AN APPRAISAL OF AMERICA'S MILITARY-ORIENTED STRATEGY AGAINST ANTI-AMERICA TERRORISM

EZE R. C. (Ph.D)
Department of Political Science,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka,
Anambra State, Nigeria
Email: ezeraphaelc@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT
Worried by the intractability of international terrorism, its attendant destruction of lives as well as the global catastrophic socio-economic cum political consequences, the paper appraised the prevailing American anti-terrorism strategy which is essentially military. It interrogated the effectiveness of the strategy. Utilizing secondary sources of data, content analysis, as well as Frustration-Aggression Theory, it examined the actual causes of anti-America terrorism and U.S. responses. It found that the provocative foreign policy injustices, actions and inactions of the U.S. and her allies against weak state and non state actors are the causes. It also discovered that the prevailing American anti-terrorism military strategy is ineffective as it is not directed at the 'real causes' of terrorism. On the basis of the findings, the paper made recommendation as to the effective strategy in fighting terrorism.

Keywords: Terrorism, Military Strategy, Axis of Evil, Imperialism and Hegemonism

INTRODUCTION

With the devastating September 11, 2001 Al-Qaeda network terrorist attack on America, the United States Government, till date, has been applying 'gun-boat' (or military) strategy to combat terrorism in and outside America. In his September 20, 2001 address to Americans, George W. Bush (*Time*, May 26, 2003:24) stated inter-allia that "Our war will not end until every terrorist group of global reach, has been found, stopped and defeated". In this regard, Williams and Head (2006:439) note that Bush took the opportunity offered by the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on U.S. to "declare war on terror against an 'axis of evil' habouring or supporting terrorists.

America's military strategy led to her invasion of Taliban controlled Afghanistan, alleged to have been habouring Osama Bin Laden-the architect of September 11, 2001 terrorist attack; Saddam's Iraq (alleged to be sponsoring anti-American terrorism); killing of Osama Bin Laden inside Pakistan (10 years after September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on U.S.); offering military training and equipments to other countries in their war against terror; arresting, torturing and detaining suspected terrorists, as well as aerial bombardments (especially with the use of drone attacks) on suspected anti-America (and her allies') terrorists, etc.

Unfortunately, despite U.S. military counter-terrorism strategy, the problem of terrorist activities, especially by Al-Qaeda (and its increasing affiliates such as Somalia's Shabab, Nigeria's Boko Haram, etc) continues against U.S. citizens, her allies and places of interest across the globe. This continuing terrorist activities, with its attendant destruction of lives and property is overheating the international political community.

Worried by the above problem, this study set itself to appraise the effectiveness of the United States military strategy against terrorism with a view to proffering necessary panacea for rolling-back terrorism and its generated insecurity.

As a guide to achieve the objective of the study, we posed the following research questions:
(a). What are the actual causes of anti-America terrorism?
(b). To what extent is the American military strategy effectively tackling anti-America terrorism?

Taking cognizance of the above research questions, we hypothesize that:
(a). The actual causes of anti-America terrorism are the adverse imperialistic foreign policies of the American government and her allies towards weaker states and non-state actors.
(b). Military strategy is not effectively tackling anti-America terrorism.

The study among others, shall be beneficial to the government of the United States of America in particular and other countries in general in their choice of strategy against terrorism and its attendant

insecurity, socio-economic and political retardation of mankind. Invariably, the study shall help to engender national and international peaceful co-existence necessary for meaningful development.

RESEARCH METHOD

In view of the *modus operandi* of terrorists (like members of Al-Qaeda network) and their general inaccessibility to researchers, the use of primary data gathering instrument such as questionnaires and interviews is not possible. Consequently, we adopted the secondary sources of information. Given the qualitative nature of the information gathered, we accordingly employed Content Analysis.

In line with the content analysis therefore, there will be thematic selection and focusing on qualitative data to address our research questions/hypotheses. Meanings will be extracted and based on logical chains of evidence inferences shall be drawn upon which conclusion shall be made.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

For appropriate appraisal of United States military strategy against terrorism, we adopted the Frustration-Aggression Theory. Though initially developed by John Dollard and his research associates, the Frustration-Aggression theory has been expanded and modified by scholars like Tedd Gurr, Leonard Berkowitz and Aubrey Yates. It appears to be the most common explanation for violent behaviours arising from inability to fulfill needs. Thus, Gurr (1970:36) avers that frustration is the "primary source of the human capacity for violence".

