications has widespread appeal. Nicaraguan television played American shows even while the government fought American-backed guerrillas. Similarly, Soviet teenagers wear blue jeans and seek American recordings, and Chinese student protesters used a symbol that resembled the statue of Liberty during the 1989 uprisings.

(Nye, *Means to Success* 193-194)

Exchange programs are very important non official forms of “soft power” as well, they appeared in 1948, even before the emergence of the term “soft power”, it was agreed by the US exchange community and the US Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs that they represent a major role in making new relations and commitments between the US and the rest of the world (Ragavan 6-8). Indeed, students who go to the United States, study there and get in touch with its culture, generally enjoy it and appreciate it more. Like Nye says “international students usually return home with a greater appreciation of American values and institution” (*Means to Success*45).

Forms of “soft power” that are directly generated by the government are considered as official instruments. As mentioned above, exchange programs can be implemented through non official forms. Nevertheless, in case the government administers them, they become official. For example, the US Fulbright program that was created in 1946 appeared to be very

successful in building bilateral relationships with many countries and achieving many goals. It aimed at promoting the American good will through bringing high educated foreign students to the US, and sending American students abroad. Furthermore, foreign aids are crucial official instruments, which can be considered as forms of “soft power” when the given money aims at economic aids for the development assistance and military aid for buying arms (Smoot 25).

4. Advantages and Disadvantages of Soft Power

“Soft power” is not necessarily a good thing in itself. Like any form of power, it can be used for good as well as bad objectives. In an interview done by Spiegel, Nye stated some cases where Soft Power was used to do harm. For example, Oussama Ben Laden neither paid nor forced the men who flew the planes that crashed into the Twin Towers. They did it because they were fascinated by his message and seduced by his convictions. As Nye states “Bin Laden did not hold a gun to the heads of the people who flew the planes. He did not pay them either. They did it because they were attracted by his convictions” (“It Is Pointless to Talk about Al Qaeda”).

Even though “soft power” can be misused and aims at obtaining negative results, it can also be well used and aims at obtaining positive outcomes. In the 70s, the United States tried to prevent France from selling a nuclear plant to Pakistan. After 7 years of failed attempts, it decided to apply the non-proliferation policy which persuaded officials of the French government that Pakistan will probably use it for making bombs or for civilian goals. In this case, the United States avoided using force or threat, instead it built fear inside the French government to influence their behaviour and stop them from selling nuclear plants to Pakistan (Movsesiyan 31).

5. Soft Power Resources

Nye identifies three main resources of “soft power” consisting of; culture, political values, and foreign policies. These elements are effective resources of “soft power” only when they can claim, respectively, to be attractive to a foreign nation, followed by both the native country and the foreign countries and considered as legitimate with moral authority.

Culture is defined as “*the set of values and practices that create meaning for a given society*”(Nye, *Means to Success*11). It includes two major types, each to be publicized according to its particularities: popular culture (pop music, movies, etc.) and high culture (education, literature, history, etc.). However, possessing cultural resources is far from being enough; there should also be the means to convert those cultural resources into results. This means to disseminate them and make them attractive to foreign population through cultural exchanges and other means (11). Popular culture can transport and expose many of the values that a society advocates. Television can be used to convey the image of a society, its symbols and its values. Sport, for example, which can be used as a medium to convey political messages “Even popular sports can play a role in communicating values” (Nye, *Means to Success* 47). High culture is also an effective instrument for the implementation of “soft power”, it is related to scientific and academic exchanges between different countries, it tends to be a very effective tool in enhancing “soft power”. The United States started applying it since Eisenhower was in power, an international educational group in US noted that “the millions of people who have studied in the United States over the years constitute a remarkable reservoir of good will for our country” (qtd. in Nye 45).

Political values are the political measures taken by a government, the values that it privileges in its domestic policy, its political ideals and the nature of the regime being democratic or authoritarian. “The values a government champions in its behaviour at home (for example, democracy), in international institutions (working with others), and in foreign

policy (promoting peace and human rights) strongly affect the preferences of others” (Nye *Means to Success* 14). As with cultural resources, these resources must be converted into results by using means to make them attractive to the target population. The power of a country lies in its ideological system. For example, Western countries are generally attracted by democratic ideologies because people believe in free life and equal opportunities, this led democracy to grow into a universal value. For this reason, many countries started to diffuse democratic ideas to upgrade the process of democracy. (Lin and Hongtao 71).

According to Nye, some elements of the foreign policy are considered as sources of “soft power” as well. He states that “The attractiveness of the United States also depends very much upon the values we express through the substance and style of our foreign policy” (*Means to Success* 60). At the level of the substance, he means firstly the values a state conveys while making decisions of foreign policies. These values tend to be more attractive when they are shared, like the case of Marshal Plan which made Europeans accept it happily. He also refers to the ways the United States manages its relations with the other States, such as when it needed to influence some distant governments on diverse issues, like the proliferation movement, trade, terrorism, etc. Nye relates the style of the foreign policy to the attitudes of the States; many countries believe that the United States follows a unilateral policy, that is to say, it does not consult its peers when making a decision. In addition, they think that it is probably in favour of unilateralism rather than multilateralism which can be really harmful for its “soft power” (60-65).

6. Soft Power and Public Diplomacy

The term “public diplomacy” was first used by Dean Edmund Guillon in 1965. He defined it as “the means by which governments, private groups and individuals influence the attitudes and opinions of other peoples and governments in such a way as to exercise influence on their foreign policy decisions” (qtd. in Renken 10-11). It refers to the process of influencing the

attitudes of people from other countries, with the aim of making the native country more attractive by creating a positive image of its foreign policies and culture. It is considered as one of the tools of “soft power” since it starts on the same basis of influencing others to achieve foreign policy goals, and tries to present the culture and values of a country in an attractive form.

In a chapter entitled *Wielding Soft Power*, Nye defines “public diplomacy” as “interactions aimed not only at foreign governments but primarily with non-governmental individuals and organizations, and often presented a variety of private views in addition to government views” (107). He also points out that governments should take into account three important dimensions of public diplomacy. First, the establishment of daily communications between the diplomatic services and the foreign public is important. This would be necessary to explain the context in which the decisions concerning the national policies and the foreign policies are taken. Furthermore, the establishment of a strategic communication model should also be considered. According to this model, themes and targeted policies would be explored recurrently, as is the case of election campaigns (107-110).

Finally, the development of lasting relationships; governments should develop them with individuals through school exchanges, conferences that effect future leaders of states like the case of Margaret Thatcher and Anwar Sadat. These three dimensions promote the relationships between countries and become effective only if they are accompanied with a foreign policy coherent in its essence and style with public diplomacy. Nye adds that for a public diplomacy’s action to be effective, it requires listening as well as talking, that is, there should be a certain understanding of the target audience. A visit to the United States when people have the opportunity to interact with Americans will be more effective than a radio show (Nye 110-11).

7. Soft Power During the Cold War

During the Second World War, the United States fought alongside the Soviet Union. However, an ideological disagreement opposed the two camps. Since 1917, the USSR is governed by a communist regime that advocates the authority of the state to impose equality among citizens. On the contrary, the United States defends the freedom of individuals in a democratic regime (Leffler and Painter 318). In 1945, the Allies managed to agree on the settlement of the war; though, a disagreement reappeared very quickly. The United States exerted its influence on the territories of Western Europe, and the Soviet Union dominated the countries of Eastern Europe. This was the start of the formation of the two blocs which characterized the entire Cold War (26-29).

The United States defended its model against the Soviet model, which it denounced as being dictatorial. The American power finally found a way to spread its ideology by applying a strategy that is now known as “soft power”. Even though the term was not coined until the 1990s, this does not mean that it was absent during the Cold War. Indeed, there are several examples from that period where the United States has sought to impose its will on others through influence and attraction. It was about winning the “battle of ideas” through the export of values and culture. During the Eisenhower and Truman administrations, a lot of efforts were done to promote the American culture and values across the Iron Curtain. The United States organized intense propaganda to denigrate their enemy and prove that they are the model of a democratic regime supporting the freedom of individuals (Rosenau 1137).

The role of culture during that period was crucial for many reasons: first, culture is what carries ideas, and therefore ideologies, and convincing through ideas can have as much impact as convincing through force, if not more. In addition to that, culture has always accompanied the greatest conquests, with a strong link between power and cultural influence, and therefore

between culture and politics. Also, as stated above the struggle that was led by the two blocs during the Cold War was mostly ideological. It was a war of ideas, images, propaganda, and diplomatic pressure. Culture became a decisive challenge making each camp standing alone and convincing the greatest number of nations. This strategy aimed at diffusing its cultural model all over the world, it started promoting the American way of life by means of explicit propaganda through television, newspapers, magazines, books and other media (Rosenau 1137).

8. The Rise of Anti-Americanism

After the attacks of 2001, the United States took new measures to protect America based on the use of hard power. However, instead of fixing things they made them worse. Its foreign policies undertaken at that time led to the rise of anti-Americanism such as the cases of Afghanistan (2001) and Iraq (2003), which undermined the image of the nation and decreased its “soft power” abilities. Moreover, many European countries believed that the American role in issues such as global poverty and maintaining peace were unfavourable (Nye, *Means to Success* 127). A Eurobarometer poll stated that many Europeans think that “Washington has hindered efforts to fight global poverty, protect the environment, and maintain peace” (Nye, “Decline of America’s Soft Power” 1). This led to the decrease of “soft power” abilities and consequently to difficulties for the United States to achieve its objectives without referring to the use of force and threat. The Iraq war was not the only cause for the rise of anti-Americanism, there had also been other past periods when the US attractiveness in European countries fell. Among them the Vietnam war, the Suez Canal crisis and the nuclear weapons policies during the Regan administration (Nye, *Means to Success* 35-37). The American image declined not only in European countries, but also in the Middle East with higher degree. A bipartisan report pointed that “hostility toward America has reached shocking levels, what is required is not merely tactical adaptation, but strategic and radical

transformation” (qtd. in Nye 43). For all these reasons, the US had to ameliorate its foreign policy in order to diminish anti-Americanism and improve its image in the eyes of the world (43).