In a nut-shell, the main explanation that the Frustration-Aggression theory provides is that aggression is not just undertaken as either 'natural' or 'crazy reaction' as some believe. Instead, aggression is the outcome of frustration and in situation where the legitimate desires of an individual or group is denied (like the non-attainment of Palestinian state) either directly (such as by Israel and her Western allies like U.S.) or by the indirect consequence of the way the society is structured such as the prevailing uni-polar world order with lopsided U.N. under America's hegemony. The feeling of disappointment may lead such a person or group to express his or their anger through violence that will be directed at those he or they holds/hold responsible. In this regard, Graham (1989:15-16) notes that "Aggression can take the form of a physical attack on some person or object causing the frustration".

Therefore, from the foregoing postulation of the Frustration-Aggression theory, the most advisable thing political leaders (like in U.S.A.) ought to do is to find out the frustrating causes of the aggression or violence of the alleged terrorists (like HAMAS, Hezbollah, Al-Qaeda network, etc) and remove them (diplomatically). Thus, remove the '**cause'** (the independent variable) and the '**effect**' (the dependent variable) shall disappear.

Unfortunately, those in positions of authority (like the hegemonistic U.S. leaders) believe that giving in to demands or entering into negotiations with the alleged terrorists (or their representatives) to tackle the root cause of their aggression (alleged terrorism) is a sign of weakness. At the standpoint of 'might' makes 'right', they (the U.S.A. for example) employ military antidote which tantamounts to mere "symptomatic treatment" to terrorism rather than "causative therapy". The inadequacy of this strategy is woefully epitomized by continuation of terrorism.

FUNDAMENTAL CAUSES OF ANTI-AMERICA TERRORISM

Medically and otherwise the cause (or causes) of an ailment or problem should first be diagnosed upon which an effective antidote or panacea should be administered. Therefore, before we delve into the appraisal of America's military strategy against anti-America terror, we first x-ray the root causes of terrorist attacks on U.S. (and her allies and interests). Holsti (1995:153) notes that:

> *Terrorist groups and individuals have resorted to skyjacking, kidnapping*
> *and seemingly senseless killing as means of publicizing their grievances*
> *throughout the world.*

The question (arising from the above) then is "what are the grievances of the anti-America (and her allies) terrorists?" In a nut-shell, directly and indirectly, international terrorism is the cumulative effect or bye-product of the adverse imperialistic decisions, actions, inactions, practices and injustices of the U.S. and her allies against weaker state and non-state actors.

Like in "Stimulus-Response" relationship, we have "Frustration" and then "Aggression" hence, "Cause" and "Effect" relationship. Thus, the independent variable "A" causes the dependent variable "B". Here "A" represents the provocative cum frustrating imperialistic practices and injustice of the countries of the North (led by the U.S.) while "B" refers to the Aggression (violent responses) from the South (in terms

of terrorism) by the helpless aggrieved individuals and groups that view their actions as acts of liberation struggle. As Mclean (1996:492) notes, "one person's terrorist is another person's freedom fighter".

Chinweizu (1978:3) observes that:

> *"Western Europe and its diasporas have been disturbing the peace of the world for nearing six centuries…. Enlightened through the renaissance…, armed with the gun, …fortified in aggressive spirit, …and motivated by the lure of enriching plunder, white hordes penchant to sallied forth from their western European homelands to explore, assault, loot, occupy, rule and exploit the rest of us has not abated".*

Thus, from the era of slave trade, through colonialism to present neo-colonial epoch, third world countries have been ravaged by the west socially, culturally, economically, politically and otherwise.

Disregarding Section 2(4) of the United Nations Charter which prohibits the use of force or threats of it in the settlement of any international dispute, the United States of America, has for example (to mention but a few), through the instrumentality of naked power, directly and indirectly invaded Lebanon, Cuba, Dominican Republic, bombarded Libya's Tripoli and Benghazi in 1986, and masterminded pro-U.S. regime change and killing of Ghadaffi in 2011. Similarly, she (the U.S.) invaded Panama in 1989 and removed president Noriega just because he was no longer serving U.S. interest, unilaterally invaded and effected pro-U.S. regime change in Iraq and death of Saddam in 2003, invaded and effected pro-U.S. regime change in Afghanistan in 2001, formed the backbone of Israeli's continued settlement buildings and occupation of Palestinian lands contrary to U.N. resolution 242 of 1967. So also was U.S. invasion of Haiti and ousting of 'recalcitrant' general Cedras for the restoration to power of pro-U.S. president Aristide (Eze 2000:iv) to mention but a few.