9. Soft Power and US Foreign Policy

The majority of the American political attitudes after the attacks of September 11, 2001 were domestically and internationally dominated by the event. At that time, the nation was under the presidency of George W. Bush whose first mandate was strongly marked by idealistic touchesthrough applying a strategy known as “the national security strategy”. His foreign policy aimed at extending a preventive war based on force and threat. This preventive war was highly criticized due to the fact that it was used to justify military actions undertaken in some nations;whether they might be contributing in future possible threats or not. Bush wasreally affected by the scenario of a global terrorism armed with weapons of mass destruction. The “war against terror” was the main mission of the foreign policy of the US. In line with the 2002 National Security Strategy, new measures were taken to ensure US security in the face of the threat posed by global terrorists. It was much more necessary to engage in “soft power” policies by promoting the extension of democracy, universal values of human rights, use of international organizations, etc. (Totoonchie 1-3).

International cooperation was a first policy used as a “soft power” instrument. It aimed at gaining international contributions from other states by making terrorism as an enemy for all the states. In order to earn more support, the US development human rights policies, claiming that “America is committed to justice, freedom, limits on the absolute power of states, respect for women, tolerance of ethnic and religious groups, and private property rights” (qtd. in Totoonchie 7).The second policy entailed abolishing terrorism, starting by determining the main causes of terrorism which was according to them “poor economic conditions, minority

rights, and weak, hostile, or oppressive regimes” (8). Thus, it was trying to prevent those problems through promoting business growth, investing in health care and education, etc.

10. US Foreign Policy in the Middle East

The United States’ decision of applying “soft power” on the Middle East is not new; it dates back to the Second World War. At that time, it attempted to make use of all available “public diplomacy” tools to ameliorate its image in the eyes of the rest of the world and put aside its negative aspects especially in the eyes of the Arab world.

Previously, it was difficult for researchers to make studies in the Arab world due to some government restrictions, but during the two last decades some researchers including John Zogby, ShilbeyTelhami and William Rugh were able to investigate there and see the perception of Arabs towards the US. Polls made by Rugh revealed that most of them have a positive thinking about the US in many aspects including education, television, science, technology and products. For example, he made a survey in Jordan in 2004, and the polls revealed that Jordanians have positive perception of US technology and science (83%), products (61%), education (59%), television and movies (56%), democracy and freedom (57%) and the American people (52%). Nonetheless, same polls showed that what they do not like is the American policies towards them especially towards Palestine (89%) and Iraq(78%). Furthermore, another research made by Zogby in 2010 showed that 77% of the Middle Easterners see the United States as the most threatening country for them after Israel with 88% (Rugh 2).

Before the digital age, the United States used telegraphic means to contact its abroad embassies, in addition to other means. They were very successful at that time because US diplomats provided them to local media reporters and editors to filter what should not be mentioned, as well as officers to translate them so that the public understands what is reported. In addition to that, the Voice of America was broadcasted every day spreading US

culture and ideology. However, with technological advancement, the news is reported as soon as it happens, through cell phones, internet and other media, making it much more difficult to filter and hide what harms the American image abroad. In addition, the news was no longer provided only by the US reporters, but new private means, not controlled by US government, started providing information about the US policies harming the “soft power” of the country. For these reasons, the American public diplomacy professionals found new ways of influencing the public and spreading positive images through new electronic devices including Youtube, Twitter, etc. Indeed, during the Bush administration, Karen Hughes; undersecretary of state; created the rapid response unit. Every day, Hughes provides American officials with sources of information about the US official actions to allow them to spread it to the public (Rugh2-3). Actually, every day Hughes presents information about the good actions of the government to keep the public following the US news and show them that American policies are legitimate. This is a good strategy to enhance the “soft power” of the country.

The Middle East countries were far from being in favour of the United States and to make things worse, the “war on terror” was declared. This war was supported by many countries including Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Canada, South Asia, etc. However, this war was not appreciated in Pakistan and the Middle East, “where popular dislike of the United States was ripe and rampant” (qtd. in Solomon 24).

With two wars and a rise in anti-Americanism, George W. Bush left a difficult legacy to his successor. Barack Obama should be remembered as a president who focused on domestic as well as foreign politics and ameliorated the image of the country. By choosing primarily “hard power” at the expense of more analyzed strategies, eight years of Republican presidency seriously undermined the credibility of the mechanism of US. Thus, the new

democratic presidency had to reactivate or invent new global approaches to reclaim lost positions and values.

Many argue that the Obama doctrine was a replica of the Bush doctrine. Nevertheless, Obama counted more on the use of instruments of “soft power” instead of “hard power” to achieve his goals. His foreign policy aimed at spreading peace and democracy in the Middle East countries. These ideological factors constituted a political weapon serving as a channel for various influences. Many instruments were used to implement this strategy among them the use of economic and diplomatic programs in the Middle East and North Africa (Dimitrova 1-2).

In 2004, Suzanne Nossel, a US diplomat, argued that the foreign policy of Bush after the 9/11 attacks was highly based on “hard power” means and claimed that this strategy had to change and include all instruments of power. She stated that “unlike conservatives, who rely on military power as the main tool of statecraft, liberal internationalists see trade, diplomacy, foreign aid and the spread of American values as equally important” (qtd. in Dimitrova 4). However, this strategy was not applied until President Obama came into office. Indeed, the new Obama administration, implemented this concept and marked a clear break with previous governance. This new US power, now the foundation of its foreign policy, is neither “hard” nor “soft”, it is “smart”. This term must be understood in the sense of clever and smart, it consists of the combination of the two concepts of power, “hard” and “soft” to influence other nations and change their behavior. Even Joseph Nye, father of “soft power”, has admitted both the relevance of the choice and consequently, the obsolete duality of “hard” and “soft power” which he had assumed fatherhood (4-6).

This strategy appeared in the US intervention in Libya. Actually, in a meeting in March 14, 2011, Hilary Clinton, Secretary of State, and Jibril, a political scientist, decided that a military action in Libya was needed. Soon after, Clinton convinced president Obama to join allies and

bomb the country. However, this military action led to the destruction of Libya leaving it with two opposed governments, ruined cities and around 4,000 deaths along with the decline of its President Qaddafi. Thinking that Libya's future leaders would be unable to unify the country, and that it was still a threat for the US security ("Hilary Clinton, "Smart Power" and a dictator's fall"). In 28 March, Obama made a speech about Libya in which he stated that the reasons behind the intervention in the country were to protect the civilian population from Qaddafi's forces. Moreover, the Obama administration decided to incorporate humanitarian actions in the country. Many countries contributed in the intervention and that made the United States policy broader than ever (Dimitrova 4-6). Both Obama's speech and humanitarian actions indicate how the Obama administration made use of "soft power" means, and its integration with military forces ("hard power") shows that the foreign policy of Obama in Libya was highly based on "smart power" means.

As the world's leading economic, political and military power, the United States has always been concerned with building a positive image around the world in order to fully assume its international role by exporting its political model, its way of life and its ideology all over the world. American "soft power" was an effective answer to the Soviet challenge during the Cold War, as well as a tool in gathering support from other nations who stood in its side while combating terrorism.

Chapter Two

Bush's War on Terror in Afghanistan: Reasons and Results

September 11, 2001 marked a turning point not only in the history of the United States, but also in world history. On this day of apocalypse, four planes hit America for the purpose of destroying certain strategic and symbolic powers. These attacks, although very deadly, were above all carriers of a symbolic value for the attackers. For them, it was a victory against the first power in the world, a victory that passed by the destruction of its icons. Indeed, the terrorists questioned the economic power by destroying the World Trade Center, military power by attacking the Pentagon and the image of deep America with the crash of the fourth plane in Pennsylvania. After the attacks, President Bush had to find new measures for enhancing the US security, and stopping the terrorist threat. Furthermore, the US government was determined to find and punish the responsible because the attacks led to a sudden and brutal loss of the conviction of the invulnerability of the US territory. In addition, they signaled a historical breakpoint that symbolized, by the terror engendered, the entry into a dark and threatening twenty-first century.

1.9/11 Attacks: The Spark of the Conflict

1.1. Terrorism

It is really difficult to find a clear, unique definition of terrorism because firstly, every definition of the term has a certain degree of subjectivity, “one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter” (qtd. in Lizardo 7). Secondly, terrorism is a multifaceted, complex and evolving phenomenon that logically goes beyond a simple and concise definition. Thus, the term does not fit into a single definition, but various ones are provided.

On the one hand, Western scholars like Chomsky define it as “the use of coercive means aimed at populations in an effort to achieve political, religious, or other aims” (qtd. in Lizardo 8). Stern considers it as “an act or threat of violence against non-combatants, with the

objective of intimidating or otherwise influencing an audience or audiences” (qtd. in Bergensen and Han 134). Finally, the US Department of State defines terrorism as a “politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience” (qtd. in Lizardo 8).