These hegemonic practices on the part of U.S. are irritating to some nationalistic individuals and groups of the victim nations. When they retaliate in their own little way (such as the 1988 Pan-Am Airliner bombing over Scotland or the September 11, 2001 attacks on the U.S.) it is termed "terrorism". Hence, in international politics, "might makes right" and "justice is to the advantage of the stronger".

Indeed, the actual catalyst of terrorism is the West led by the United States of America that specialized in the application of Hans J. Morgenthau's "Political Realism" (Power Politics) and Nichollo Machiavelli's principle of "Fox and Lion". While posing as the global champion of peace, the U.S. and her allies clandestinely fuel the conflict in the third world through enormous arms sale, which alleged terrorists also use. Thus, Noluxolo (1994:2069) records that: "the total amount of money raised through arms sales to Somalia by the U.S. between the year 1981 and 1992 was $153.979m".

As "justice is to the advantage of the stronger", in the predatory terrain of international politics, the same U.S. that perpetrated the above in the war-torn-Somalia ironically masterminded the arrest, trial and imprisonment of ex-president Charles Taylor of Liberia for alleged instigation of war in neighboring Sierra Leone (Franklin 2007:48). Regardless of the principle of sovereignty and non-interference, the same U.S. fuelled the over 25-year bloody war in Angola by her open military and financial support to the Jonas Savimbi-led UNITA rebels against the legitimate MPLA Government-just because she (the U.S.) wanted an installation of a neo-colonial puppet regime for her economic cum geo-strategic interests (Obiukwu 1989:127). If it was possible for the over-frustrated supporters of legitimate MPLA Government and relatives of those massacred by the U.S. backed UNITA rebels to exhibit violent revenge against U.S. interests anywhere in the world, that would have been branded 'terrorism' by the U.S. and her allies, whereas the real cause-the U.S. subversive foreign policy action in Angola, would be disregarded (unless perpetrated by Charles Taylor and the likes).

Corollary, the Middle East remains a fertile ground for the emergence of alleged terrorist groups and individuals consequent upon the Arab-Israeli conflict and the adverse selfish Euro-American involvement in the region. In November 1947, the United Nations Assembly voted for the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish state. As David, et al (1979:29) notes:

> *The Zionists accepted the proposal but the Arabs rejected it. The U.N.*
> *could not enforce it. In the event it was enforced by the Israeli Army. On*
> *24 May, 1948, the state of Israel was proclaimed.*

In the 1967 six-day Israeli-Arab war, the Israel (with the help of the U.S. and her western allies) not only defended their new state but conquered and occupied more Arab territories such as the Sinai Peninsular, (later returned to Egypt after Camp David Accord), Golan Heights, West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem. Clandestinely backed by her western allies led by the U.S, Israel, till date, has continued to build Israeli settlement in the occupied lands contrary to 1967 U.N. resolution 242 requiring her (Israel) to

withdraw from the said land. This has rendered as utopia, the possibility of the creation of Palestinian state and angered the Arab world, hence, the emergence of liberation movements or freedom fighters (termed terrorists by Israel, U.S. and western allies) such as the HAMAS, Hezbollah, Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), and by extension the grievance of Al-Qaeda network, etc.

Barry Rubin et al (1994:5) notes that "the start of the movement to create Jewish settlements in the captured territories both reflected and deepened the sense that these lands should be kept, that there was no real peace option". On this, Adeniran (1983:59) observes that "the Israeli continued occupation of Arab lands regardless of U.N. resolutions on land for peace is a violation of international law, as it amounts to trespassing on other states territories and deprivation of the Palestinians of their rights to self-determination".

The U.S. aggressive scramble for the middle east oil coupled with her alignment with Israel gingered great strain in her relations with the Arab states (Stookey 1975:v). Till date, the American-led "Road Map" and mediation for peace in the Middle East remains smokescreen for pursuing U.S. economic and geo-strategic interests in the region.