On the other hand, many Muslim scholars argue that terrorism “covers all acts of aggression unjustly committed by individuals, groups or states against human beings including attacks on their religion, life, intellect, property or honor” (Bashir). They also consider all acts of violence and threat produced to terrify people or risk their lives as acts of terrorism. For example, according to them the actions held by Israelis against Palestinians are terrorist actions. On the contrary, Westerners believe that the inverse is true (Bashir).

Two Dutch researchers, Alex P. Schmid and Albert J. Yongman, have taken an interesting approach to this problem by examining one hundred and nine different definitions of the term among academics. The two researchers analyzed the definitions for their main components: violence, politics, terror, organized action, reactions, etc. and showed the difficulty of finding a consensus on a single definition that will be acceptable to everyone (Boaz).

Even the UN recognizes the impossibility of agreeing on a unanimous definition, however, they know that one is necessary for consensus. One of the definitions they provided in 1994 stipulates that:

Criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes are in any circumstance unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or any other nature that may be invoked to justify them. (“Measure to Eliminate International Terrorism”)

Due to 9/11 attacks, people started relating terrorism to the religion of Islam. For this reason, Kofi Annan, UN Secretary General, claimed that the definition of terrorism should not

be based on its political aims, arguing that a terrorist attack against a particular country should be considered as “an attack on humanity as a whole” (qtd. in Carlile 16).

1.2. Plan, Intelligence and Execution of 9/11 attacks

In 2004, the National Commission on the attacks against the United States published a report about Al Qaeda’s attacks of September, 2001. The commission had access to various sources, including intelligence data obtained during the interrogation of Al Qaeda members. This report provides important insights about the 9/11 attacks.

Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, a highly educated Kuwaiti citizen from Baluchistan (Pakistan), was the one who came up with the idea of the 9/11 attacks. In 1993, he helped to finance the World Trade Center bombing, which was led by his nephew Ramzi Yousef. Later in 1994, both went to the Philippines, where they planned the Manila air. In 1995, the authorities of the Philippine discovered Yousef’s bomb-making equipments and put an end to the business. Yousef was arrested, while KSM, who was in Qatar at that time, stayed free. In 1996, KSM traveled to Afghanistan and presented several plans of operations against the United States to Bin Laden, including a larger version of what would become the 9/11 attacks. However, Bin Laden only listened to him, without making any commitment. The 1998 attacks on US embassies in Nairobi and Dar Es Salaam convinced KSM that Al Qaeda's leader was then ready to embark on major anti-American operations. In late 1998 or early 1999, KSM was informed by a member of Al Qaeda that Bin Laden finally approved his plan to attack the United States (Kean and Hamilton 145-49).

Bin Laden did not just approve the idea, he also made available to KSM potential volunteers for suicide bombings. The newly recruited members began their training in 1999. During the same period, four men with Western education arrived at Kandahar; Ziad Jarrah, Marwan al Shehhi, Ramzi Binalshibh and Mohamed Atta. These men presented a better alternative for the plane operations since, unlike the others, had a good experience of life in

the West. The new volunteers lived in Hamburg; but were marked by extreme anti-American discussions (Kean and Hamilton 157-60). In early 1999, they decided to put their actions in accordance with their convictions and go to Chechnya to serve the cause of Jihad against the Russians. Though, one of the members of Al Qaeda heard their intentions and contacted them, he explained to them that going to Chechnya would be difficult and that it would be better for them to go to Afghanistan first. They followed his advice and, in late 1999, went to Afghanistan, once there they swore allegiance to Osama bin Laden and were quickly selected for the operation in preparation (164-66).

Al Qaeda faced some difficulties concerning the training and the visas of the selected members, that is why they needed a new well trained pilot. For this reason, they recruited Hani Hanjour, a Saudi who already received a commercial pilot certificate in the United States. Hanjour arrived at an Al Qaeda camp in Afghanistan where Bin Laden realized that he was appropriate for the mission and promptly recruited him. Hanjour returned to the United States in December 2000 to perfect his training as a pilot. In 2001, he started his training in a flight academy in Mesa (Kean and Hamilton 225-226). Meanwhile, Bin Laden and his relatives chose the men who were going to take part in the operation, having the mission of helping the pilots who were going to take control of the aircrafts. Most of them were Saudis, between the ages of 20 and 28, none had completed his university studies, and none had been married. They apparently did not all live a real Muslim life, but seemed to have been recruited for Jihad by active networks in Saudi universities and mosques. They received in Afghanistan a specific training for their task in hijacking the planes (231-233).

The future pilots flew several times to examine the best ways to take control of the aircrafts. They also discovered that they were able to board planes with cutters without being intercepted. They concluded that the best time to take control of the aircraft would be 10 to 15 minutes after its departure, when the cockpit doors open for the first time. In July, 2001, Bin

Laden suggested the attacks to be as soon as possible. However, Atta refused and insisted on the fact that the hijackers were not ready. Furthermore, Bin Laden insisted on choosing Washington as one of the targets, in addition to the Pentagon and the White House rather than the Capitol. But Atta felt that reaching the White House would be harder and preferred the choice of the Capitol. Atta finally decided to give the White House the priority, leaving the Capitol as a reserve option (Kean and Hamilton 243-245). Until the last minutes uncertainties remained about the fourth target, yet the last plane did not reach any of the two targets and crashed into a rural field.

On September 11, 2001, the plane operations began. The four commercial planes departed from Boston (Massachusetts), Dulles (Virginia) and Newark (New Jersey). They were hijacked simultaneously and crashed on highly symbolic territories in the United States of America. These crashes have tragically destroyed the lives of millions of people all over the world (Kean and Hamilton 1-4). That day at 8:46 am, the plane of flight 11 of the American Airlines was embedded in the north tower of the World Trade Center. At 9:03, the flight 175 of the United Airlines crashed in the south tower that collapsed fifty-six minutes later, before the fall of the north tower at 10:28 (285). Their destruction led to the death of almost three thousand people (311).

The event was indelibly marked in the contemporary imagination because it was, from the very first moments, mediatized to the extreme. It is undoubtedly one of the most documented events in human history. Through television, photographic and video images, the entire world has been able to follow the process minute after minute. The unexpected magnitude of the attacks, never seen on the American soil, explains the extra-ordinary shock felt that morning. The events were claimed to be highly visual and astonishing; the two airlines that hit into the towers of the World Trade Center in Manhattan were chosen by the terrorists to create maximum visual impact; and thus plunge the spectators and hostages into a state of horror,

and to show the vulnerability of the United States to terror attacks as well. In addition, their uninterrupted repetition via television made it the iconic global event of the early twenty-first century (Kellner 3-4).

2. Bush's Global War on Terror in Afghanistan

Considering the United States inadequacy to take a powerful reprisal actions in response to previous terrorist attacks, Al Qaeda probably believed that with the 9/11 attacks, the Bush administration would carry out a long-term investigation to find the responsible, instead of taking an immediate action (Collins 45). Nevertheless, President George W. Bush immediately considered the attacks as an aggression and an act of war. The violence of the blow against the symbols of the American power, their repeated precise and coordinated character, and even the panic that they seem to have provoked in the federal administration were indeed images of war (Gregg II). In response to the attacks, the president quickly embarked on an unprecedented fight against terrorism. Since then, the United States has based its international security policy on the war on terror. This war put them against an enemy that was hard to identify and fight, with the goal of keeping the Americans and their allies safe.

2.1. Gaining Political Support

The US government announced a global terrorist threat, and asked some special rights to deal with it. The Bush administration has subsequently taken several extraordinary steps to prevent and combat this terrorist threat. Aware of the importance of international cooperation for such problem, Bush made clear the fact that all those who were not going to support the United States would be treated as enemies, stating that they “will make no distinction between those who planned these acts and those who harbor them” (qtd. in Woodward 26). In addition, he declared the “war on terror”, a war that no one had prepared himself for. Many have shown support, some by solidarity and others by fear; indeed, a good part of the planet felt threatened because of his speech.

Soon after, the Congress authorized the President “to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks” (qtd. in Collins 45-46). In addition, the NATO Council stated that the attacks would be treated as an action under Article 5 of the National Atlantic Treaty (Daalder and Lindsay 25). The treaty states that “an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered as an attack directed against all” (829). They considered as if the terrorist attacks launched against the United States were launched against them all, and pledged to provide all the indispensable assistance to the United States of America.

The United Nations considered the attacks as an international terrorist act, and a threat to international security and peace as well. On September 12, the UN Security Council embraced a resolution that required all the States to work together in order to help and support the US and bring the promoters and organizers of these terrible acts to justice. In this resolution, the Council gave to the United States the right of collective and individual self-defense (Rupérez 13). In other words, it authorized them to use force against the promoters of the attacks. This right was defined in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, it stipulates that “Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.” (qtd. in Hertz 2). The United Nations even gave the right to the United States to invoke this self-defense to justify possible retaliation acts.

In September 15, President Bush convened his national security advisors in Camp David and confirmed to the media that Osama bin Laden was the prime suspect for the attacks. Moreover, the Secretary of State Colin Powell expressed his satisfaction with the expressions of support from around the world stating that “Dozens of countries lost lives [at the World

Trade Center] and they realize that this was an attack against them, as well”(qtd. in “The United States and the Global Coalition against Terrorism”).In the aftermath, it appeared that many Muslim nations gave positive answers to President Bush including Saudi Arabia, the Gulf, Pakistan, Syria and Iran. On September 18, The United Nations Security Council called on the Taliban to surrender Osama bin Laden in accordance with Resolution 1333 of December 19, 2000. However, their Leader Mohamed Omar refused to do so. On September 20, the President delivered a televised address to a joint session of both houses of Congress outlining a broad initiative by the United States and the international community to put an end to global terrorism, naming Al Qaeda and a nebulous network of terrorist groups as the main suspects of the September 11 attacks (“The United States and the Global Coalition against Terrorism”).

In September 28, the UN Security Council collectively endorsed resolution 1373. It was a real plan of action that obliged the member states to take far-reaching measures to combat terrorism, measures that specifically targeted the financial support needed by terrorists to conduct their operations (Rupérez 13).It means that it prevented financing terrorists and stated that all states had to “Criminalize the willful provision or collection, by any means, directly or indirectly, of funds by their nationals or in their territories with the intention that the funds should be used, or in the knowledge that they are to be used, in order to carry out terrorist acts.” (“Resolution 1373” 1)

On October 26, 2001, Bush signed an Act that came out of Congress under the name: USA PATRIOT Act. This act aimed at uniting America and making it stronger by providing it with the needed tools to neutralize and stop terrorism. In addition, it significantly increased the powers of federal law enforcement agencies to obtain intelligence and investigate anyone suspected of terrorist activities. The President stated that this act “takes account of the new realities and dangers posed by modern terrorists. It will help law enforcement to identify, to

dismantle, to disrupt, and to punish terrorists before they strike” (qtd. in “Report from the Field: The USA PATRIOT Act at Work” 1).

Bush succeeded in building up an international cooperation; he gained the support of the Congress, the United Nations and the NATO. Furthermore, many countries around the world showed their solidarity to the United States for its war on terror, including some Muslim states.

2.2. Reasons, Objectives and Results

America found itself at war, it discovered its vulnerability and the intensity of the hostility of which it was the object. However, terrorism was not a threat directed to America only, but directed to many states especially the ones characterized by their democratic ideologies. For this reason, a “global war on terrorism” was conceptualized and led the president of the United States to push all the states to “eliminate the terrorist parasites who threaten their countries” combined to a demand for an immediate diplomatic and military response to the extent of violence (Tellis 57).

Moreover, terrorism which is combined with weapons of mass destruction, presents the greatest threat for the international order; due to the weapons’ availability, their potential of killing a considerable number of people in a short period of time and their difficulty to be neutralized. Therefore, the United States had to “deny terrorists and their state sponsors the materials, technology, and expertise to make and deliver weapons of mass destruction” (Tellis 58). Indeed, the extent of the destruction and the disruption they might cause can reach a level of violence comparable to an operation of war and in order to protect America, Bush had to stop their spread.

Furthermore, political opinion in the United States concluded that deterrence was far from being sufficient for preventing terrorist attacks. Hence, active defense had to be implemented in order to compromise what terrorists value the most. However, terrorists’ readiness to

sacrifice and kill themselves for their beliefs and for the accomplishment of their missions made it harder for the US intelligence to find an appropriate strategy to maintain security. In addition, according to the Bush administration, “hostile states, including those that sponsor terrorism, are investing large resources to develop and acquire ballistic missiles of increasing range and sophistication that could be used against the United States” (qtd. in Tellis58-59). The Bush administration believed that many countries were helping terrorists to establish weapons of mass destruction to fight the United States. Besides the 9/11 attacks increased the fear inside the Americans about terrorism and led to the expansion of new strategies to combat it. Therefore, it was concluded that missile defense had to be upgraded in order to anticipate future attacks (59).

The post-9/11 strategy had been progressively built, and with time its objectives have been expanded. It is true that the United States is the super power of the world, and it seemed to be strong and untouchable. Nevertheless, the attacks of 9/11 led to its downfall. Indeed, the whole world was able to observe the attacks, and noticed the vulnerability of the United States to terror attacks. Hence, one of the most important objectives of the war on terror was preserving the sovereignty and democracy of the country through protecting its ideologies and principles of preserving people in the choice of their way of life along with protecting the tolerance and moderation of open and free societies (“National Security Strategy” 24-25).

Another objective behind declaring the war on terror against Afghanistan was the destruction of terrorist networks of global reach. Indeed, the United States managed to use all the possible resources of power in order to defeat terrorist organizations, reduce their capabilities and prevent their evolution. It also targeted and threatened the states that would knowingly help those terrorists in a way or another. Therefore, the United States aimed at identifying and locating terrorist groups, especially those holding WMD. After knowing their

position, the federal government would send forces to neutralize them through attacking their refugees and destroying their communication materials (“National Security Strategy” 15-16).

In addition, the United States intended to stop the support and funding of terrorist organizations. This Funding is the basis of these terrorist organizations, cutting it will decrease their ability to develop and execute different missions. Furthermore, The Bush administration knew that some countries would feel themselves obliged to combat terrorism inside and outside their borders, while others would refuse to cooperate, in this case, the US government planned to find new ways to convince them to avoid harboring terrorists. By doing so, the objectives of the US would be fulfilled, and terrorist organizations would be weakened. Each refusal of a state to help terrorists would be a success to the United States (“National Security Strategy” 17-18).

Soon after the attacks, George W. Bush launched the “Enduring Freedom” operation against terrorism in Afghanistan. The main objective of this operation was achieving political goals through military means. Indeed, the United States carried out large-scale military actions and wars against states that were suspected of helping terrorist groups. For this reason, a large coalition led by the United States invaded Afghanistan to oust Taliban defendants who provided help and protection to al Qaeda. In addition, it wanted to capture the leader of Al Qaeda and bring him to justice (Paraguez and Rodriguez 83-84). On October 7, 2001 in a declaration to the United Nations Bush addressed his main objective behind declaring war against Afghanistan:

The United States military has begun strikes against Al Qaeda terrorist training camps and military installations of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. These carefully targeted actions are designed to disrupt the use of Afghanistan as a terrorist base of operations, and to attack the military capability of the Taliban regime. (“Operation Enduring Freedom”14)

On October 7, operations against military targets in Afghanistan were engaged by the American units. Soon after, in exchange of information soldiers started providing rewards to Afghan citizens. Operations were held in the country almost every day, and since then members of the Taliban regime began being captured and; according to some sources; were treated badly(Afghanistan Country Report).For the United States, the war was successful during the first 3 months, since it was progressing with time. In addition to capturing around 7,000 and killing around 4,000 Taliban troops, the US forces destroyed some of Al Qaeda operations and disrupted their ability to act globally to approximately 30% (Conetta5-6).

The United States forces targeted the Taliban regime and Al Qaeda, though, the civilian population of Afghanistan was not spared. This aggression against Afghanistan inflicted terrible suffering on the population already ravaged by decades of war, poverty, famine and drought. Indeed, the use of cluster bombs and weapons, particularly as a result of several target errors, drove to the death of hundreds of people and dismantled hundreds of desperate families. This included the bombing of residential areas, military hospitals and schools, as well as that of a Red Cross warehouse. These errors led to a wave of opposition because of the fact that they reached the Afghan people and not those responsible for the attacks. Moreover, many questioned the necessity of the war and the use of cluster bombs. For this reason, Rumsfeld, the United States' Secretary of Defense, responded to critics stating that collateral damages are inevitable in wars and that the US was doing its best to avoid casualties (Conetta15-16).

3. A New Afghanistan Founded

After a military victory in just few weeks, the coalition found itself facing the delicate problem of stabilization and reconstruction of a country devastated by thirty years of war, more or less ready to accept the Western presence, and without any real state structure capable of organizing the country's recovery. In addition, the results of the "Operation

Enduring Freedom” were awful and the military means of the country had been destroyed. Thus, it was necessary to restart building the nation from the beginning. It was therefore for the coalition, in parallel with the military operations against the Taliban and Al Qaeda, to lead a real mission of state building.

This desire to turn Afghanistan into a democracy that would no longer support international terrorism, and provide it with at least the capacity to effectively carry out its sovereign functions has made necessary the reform of the security sector, known as the Security Sector Reform (SSR). After applying this internationally developed concept, five pillars were identified and included: the military, police, development of state justice partly distinct from traditional justice, disarmament and demobilization along with the reintegration of militias and insurgent groups, and the conduct of anti-drug missions and policies. Then, leading nations were entrusted with each pillar, US, US and Germany, Italy and other UN members, Japan and the UK respectively (Stankzai and Kudo 10-11).

Germany focused on the Afghan police force, in 2002, it took the lead to rebuild them, and set up the German Police Project Office (GPPO) where it made available €12 million per year, in a situation where:

The police force is in a deplorable state just a few months after the dissolution of the Taliban regime. There is a total lack of equipment and supplies. No systematic training has been provided for around 20 years. At least one entire generation of trained police officers are missing. (Hochwart 32)

This GPPO had many goals such as regulating the salaries of the Afghan National Army (ANA) and fighting terrorism and crime. In addition, the mission had a relatively broad purpose of advising, training, coordinating and assisting the Afghan police. Despite all that, the German efforts soon proved to be too limited. Indeed, even though they were bounded with time, the Germans favored a long-term training for the Afghan police, focusing on

training the higher ranks of the latter, and abandoning the recruitment and training objectives of the mission (Gross 26-27).

In August 2003, NATO took operational control of the United Nations International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. NATO's mission was to rebuild the state through ensuring the human rights of the Afghan people and settling centralized rules in the state. Soon, the mission took place to include Provincial Reconstruction Teams; which consisted of small groups of military and civilian experts; who provided aid and assistance to the Afghan government and helped in its restoration through a variety of reconstruction initiatives (Larsen 4-5). NATO's mission was divided into three phases: from 2003 to 2004, efforts were located in northern Afghanistan under the lead of German and French forces. In 2005, it extended to western Afghanistan where Spanish and Italian forces took the lead. In early July and October 2006 started the third and fourth phases where ISAF expanded its presence in the entire country (Gallis 3).