The West led by the U.S. also directly and indirectly generates international terrorism in many other ways. During the Iran-Iraq war, contrary to the 'Law of Neutrality' governing the conducts of international war, "an Iranian ship was battered by American helicopter gun ships killing three Iranians and capturing about twenty five of them. An American naval ship, (U.S.S. Venccennes) also downed an Iranian Jumbo Jet over the Persian Gulf, killing all its nearly three hundred passengers" (Echezona 1993:30-31). In all these, if an aggrieved Iranian or patriotic cum nationalistic group had resorted to violent revenge against the U.S. citizens and interest in any part of the world, the same U.S. (and her western allies like Britain) would have baptized the action "terrorism" without seeing herself (the U.S.) as the actual cause of the terrorism-oriented vendetta. In the same vein, based on allegation that Iraq (under Saddam Hussein) was sponsoring terrorism and "manufacturing weapons of mass destruction" (Franklin 2007:25-26), the U.S., without U.N. final resolution for application of force, and with disregard to anti-war international public opinion, as well as non-concluded inspection by the officials of the U.N. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) weapon inspectors, unilaterally invaded Iraq, and effected a pro-U.S. regime change, as well as the death of Saddam Hussein.

Osama Bin Laden also exposed how the U.S. and her allies (like Israel) caused the September 11, 2001 catastrophic attack on the U.S. World Trade Centre and the Pentagon. In his video tape (released by Al-Jazeera on November 1, 2004) titled '**Our acts are reaction to your own acts**' addressed to citizens of the United State, Bin Laden dismissed as rhetoric claims by U.S. presidents George W. Bush that the attack occurred because Islamic extremists "hate freedom" saying "if Bush says we hate freedom, let him tell us why we didn't attack Sweden, for example". In his summary of the said Osama Bin Laden's message, Andrew Burnet (2006:64) notes that:

> *He (Bin Laden) argues that his followers are targeting the West because Western nations have harmed Muslim interests, denying them power and security. This he suggests is morally equivalent to the acts of terrorism pursued by Al-Qaeda-'your commodity that was returned to you'. He points specifically to the plight of the Palestinians displaced and dispossessed by Israel, with the support of the USA. Westerners who desired peace, he says, should promote the cause of Palestinians and other oppressed Muslim people. He emphasizes this message with a blunt threat: 'stop shedding our blood so as to preserve your blood'.*

So from Osama Bin Laden's widely televised speech, we deduce once more that the actual cause of the sporadic violent reactions (called terrorism) is the adverse imperialistic cum hegemonic foreign policy decisions and actions of powerful nations (like U.S.) against the down-trodden state and non-state actors from the South.

Presently, the U.S. is threatening Syria, Iran, North Korea, etc as its alleged "axis of evil". Note that the U.S. is the originator of nuclear armament which till date constitute a major threat to human existence itself. It should be observed that in our contemporary world, the much orchestrated "Globalization" is nothing but "Americanization" (Rosenberg 1982:13) and those not fast in swallowing, in-toto, America's socio-economic and political values, are directly and indirectly being coerced to follow suit especially through direct and indirect use of force-including unilateral imposition of strangulating economic and other sanctions to non-pro U.S. governments in the Third World (Dillibe, 1996). However, in America's "Carrot and Stick" foreign policy, her greater application of the "Big Stick" or force is generating more hatred for America and her allies, and hence, more globalization of terrorism.

Enunciating the exploit of the American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Stockwell (2007:48), posits that: "the C.I.A is a near perfect organization that carries out its assigned duties satisfactorily". He cited the various coups d'etat initiated and successfully executed by the CIA in Africa, South America, Asia and the Caribbean to remove unfriendly governments from power. The removal of Nkrumah, the assassination of Patrice Lumumba and Walter Rodney were some of the cases highlighted by Stockwell.

Indeed, in the North-South relations, many countries of the North, led by the United State of America have (in collaboration with their Third World pro-U.S. reactionaries) been carrying out subversive activities that saw the death of progressive cum nationalistic leaders like Late General Murtala Mohammed of Nigeria, President Laurent Kabilla of Congo, President Mitchel of Mozambique, Late Captain Thomas Sankara of Burkina Faso, etc. In this regard, Abubakar (1987:24) notes that directly and indirectly: "Imperialism tries by all means to eliminate leaders who have the vision and strategy to break away from its stranglehold".