Despite the increase in terrorist attacks against NATO forces in 2005 and 2006, NATO had no doubts about its ability to expand the mandate of the fiasco, to which the Taliban displayed considerable resistance. However, many problems started to appear. In February 2006, the PRT were attacked and no NATO members were available in the area. Due to these growing difficulties posed by Afghan resistance, NATO governments had consistently emphasized the importance and priority of their activities in Afghanistan and pleaded with allies to send more troops to the region (Gallis 8).

Although NATO has helped to rebuild the country, their work was poorly organized and led to many problems. Each country interpreted ISAF's role in a different way; Germany saw it as a mission done to build peace in the country, but Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States saw it as an operation that aimed at preserving stability and encompassing counterinsurgency actions. This incomprehension led to lack of coordination and cooperation

between the nations. Moreover, the required number of troops needed for the ISAF posed a great problem within the NATO states, some states refused to send troops while others thought that more troops were needed (Roberts 21-22).

The entire US Administration ignored the substance of Al Qaeda's message, that is, the protest against US policy in the Islamic world that was at the center of the debates before, as well as after September 11, 2001. Al Qaeda has always carefully avoided hitting states that do not participate in the military occupation of Iraq, and that do not support Israel in its war against Palestinians. However, due to the United States' interventions in many Islamic States, an action was taken by Al Qaeda and America was attacked. As a reaction, the Bush administration declared the war on terror aiming at capturing the responsible of this disaster. However, the means implemented during this war such as bombing, electronic surveillance inside the country, illegal detention and the use of torture, did not put an end to Al Qaeda and the Taliban regime. Instead, it led to slippages that deeply shocked Americans and tarnished its image all over the world.

Chapter Three

US Soft Power in Use: the Road to Rebuild New Afghanistan

The invasion of Afghanistan was the response of the Bush administration to the 9/11 attacks. Two main objectives were announced to justify the war, the destruction of the sanctuary of the Taliban regime on one hand, and the prevention of the use of weapons of mass destruction, or even the alliance with Al Qaeda on the other hand. This military operation was a kind of preventive attitude to protect the United States from future attacks on its homeland. However, the utility of the military tool was too limited in the struggle against terrorist organizations because the use of military power could not influence the Afghan people who refused to accept the Western presence and cooperate with them. For this reason, the United States commenced attempting to improve its “soft power” strategies to meet the challenges of international terrorism. Indeed, the State Department of the Bush administration began struggling to find new policies to restore the image of the United States and regain the sympathy of the world. In the first term of President Bush, its administration was focusing on military means more, but later it became particularly interested in softer means through implementing aid assistance, reconstructing the Afghanistan and privileging partnerships with non-governmental organizations and private companies.

1. Constant Changes in the United States Strategies in Afghanistan

The use of the military power and the War campaign in Afghanistan against Taliban regime and a humanitarian campaign for the Afghan population, although disputed by Colin Powell at the beginning, was quickly endorsed as a solution. As mentioned in the second chapter, the Congress was in support of the United States decision to declare the “war on terror” because, according to its members, the US had to defend itself and destroy the aggressors. This was considered by Bush as a legitimization to use force for eventual actions against terrorism.

Bush stated that in order to destroy Al Qaeda, all possible resources of power were going to be utilized in the war on terror such as weapons, diplomacy and law enforcement.

At the beginning, the US executives opted for the use of “hard power” against the perpetrators of the attacks. On October 7, 2001, the Operation Enduring Freedom was launched, after the Taliban’s refusal to hand over Al Qaeda’s leader. This was the first massive military action undertaken by the United States to fight terror with the alliance of many states such as Germany, France, Canada and Australia. This Operation had many phases consisting primarily of sending CIA teams and Special Forces to Afghanistan, then making air operations with humanitarian drops, and finally working to establish a free society and secure the country (Saleh 93-97).

Within few months, around 13,000 armed forces were already on the Afghan soil aiming at capturing the leaders of Taliban and Al Qaeda (Saleh 158-59). The United States thought that the threat would not be permanent, and that Al Qaeda’s leaders would be captured quickly. Nevertheless, the operations were not successful and the Bush’s administration figured out that military force was not sufficient and that new strategies had to be implemented in the country.

Indeed, military action, or in other words the use of “hard power”, was a good option at that time. The United States and its allies could reduce, or even annihilate the freedom of terrorist actions of their opponents through armed forces, means of control and intelligence services. Nonetheless, this was a good solution only for a short-term threat, but when it comes to a long-term one, this strategy is no longer effective. Consequently, the US opted for an alternative based on the use of “soft power” through winning the “hearts and minds” of the targeted population (Saleh 97).

An indirect approach had to be adopted aiming at stretching the opponents’ strategic center of gravity, rather than destroying them militarily. Though, this did not mean that military

means were not important in this indirect approach, but their use had to remain dependent on the need to conquer the hearts and minds of the Afghan people.

The success of “soft power” strategy was based on policies that would bring a real change in the lives of ordinary Afghans. In this regard, an issue was of paramount importance, consisting of the establishment of a good mode of governance in the country, through convincing the population about the US forces and PRT’s legitimacy, credibility and the need of the Afghans to cooperate with them (Acey 31). Moreover, the Afghans had to be sure that both the military army and the government would serve their best interests, such as assuring their safety and protecting their culture. This strategy would build trust, bring the US popular support and grant them the control of the local villages (31-32).

The United States did not use such kind of power only against the Afghan people, but also against the entire world with the goal of winning the “war of ideas” through convincing people about the illegitimacy of terrorism. In addition, they used public diplomacy in order to give the societies that were led by supporters of terrorism some hope about possible freedom. Indeed, in Afghanistan the United States counted highly on “soft power” instruments and even worked with NGOs, UN, etc. to provide political, humanitarian and security aid in order to reconstruct the country (Saleh 98-99).

1. Forms of the United States Soft Power in Afghanistan

The events of September 11, 2001, have shown the dangers that a left neglected third world represented. During the war against terrorism, the emergency operations, the fight against poverty along with humanitarian aids were supposed to rebuilt Afghanistan and prevent the spread of terrorism there. However, this international assistance became rather a lever of influence and a diplomatic tool for the United States of America.

1.1. Non-Official Forms

It was really hard for several US non-official forms of “soft power” to be successfully enforced in Afghanistan. Actually, the Taliban Regime prohibited the use of modern communication tools in almost all the country including the internet and television; leading to the isolation and illiteracy of the majority of its citizens. Therefore, making Afghanistan a modernized country became an almost impossible mission (Smoot 44).

In fact, most of the Afghan people were repelled rather than attracted by Hollywood movies, because their majority were conservatives and Muslims, and in complete disfavor with the American way of life. Furthermore, Due to the Taliban’s spread of propaganda against Western societies, skepticism and even hatred towards the American culture raised. Consequently, a lot of US-based NGOs started working and providing humanitarian aids and development assistance in Afghanistan and successfully began attracting people and ameliorating the image of America (Smoot 44-45).

NGOs have, in fact, acquired an increasingly important role on the international scene, to the extent that the US government openly uses them. These organizations appeared in Afghanistan in 1979 after the Soviet invasion, throughout this period they provided food and refuges for the Afghan people and commenced many programs of education, healthcare and agriculture. Yet, the 9/11 attacks made their working atmosphere harder as more damages were done and more shelters and food were needed. Thus, they began having more functions in the Afghan society and were even in constant contact with women, disabled people and children (“Overview of Civil Society Organizations” 3-4). This showed that the Americans were clearly engaging in a strategy of large-scale influence on the most vulnerable persons in Afghanistan.

After the US military invasion, NGOs had the duty of reconstructing the country and enhancing its welfare by providing services in zones where governmental support was missing. Hence, they were responsible of building up security, restoring the system of justice, protecting the nation's civil rights, creating a democratic governance, etc. (Barajas et al. 1-2). This project of nation-building was really complex, NGOs found difficulties in reaching the intended goals. For this reason, they cooperated with the military forces and worked simultaneously in order to provide a better humanitarian assistance and advance a long-term security and stability (9). In 2003, Karzai, the President of Afghanistan, showed his support for the works of the NGOs stating that he would: "like to concentrate more on removing the causes of humanitarian difficulties rather than treating the symptoms" (qtd. in Mitchell 4).

On May 2003, Andrew Natsios, director of USAID, explicitly announced the new conditions of the US funding for these organizations. These conditions consisted of the NGO's need to achieve better results and better promote the US foreign policy, he even threatened them to stop the funding in case they fail. Moreover, Bush declared: "we are losing the public relations war. We're not getting credit for what we are doing for the Afghan people" (qtd. in "Humanitarian Exchange" 5). Accordingly, Natsios became more aware of the importance of NGOs, and later declared: "The work we do is now perceived to affect the national survival of the US" (qtd. in "Humanitarian Exchange" 6).

In fact, the humanitarian argument was just an excuse to serve the political and military ambitions of the United States of America. Even though the armed forces and NGOs operated simultaneously on the same field of intervention with different missions, but they had one major goal to achieve. Both the humanitarian actions and the contact with the people aimed at raising the compassion, loyalty and confidence of the civilian population towards the US and guarantying the NGO's impartiality in the conflict. Even though these armed forces and

NGOs could take care of assistance, they could not legitimately claim humanitarian actions and even less play the role of coordinators of humanitarian actions.

1.2. Official Forms of Soft Power

Due to their huge importance, aid programs became among the most financed instruments of US “soft power”. Indeed, after the disasters that happened in Afghanistan, the US Government became more committed to renovating its educational system. Between 2002 and 2010, \$56.1 billion were administered only in aid programs implemented in Afghanistan. Actually, a considerable amount of the supply provided to the country focused on education as it allowed the United States to combat radical ideologies, and guaranteed the ability of convincing the Afghan people to be in disfavor of extremism. Furthermore, education was one of the most serious problems that the nation was facing. Actually, the quality of education was poor, due to poorly trained teachers and there was a lack of school equipments such as textbooks. This made it easier for the United States to have a total control of the discipline. Thus, the USAID commenced emphasizing on it and began constructing schools in addition to providing competent teachers and materials (Smoot 45-48). In fact, educating the Afghan people was among the best ways to spread the American culture and ideologies, as the majority of the new teachers were either Americans, or Afghans who got trained in America, and consequently affected by the American ideology and culture.

Development and humanitarian aids are crucial instruments of “soft power”. They are fundamental in establishing appropriate conditions for a democratic and powerful government. For example, the Afghan people had to engage in political systems. In order to do so, they had to effectively read an election poll and have well constructed roads through which they can attend the ballots, etc. Nonetheless, these conditions were unavailable in Afghanistan, which led to the construction of more than 1,650 miles of roads by the USAID (Smoot 46-47)

Moreover, due to the presence of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan at that time, the public healthcare service was missing in the country, leading to a high degree of children deaths along with a life expectancy of the Afghan people of only approximately 44 years. Nevertheless, since USAID started providing help, the situation in the country began being repaired. More than \$110 million have been provided to NGOs in order to take care of the delivery of medical supplies and nutrition (Smoot 46-47). NGOs became “soft power” winners, since they were very liked by the Afghan people. This is why America used them to export cultural values.

Furthermore, the US government thought of the importance of Afghan women, who were neglected in their society, it started making more efforts in order to improve their status and provide equality to men. At that time, women were deprived of their human rights such as education and work. As a consequence, the United States began fighting religious fundamentalism by helping girls to go to school and freeing women under the Taliban rule. In a declaration made by Bush he stated: “Today women are free, and are part of Afghanistan’s new government” (qtd. in Kolhatkar 22). In addition, women began getting governmental positions in their countries particularly those concerning women’s rights.

In 2010, \$175 million were put aside in order to improve the Afghan women’s situation and guide them to endorse some important jobs such as police officers, investigators and judges with the purpose of instructing them to defend themselves against violence and discrimination. In addition, the United States managed to increase Afghan women’s awareness and show them that they are considered equal to men in the new judicial system of Afghanistan, through the implementation of forums, media discussions, and seminars. Doing this was beneficial to the functioning of US democracy because it grants them the cooperation of the Afghan women and facilitates their contribution in the political system (Smoot 48-49).

Naturally, with the United States amelioration of Afghan's conditions by educating and providing them with healthcare and constructing new roads in addition to giving women their rights, the Afghan population will have more compassion inside their minds and hearts for the US. Moreover, they will start to appreciate the American culture, foreign policies and political values.

3. The United States Resources of Soft Power in Afghanistan

American efforts to impose democracy through the use of merely "hard power" have been a total failure. Its military intervention in Afghanistan led to the raise of anti-Americanism, because their presence there appeared to many residents as an imperial occupation. In addition, this presence generated considerable costs in terms of human lives and financial resources. For these reasons, the Bush administration attempted to find new methods to control the area and became aware that it did not use its "soft power" abilities when needed. Therefore, in addition to the aid programs as a tool of influence, it attempted to attract the Afghan people through promoting the American culture and showing the legitimacy of both its political values and foreign policy.

In order to do so, the United States began broad casting activities in Afghanistan through the Voice of America (VOA) and Radio Liberty (Smoot 77). The expertise, technology and funding needed to uphold local Afghans to work on the programs were provided by USAID. In February 2002, USAID and the NGOs put into action a program in Afghanistan in order to generate a local media atmosphere outside some of the Afghan cities (77), this business has established "the capacity of local independent media through technical support, equipment upgrades, hands-on training, business development, and strengthening of media industry institutions, networks, and associations to increase media professionalism" ("USAID Launches Innovation").

Furthermore, it linked between many communities around the country and provided the isolated population who lacked technological means with some tools of communication. The majority of the broadcasts were presented in Kabul with a programming of 4 to 6 hours per day. The goal of these broadcasts was to make sure that the local media would convince the Afghan population that the United States' assistance was of huge importance for their country (Smoot 77).

All the broadcasting programs sponsored by the government in Afghanistan were implemented by the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG), these programs aimed at generating attraction for US policies and values. When the international broadcasting programs provide accurate information about all the countries of the world including Afghanistan, the interests of the US foreign policy would be achieved, "Given access to full, balanced, and objective information, people around the world will be more likely to embrace democratic ideals, respect for the rule of law" (Smoot 79). VOA began broadcasting in Afghanistan after the invasion of the Soviets, but after their departure its activities decreased (79). Americans probably thought that influencing people through attraction was no longer necessary.

After the 9/11 attacks and the failure of military intervention in Afghanistan, a great focus on broadcasting activities reappeared. In 2002, VOA expended its services of Patcho and Dari to 3 hours per day instead of 1,35. In 2004, these 2 services launched VOA Radio Ashna with a broadcast of 12 hours per day. In 2006, they added 9 hours to Deewa programming (Smoot 85), which presented current events and news. A managing editor of this service said: "We at Deewa Radio work to explain complex and regional politics as well as local issues of concern to the Pashtun people" (qtd. in Smoot 87). Drug addiction was one the most tackled subjects of this channel, it aimed at preventing the spread of drugs and educating the local population. In addition, there were other subjects such as the role of women in the society and health

issues. The main purpose of these programs was to provide accurate information with the preservation of the compliance of VOA charter (87). This VOA programs has been crucial in serving the US's long-term interests for decades, through directly communicating with people all over the world, and intended to "represent America, not any single segment of American society, and will therefore present a balanced and comprehensive projection of significant American thought and institutions" (Smoot 84). Furthermore, it was stated that it will "present the policies of the United States clearly and effectively, and will also present responsible discussions and opinion on these policies" (Smoot 84). These two conditions are still applied by the VOA in Afghanistan in order to influence the population about the reliability of its news.

In 2004, VOA generated Radio Ashna, a new channel with a daily broadcast of 12 hours. The production of the content was made in Washington offices and after sent to the bureau of Kabul. All kinds of programs were implemented including poetry, news, literature, sports, music, etc. Due to the fact that the shows allowed people to express their opinions and ask questions, and the programs were broadcasted in Pashto and Dari, radio Ashna became very popular with five major frequencies in five Afghan cities. Another important program implemented by VOA was the TV Ashna, which was watched by approximately the half of adults one time a week minimum (Smoot 87). These kinds of programs permitted to the Bush administration to show to Afghanistan the American culture, pop music, literature, art..., etc. and made them appreciate it more, and probably embrace it.

Another important resource of US "soft power" are the exchange programs, Since 2001, various exchange programs in Afghanistan were funded and implemented by the United States, whether administrative, academic or military. Both the USAID and US State department took care of different exchange programs in the country. Among the most important ones managed by USAID was the Fulbright Exchange Program. This program

existed since 1946 but was restored in the country in 2003. It consists of selecting post-secondary Afghan pupils and sending them to America and vice versa aiming at “increasing mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries” (Smoot 55). Exchanges for Afghan teachers were as well implemented in order to train them and make them aware of the American culture and system of education. After a whole week in Washington D.C, the participants would get back to their country and deliver their experience to their students. Moreover, Internet exchange programs started to be applied, in which students and teachers began online seminars, and built relationships with foreigners (55-56).

The main purpose of all these programs was making the American cultural values more attractive and universal, showing that the US government promotes human values, such as democracy, peace and human rights, and proving to the citizens that the US policies are legitimate with moral authority. In addition, those who visit a country and participate in an exchange program will probably be more favorable to its ideology.

4. The Shift to Smart Power

As early as 2009, Hillary Clinton claimed the implementation of intelligent power; the clever combination of “hard” and “soft power”, as she said:

I believe that American leadership has been wanting, but is still wanted. We must use what has been called “smart power,” the full range of tools at our disposal – diplomatic, economic, military, political, legal, and cultural – picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation. With smart power, diplomacy will be the vanguard of foreign policy. (qtd. in Haaf 5)

This was a kind of Rhetoric aiming at revitalizing American “soft power” that was weakened during the Bush era. The Obama administration was prepared to engage in new

strategies based on a combination of all tools of influence in order to adapt its leadership and ameliorate its foreign policy.

Since the beginning of his presidency, Obama considered the War in Afghanistan as a “right war” and decided to focus on it rather than on the Iraq conflict, because according to him the War in Iraq was a “wrong war”. During the first year of Obama’s presidency, US troops have been withdrawn from Iraq, but upgraded in Afghanistan to almost 100,000 troops. Even the funding of the Operation Enduring Freedom there doubled to \$100 billion (Tardelli 18). However, instead of ameliorating the situation in Afghanistan, the Obama administration made things worse by focusing more on Al Qaeda and Taliban leaders and increasing the number of ‘kill-or-capture’ actions and drone attacks against them. In 2010, 118 drone strikes were authorized, much more than during the Bush administration which authorized only 44 drone attacks between 2004 and 2008. These attacks pushed the Taliban to increase its reliance on improvised explosive devices. Indeed, in September 2011, they attacked the NATO and US Embassy in Kabul and murdered the Afghan head of Peace Council Barhuddin Rabbani (19). For this reason, the Obama administration had to focus more on the use of other forms of influence including “public diplomacy” and “soft power” and leave force and coercion as a last option.