In the same vein, where outright elimination fails, these imperialists sabotage and frustrate (especially via sanction and even direct military action), the developmental efforts of non-puppet regimes (like that of late Col. Muammar Ghadaffii of Libya, then President Fidel Castro of Cuba, Mugabe of Zimbabwe, late Chile's Allende, late Venezuela's Hugo Chavez, etc).

With the present transformation of the international order from "Bipolarity" to "Unipolarity" (under U.S. hegemony), international terrorism is bound to be on the increase. "Power", it is known, "corrupts" and "absolute power corrupts absolutely". In the hitherto Bipolar era, the Eastern Socialist block led by the defunct Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and the Western Capitalist bloc headed by the United States of America (USA) offered to each other the necessary "checks and balances" that greatly reduced their excesses.

Unfortunately, upon the disintegration of USSR, the U.S. became the only super power with little or no checks over her excesses-a situation where even the United Nations (the U.N.) is now "a mere rubber stamp" for the global hegemonistic interests of the prevailing "Leviathan". In this regard, Muyunda (1993:19) laments:

> *Now that the cold war is over, the U.S. has emerged as the sole great*
> *power. This uni-polarity means the U.S. can literally walk into any*
> *country now, and do anything it wants, in order to promote the free*
> *world.*

So, with uni-polarity and loss of hope on the United Nations by many down-trodden aggrieved weaker state and non-state powerless actors in our U.S.-driven predatory international terrain, terrorism becomes their last resort for either revenge or at least, draws global attention over their grievances.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AMERICA'S MILITARY STRATEGY AGAINST TERRORISM

The United States of America has been applying military strategy against international terrorism especially after September 11, 2001 catastrophic terrorist attack on her. Our preceding analysis has exposed the root cause of anti-America terrorism. Invariably, the prevailing military oriented counter-terrorism of the U.S. government is like a square peg in a round hole, and hence ineffective.

In a nut-shell, the U.S. military strategy for combating international terrorism entails:
a. No negotiation (or dialogue) with alleged terrorists;
b. Pursue, attack and kill terrorists with all military capability wherever they may be found in any part of the world.
c. Direct military attack, overthrow of government or regime suspected to be sponsoring or harbouring terrorist groups;
d. Increase in anti-terrorism budget;
e. Tight security network and terrorism information gathering-nationally and internationally;
f. Establish rapid response forces cum military bases in strategic parts of the world.
g. Application of unilateral and multilateral stringent sanctions and sabotage against countries suspected to be encouraging terrorism;
h. Close watch on Islamic countries with Muslim fundamentalists;
i. Arrest, torture and detention of alleged terrorists;
j. Increase in propaganda dismissing terrorism as irrational acts of crazed fanatics, etc.

Strategically, most of the above measures are military oriented. They are grounded on use of force and not on politico-diplomatic solution directed at removing observed root causes of the frustration on the

part of some state and non-state actors generating anti-America terrorism as a way of revenge or publicizing their grievances. Isa (2006:74) notes:

> *Trying to defeat terror with terror has brought the world to*
> *unexpected turn. We have let the jinx out of the box and we*
> *are fixed. We have done more damage to human lives than*
> *good.*

As stated earlier, in medical science and elsewhere, the identification of the actual cause of a problem is a major prerequisite upon which an effective antidote is administered. America's military strategy is not addressing the root cause of anti-America terrorism which borders on U.S. imperialistic actions and inactions against weaker state and non-state actors in the international political system. It is too focused on military solution rather on total overhaul of America's adverse and provocative hegemonic cum imperialistic foreign policy. Though air strikes have played well with the America public, because they give the impression that Washington is taking decisive action to strike back at terrorists, in reality, the U.S. war against terrorism has often taken the form of foreign policy by catharsis. Surgical air strikes may make sense in war time, when the targets are heavy equipment, lethal weaponry, communication centers and large concentration of armed forces. But "terrorist bases" generally contain none of these. As a result, air raids make little sense strategically.