As an alternative, Obama implemented a new foreign policy far different from that of his predecessor Bush. His policy was based on a smarter combination of “soft power”, connecting the power of attraction and influence, the diplomatic tool and the hard, and military and economic power (Valdés-Ugalde and Duarte 98). This new policy left the use of force as a last resort and preferred to focus on other tools of foreign policy including diplomacy and economic policy, Robert M. Gates; the secretary of defense; stated:

One of the most important lessons of the Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan is that military success is not sufficient to win: economic development, institution-

building and the rule of law, promoting internal reconciliation, good governance, providing basic services to the people, training and equipping indigenous military and police forces, strategic communications, and more – these, along with security, are essential ingredients for long term success. (qtd. in “Dealing With Today’s Asymmetric ...” 6)

In addition, Obama stated in a speech in Cairo that: “We also know that military power alone is not going to solve the problems in Afghanistan” (Nuruzzaman). Indeed, The US military interventions in Afghanistan were no longer the only or main component of their leadership, a major focus started being given to the use of a more pragmatic strategy known as “Smart Power”.

Communication, training, and education were the main focus of the US public diplomacy in Afghanistan, this is why the new projects were implemented in the country in order to train and teach diplomats. One of these projects was the Young Diplomat Training Program. The latter was implemented in order to improve people’s capacities in relation to language and policy, etc. (Kamminga 8). The main goal of this program was increasing reciprocal understanding between persons from the United States and others from other countries, through the demonstrations of their culture and educational systems, for the purpose of making the relationship between the US and other nations more peaceful, sympathetic and friendly (“Funding Opportunity Description” 1).

In 2010, the US State Department invested in more communicative tools including new network towers and mobile phones that cost around \$ 113 million. These new tools permitted to hundreds of Afghan citizens to have an education in the United States. In order to generate empathy and tolerance between the American and Afghan’s cultures, many US public and private initiatives cooperated to implement cultural exchanges and dialogues, among them the Global Citizens in Action program (Kamminga 8-9). Here, the culture is usually utilized in

order to generate an interaction between Americans and the Afghan people, basically aiming at accomplishing foreign policy goals.

The Comprehensive Approach was another strategy used by the United States in Afghanistan, it consists of a combination between the army and the civilians in order to achieve military objectives, or in other terms it focuses on the support of public diplomacy for military ends (Kamminga 9-10). Civil–Military Cooperation (CIMIC) is one example of the different means of this approach. In this case, the military were usually compelled to participate in non-military activities and have a constant contact with the civilians. Nevertheless, this comprehensive approach is too limited due to the fact that Public diplomacy is a force that depends a lot on the presence of military army (9-10).

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, against Washington and New York, the Bush administration has taken a series of unilateral decisions, most of them were contrary to the international law and worsened the American image around the world. Among these decisions was waging the War in Afghanistan. It is true that the Americans are accustomed to interfere in the civil wars of other people. However, what was different in this case was the way they entered this war and the means they used to get out of it. In that fight, American policy led to disastrous results, not only a considerable number of Afghans were killed and tortured, but even members of the American military died, and Afghanistan was destroyed as well.

Therefore, the US started struggling to put in place new policies based on softer means in order to achieve political and cultural goals aiming at influencing the Afghans through attraction and seduction rather than force. Thus, it implemented humanitarian aids, exchange programs, broadcasting activities, etc. to spread its culture and make its actions legitimate in the eyes of others. However, when Obama came into power, he recognized that the Bush doctrine was a failure and that other means based on the use of both diplomatic and military

means had to be applied. Indeed, since 2009 he commenced applying such method and started assuring America the restoration and maintenance of its leadership.

Conclusion

For decades, “hard power” has been the traditional tool for the American foreign policy. A tool based on the use of either coercion by the threat of military retaliation, or incitement through economic control. Nevertheless, this strategy was not as fruitful as expected since it led to disastrous results such as the death of a considerable number of people and the destruction of many colonized countries around the world, besides it fed anti-Americanism in many countries in the world. Therefore, during the two last decades the US government started implementing another strategy known as “soft power” based on the use of softer means. As a result. The US began using the power of attraction of its culture, its ideas and its domestic policies.

The attacks of September 11, 2001, against the US led to the destruction of the symbols of its power and showed to the whole world its vulnerability to terrorist attacks and the hostility to which it was subject. Since then, the US government has waged a relentless fight against international terrorism. Indeed, soon after the attacks George W. Bush declared a “war on terror” and succeeded in gaining the support of many nations. However, the first action taken by the US government was not appreciated. In 2001, the Bush administration launched an operation known as the “Operation Enduring Freedom” in Afghanistan, for the aim of destroying Al Qaeda sanctuary, and stopping terrorist actions in the country.

As soon as the US soldiers, with the cooperation of other soldiers from NATO nations, put their feet in Afghanistan, they started using military force, or in other words “hard power”. They bombarded, killed and tortured hundreds of people leading to the destruction of a country which was already in a really bad situation. Furthermore, the Bush administration suspected Iraq of harboring weapons of mass destruction and providing terrorists with them, thus they waged another war there in 2003 to stop them.

The bad results of the war in Afghanistan, along with the failure of the war in Iraq, and the highly criticized “National Security Strategy”, which was used to justify military actions undertaken in some nations, undermined the image of the United States leading to the rise of anti-Americanism, not only in the Middle East but also in many European countries. As a result, the US realized that this strategy based on military actions was no longer effective for its fight against terror and began implementing “soft power” and trying to transform the Middle East societies by controlling the citizens’ ideas through persuasion and attraction. The first “soft power” strategy engendered by the Bush administration in the Middle East was the reconstruction of Afghanistan. Indeed, the US forces along with some NATO members and NGOs started rebuilding a nation devastated by decades of war, for the purpose of winning the “hearts and minds” of the Afghan people through making them accept the Western presence, cooperate with them and eject extremism from their minds. Thus, the coalition began providing humanitarian aid, taking care of health and assistance, defending the rights of women, reconstructing roads, fighting against poverty, etc. All this help provided by the US was a good strategy for promoting its foreign policy and thus ameliorating its image.

The US did not stop its “soft power” strategy in Afghanistan only by reconstructing the country, but it attempted to upgrade it and make its citizens appreciate the United States more. This was done through spreading its culture, its political values and showing the legitimacy of its foreign policies. In fact, millions of dollars were spent by the country only for education; they constructed schools and provided them with appropriate materials and suitable teachers. The teachers were either Americans, or Afghans who got trained in America. Thus, they had a good understanding of the American culture and contributed a lot in spreading it and making the Afghan students more attracted to it. Other ways to spread the culture was the exchange programs, which consisted of bringing US students to Afghanistan and vice versa.

When students go to the United States to study there, they get in touch with its culture and appreciate it more; and once the US students are in Afghanistan, they share their culture with Afghans, too.

Moreover, Broadcasting activities were implemented in Afghanistan including the Voice of America and Radio Liberty. This radio channels passed daily programs in many cities of the country showing the American music, art, literature, etc. In addition, the Afghan people were deprived of technology, and the US provided them with some technological tools and started showing them their ideology based on democracy and free life. This helped the US government to succeed in making many of the Afghan citizens, who were in complete disfavor with the American way of life, appreciate it more and even embrace it.

Despite the fact that Bush somehow succeeded in enforcing “soft power” in Afghanistan, and tried reconstructing the country, he made more harm than benefice. When Obama came to office, “smart power” became a major tool in its foreign policy. It was based on the use of both “soft” and “hard” power. Nonetheless, he focused more on expanding his influence through attraction and developing better relationships with the Muslim world, leaving the use of military force as a last alternative.

Bibliography

Books

Collins, Joseph J. *Understanding War in Afghanistan*. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 2011. Web. 5 May 2018.

Leffler, Melvin P., and David S. Painter, eds. *Origins of The Cold War*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2005. Web. 27 Feb. 2018.

Nye, Joseph S. Jr. *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. New York: Basic Books, 1990. Web. 22 Feb. 2018.

----- *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004. Web. 15 Feb. 2018.

Parmer, Inderjeet and Michael Cox, eds. *Soft Power and US Foreign Policy*. 2nd ed. Britain: Routledge, 2010. Web. 27 Feb. 2018.

Woodward, Bob. *Bush at War*. New York: Simon and Schuster Center, 2002. Web. 8 May 2018.

Articles

Brown, Colin. "Bush Threatens Iran with Military Action." *Independent*. 17 June 2008. Web. 3 Mar. 2018.

"Dealing with today's Asymmetric Threat to US and Global Security." *CACI International Inc*. Sept. 2009. Web. 13 Apr. 2018.

Dimitrova, Anna. "Obama's Foreign Policy: Between Pragmatic Realism and Smart Diplomacy." *Ecole Supérieur du Commerce Extérieur*. n.d. Web. 1 Mar. 2018.

Gregg II, Gary L. "George W. Bush: Foreign Affairs." *the University of Virginia Miller Center*. 2017. Web. 13 Apr. 2018.

Hertz, Eli E. "The Right to Self-Defense." *The International Court of Justice and the Goldstone Report*. 2009. Web. 5 May 2018.

Lindsay, James M. and Ivo H. Daadler. "The Bush Revolution: The Remarkings of America's Foreign Policy." *The Brookings Institution*. May 2003. Web. 4 May 2008.

Kellner, Douglas. "9/11, Spectacles of Terror, and Media Manipulation: A Critique of Jihadist and Bush Media Politics." N.p. n.d. Web. 5 Jun 2018.

Nye, Joseph. "The Decline of America's Soft Power." *Council on Foreign Relations*. May 2004. Web. 25 Feb. 2018.

"USAID Launches Innovation Laboratory in Kabul." *US Agency for International Development*. 23 Jan 2012. Web. 18 June 2018.

"Overview of Civil Society Organizations." *Civil Society Briefs*. June 2009. Web. 25 May 2018.

Rugh, William. "American Soft Power and Public Diplomacy in the Arab World." *Palgrave communication*. 1 Aug. 2017. Web. 27 Feb. 2018.

Rosenau, William. "Waging the War of Ideas." *Political Scientist, the RAND Corporation Washington Office*. n.d. Web. 5 APR. 2018.

Totoonchie, Kathleen. "The Power Politics of the Bush Doctrine: International Security and the War on Terrorism." *Boston College*. 2004. Web. 1 Mar. 2018.

Journal Articles

Afshan, Sajid. "NATO Mission in Afghanistan: Problems and Prospects." *Issra Papers* (2011): 67-77. Web. 13 May. 2018.

- Bergensen, Albert J. and Yi Han. "New Directions for Terrorism Research." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 46 (2005): 133-151. Web. 18 June. 2018.
- Lin, Li and LengHongtao. "Joseph Nye's Soft Power Theory and its Revelation towards Ideological and Political Education." *Humanities and Social Sciences*.5.2 (2017): 69-74. Web. 6 Jan. 2018.
- Khatib, Lina and Klaus Dodds. "Geopolitics, Public Diplomacy and Soft Power." *Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication* 2 (2009): 5-12. Web. 5 Mar. 2018.
- Kolhatkar, Sonali. "The Impact of US Intervention on Afghan Women's Rights." *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law and Justice* 17.1 (2002): 12-30. Web. 15 May 2018.
- Lizardo, Omar. "Defining and Theorizing Terrorism: A Global Actor-Centered Approach." *Journal of World-Systems Research* 2 (2008): 91-118. Web. 16 June 2018.
- Mitchell, David F. "NGO Presence and Activity in Afghanistan, 2000-2014: A Provincial-Level Dataset." *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development*. 6.1 (2017): 1-18. Web. 24 May 2018.
- Nuruzzaman, Mohammed. "President Obama's Middle East Policy, 2009-2013." *Gulf University of Science and Technology*.17.1 (2015). N.P. Web. 17 May 2018.
- Parraguez, Luisa and Mariana Gonzalez Rodriguez. "The American Way of War: Afghanistan and Iraq." *Revista Enfoques* 11 (2013): 77-101. Web. 12 May 2018.
- Solomon, T. "The Effective Underpinnings of Soft Power." *European Journal of International Relations*. 20.3 (2014): 720-741. Web. 2 Mar. 2018.
- Tellis, Ashley J. "Assessing America's War on Terror: Confronting Insurgency, Cementing Primacy." *The National Bureau of Asian Research* 15.4 (2004): 1-100. Web. 9 May 2018.

Zagacki, Kenneth S. "The Rhetoric of American Decline: Paul Kennedy, Conservatives, and the Solvency Debate." *Western Journal of Communication* 56 (1992): 376-381. Web. 9 Feb. 2018.

Newspaper Article

Becker, Jo and Scott Shane. (2016, February 27). Hilary Clinton, 'Smart Power' and a Dictator's Fall. The New York Times. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/>

Magazine Articles

"Humanitarian Exchange." *Humanitarian Practice Network*. Dec. 2003. 1-43. Web.

Valdès-Uglade, José Luis and Frania Duarte. "Saving the Homeland: Obama's New Smart Power Security Strategy." *Voices of Mexico*. n.d. 97-100. Web. 26 May 2018.

Dissertations

Saleh, Layla. "Soft Power, NGOs, and the US War on Terror." Diss. U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. 2012. Web. 25 May 2018.

Papers

Conetta, Carl. "Strange Victory: A Critical Appraisal of Operation Enduring Freedom and the Afghanistan War." Project of Defense Alternatives, 30 Jan. 2002. Web. 12 May 2018.

Gross, Eva. "The Limits of European Soft Power." Institute for European Studies, Free University Brussels. n.d. Web. 15 May 2018.

Kamminga, Jorrit. "Public Diplomacy in Afghanistan beyond the 2014 Transition: Lessons from the United States and the Netherlands." Netherlands Institute of International Relations, June 2013. Web. 10 May 2018.

"Operation Enduring Freedom and the Conflict in Afghanistan: An Update." International Affairs and Defense Section, 31 Oct. 2001. Web. 12 May 2018.

Rupérez, Javier. "The United Nations in the Fight against Terrorism." Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate, n.d. Web. 5 May 2018.

Roberts, Adam. "Afghanistan and International Security." International Law Studies. n.d. Web. 13 May 2018.

Stanekzai, Masoom Mohd. and Masaki Kudo. "Security Sector Reform in Afghanistan: Insights from the Field." Japan Bank for International Cooperation, Sept. 2008. Web. 13 May. 2018.

Reports

Afghanistan Country Report. Immigration and Nationality Directorate Home Office, United Kingdom, Apr. 2004. Web. 12 May 2018.

Barajas, Richard, et al. *Nation-Building in Afghanistan: A Role for NGOs*. La Follette School of Public Affairs, 2006. Web. 24 May 2018.

Carlile, Lord. *The Definition of Terrorism*. Bell Yars, London, 15 Mar. 2007. Web.

Galis, Paul. *NATO in Afghanistan: A Test of the Transatlantic Alliance*. Congressional Research Service, 23 Oct. 2007. Web. 13 May 2018.

Hochwart, Michael A. *The Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghanistan- a Model for Future Nation Building Operations*. School of Advanced Military Studies, 2009. Web. 13 May 2018.

Kean, Thomas H, and Lee Hamilton. *The 9/11 Commission Report*. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, 2004. Web. 11 Apr. 2018.

Larsen, Henrik B.L. *NATO in Afghanistan: Democratization Warfare, National Narratives, and Budgetary Austerity*. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Dec. 2013. Web. 13 May 2018.

Report from the Field: The USA PATRIOT Act at Work. US Department of Justice, July 2004. Web. 8 May 2018.

Tardelli, Luca. *The United States after Unipolarity: Obama's Interventions: Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya*. London School of Economics and Political Science, 2012. Web. 1 Jun 2018.

Theses

Acey, Philip. *Winning Hearts and Minds: Population-Centric Counterinsurgency in the North Caucasus Federal District*. University of Tempere, 2013. Web. 21 May 2018.

Haaf, Dynph Ten. *The Implementation of Smart Power in American Foreign Policy Regarding the Ukraine Crisis and South China Sea Conflict*. Universiteit Leiden, 8 Sept. 2016. Web. 3 June 2018.

Movesesiyanyan, Torkom. *Raqs Sharqi in Cultural Diplomacy; An Important but Neglected Diplomatic Tool in US-Egypt Diplomatic Relations*. MA Thesis. City University of New York, 2013. Web. 20 Feb. 2018.

Ragavan, Nambee. *International Student Exchange Among Muslim Nations; Soft Power and Voting Alliances At the United Nations*. MA Thesis. Bemidji State University, 2011. Web. 21 Feb 2018.

Renken, Wiebke. *Social Media Use in Public Diplomacy*. MA Thesis. Stirling and Lund University. 2014. Web. 23 Feb 2018.

Smoot, Taylor. *United States Soft Power- Free and Open Media to Bolster Afghan Democracy*. MA Thesis. Charles University, 2012. Web. 5 Nov. 2017.

Štverková, Iva Mgr. *The Role of the US in NATO: How Did It Change after 9/11 under Bush Administration*. MA Thesis. Charles University, 2017. Web. 24. Feb. 2018.

Web pages

Bashir, Abdul Wahab. Scholars Define Terrorism, Call for Joint Action to Defend Islam Dossier Palestina. 26 May 2005. Web. 18 June 2018.

Boaz, Ganor. *Defining Terrorism- Is One Man's Terrorist Another Man's Freedom Fighter?* International Institute for Counter-Terrorism. 1 Jan. 2010. Web. 18 June 2018.

Steingart, Gabor, and Gregor Peter Schmitz. It's Pointless to Talk to Al Qaeda. Spiegel Online. 17 August 2009. Web. 17 Feb 2018.

Government documents

"Notional Strategy for Combating Terrorism." US government. Feb. 2003. Web. 5 May 2018.

"North Atlantic Treaty Organization." N.p. n.d. Web. 4 Apr. 2018.

"President Dwight D. Eisenhower's Trip to South America, February 23-March 7, 1960." Foreign Relations. 1960. Web. 23 Feb. 2018.

United Nations. "Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism." General Assembly. 9 Dec. 1994. Web. 19 June 2018.

US Embassy. Department of State. "Funding Opportunity Description." Public Affairs. n.d. Web. 2 June 2018.

----- "Resolution 1373." Security Council. 28 Sept. 2001. Web. 7 May 2018.

US and Coalition. "The United States and the Global Coalition against Terrorism." US

Department of State. June 2004. Web. 5 May 2018.