Osama Bin Laden's Al-Qaeda cells, for example, are scattered over many parts of the world. In their application of guerrilla war tactics, terrorists have no clear war front or battle field. They decide how, when and where to attack, making non-sense the Techno-military capability of such a super power like the U.S. On Al-Qaeda, Stafano (2001:24) notes:

> *There are well established Qaeda cells from Indonesia to Europe and,*
> *possibly, the United States. There is not a hierarchy. These groups are*
> *coordinated by Bin Laden but not directed by him. Every one of them has*
> *its own ethnic and other peculiarities. Some of the groups-Egyptian*
> *Islamic Jihad and Algeria's Ahmed Islamic Group (GIA), for instance-*
> *existed before the rise of Bin Laden and could survive his demise.*

In the ongoing asymmetrical cum guerrilla war situation, military solution to terrorism is to no avail. In addition, targeting terrorist bases, which are often near populated areas, risks casualties among innocent civilians thus attracting more hatred for the U.S. In 1986 for instance, the U.S. bombed two Libyan cities (Tripoli and Benghazi) claiming many innocent lives, in retaliation for suspected Libyan involvement in a terrorist attack at a Berlin discotheque in which two Americans were killed. On this, Rourke (1997:361) laments:

> *Whether, for example, such acts as the U.S. attempt to kill Libya's leader*
> *Muammar Ghadaffi in a 1986 air raid constitute an assassination attempt*
> *and, therefore, a terrorist act. During the raid, F-111 warplanes rained*
> *2,000 pounds bombs on attacked Ghadaffi's residence. The Libyan leader*
> *was not there, but Ghadaffi's 15-month adopted was. She died, as did*
> *another 100 people who lived in nearby residential neighbourhoods.*

It is worth noting that a major trade mark of U.S. anti-terror military actions has been enormous unfortunate destruction of innocent lives, and property. Often, such air strikes are based on faulty intelligence, such as the 1993 bombing of a Baghdad neighbourhood in reaction to an unsubstantiated allegation of an Iraqi assassination attempt against former president Bush. Likewise, in August 1998 the U.S. bombed a Sudanese pharmaceutical plant, claiming it was a chemical weapons plant controlled by Osama Bin Laden. The Clinton administration subsequently refused to release the supposed evidence prompting these strikes or to allow independent investigations by the United Nations.

Rather than curbing terrorism, such U.S. military strikes or bombardments often oscillate the cycle of the violence, as terrorists seek further retaliation. In 1988, Libyan agents allegedly blew up a Pan Am Airliner over Lockerbie, Scotland, in retaliation for the U.S. strikes against Libyan cities. Thus, Libyans, Iraqis, Palestinians, and other people victimized by U.S. (and her allies like Israel, U.K., etc) bombing raids are likely to become more hostile toward the U.S. and more sympathetic to terrorists. Here again lies the porosity of U.S. gun-boat strategy against terrorism.

There are also serious legal question marks on the U.S. rampant use of force in tackling international terrorism. International law prohibits the use of armed forces except self-defence. Unfortunately, the U.S. appears to be above international law. She prefers constant use of naked power against weaker state actors like Sudan, Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan, etc.

In fact, the brutal application of force or military solution to terrorism by the U.S. remains ineffective both prior to and after the September 11, 2001 terrorists attack on her. Intermittently, terrorism continues against U.S. citizens and places of vital interest to U.S. and her allies whether in Pakistan, Kenya, Israel, Algeria, Lebanon, the Middle East in general and elsewhere. Right now, the U.S. is luring as well as coercing other countries of the world, especially the dependent third world, to join her (and her allies) in fighting against her self-inflicted injury (terrorism). As many countries join the U.S.-led war against terrorism, they invariably attract terrorists to themselves, and hence a globalization of terrorism.

The U.S. citizens are already suffering from the escalating "opportunity costs" of their government anti-terrorist policies such as more military spending, higher taxes and forfeiture of some personal freedom.

On the economic front the acute financial crisis in U.S. with its adverse spill-over effects on the global economy is directly and indirectly connected with her escalating military spending in her protracted war against terrorism in all parts of the world. Thus, enormous money that is supposed to be utilized for socio-economic and political welfare of the people is sacrificed at the altar of warfare. Such enormous money would have been saved if appropriate overhaul of U.S. adverse foreign policies is undertaken.

Lamenting on the anti-terrorist stringent policies leading to increasing loss of fundamental human rights hitherto enjoyed by American citizens, Hughes (2002:129) notes:

> *As the United State faces a new war against uncertain and new enemies,*
> *the temptation to sacrifice our freedom in the hopes of protecting*
> *ourselves from harm is powerful. The danger is that we will end up neither*
> *safe nor free.*

Though, the U.S. has succeeded in tracking down and killing Osama Bin Laden (the leader of Al-Qaeda network) 10 years after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on USA, till date, terrorist attacks by Al-Qaeda and its affiliates (and other terrorist elements) continue in many parts of the globe and especially against places of U.S. and her allies' interests, leading to continued loss of lives and properties and incessant restriction of travels and in some cases, closure of U.S. embassies.

FINDINGS

In the preceding analysis, we examined the fundamental causes of anti-America terrorism as well as x-rayed the effectiveness or otherwise of America's military oriented strategy against terrorism. In a nut-shell, through logical chain of evidences and inference, we deduced that:

(a). The actual causes of anti-America terrorism are the hegemonic and imperialistic foreign policy actions and inactions of the United States of America towards weaker states and non-state actors in the Third World especially the Arab nations and,

(b). The prevailing America Military strategy is not effectively tackling the actual causes of anti-America terrorism but is spreading terrorism elsewhere.

The above findings are in tandem with our stated hypotheses. Invariably, the policy implication of our findings is that the United States government should abandon her military oriented anti-terrorism strategy and adopt causative therapy grounded on abstaining from her hegemonic and imperialistic policies attracting external antagonisms cum vendetta.

CONCLUSION

In this study, we have x-rayed how the United States of America attracts terrorism against herself, her interests and allies across the globe as well as the ineffectiveness of her military strategy for combating terrorism that is not directed at removing the root causes of terrorism, for as Rourke (1997:361-362) rightly pointed out:

> *It is misleading to treat terrorism as the irrational acts of crazed fanatics.*
> *To the contrary, terrorism occurs because many of those who use it*
> *consider it a necessary, legitimate, and effective tool to rid themselves of*
> *what they consider oppression.*

As our Frustration-Aggression theoretical perspective postulated, frustration on the part of oppressed, aggrieved and frustrated state and non-state actors is indeed the "primary source of human capacity for violence" (Gurr, 1970:36). As Isa (2006:269) rightly advised "in order to make any permanent change, it is the cause that we must seek". Consequent upon the ineffectiveness and inadequacy of the present America's "symptomatic treatment", which among others, is merely targeting and killing alleged terrorists, this study therefore, recommends as a matter of urgency, that the United States of America should adopt a permanent "Causative Therapy"-that is America jettisoning her provocative imperialistic foreign policy actions and

resort to an overhauled foreign policy grounded on the principle of egalitarianism, justice, equity and fair-play as well as welfare (not warfare). This shall no doubt usher in a genuine global peaceful co-existence and socio-economic cum political development, devoid of subjugation of man by man and nation by nation.

REFERENCES

Adeniran, T. (1993), *Introduction to International Relations*, Ibadana: Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Ltd.

Andrew, B. (2006), *Chambers Book of Speeches*. Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers Ltd.

Anne, W. and Vivian Head (2006), Terror Attacks: The Violent Expression of Desperation. London: Omnipress.

Barry, R. et al (1994), *From War to Peace: Arab-Israeli Relations, 1973-1993*, New York: New York University Press.

Chinweizu (1978), *The West and the Rest of Us*, London: NOK Publishers.

David, S. et al (1979), *Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Minnesota: Greenhaven Press, Inc.

Dillibe, O. (1996), *A Message to my Compatriots: The Case Against Sanctions,* Enugu: Delta Publication Ltd.

Echezona, N. (1993), *Hegemonism or a New World Order*, Awka: MEKSLINK Publisher.

Eze, R. C. (2000), *International Law and Political Realism: Lessons for the Third World*, Enugu: Oktek Publishers.

Franklin, R. Jnr (2007), *The Arrest, Trial and Execution of Saddam Hussein*, Atlanta: Ivory Towers Ltd.

Graham, H. T. (1989), *Human Resources Management*, London: Longman Group.

Gurr, T. (1970), *Why Men Rebel*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Holsti, K. J. (1995), *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*, 7th Edition, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hughes, B. (2002), *The Secret Terrorists*, USA: Truth Triumphant.

Isa, O. (2006) *War on Terrrorism: Welfare not Warfare-An Alternative Weapon to Defuse Terror*, Enugu: Global Rays Publications.

Mclean, I. (ed) (1996), *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Noluxolo, N. (1994), "The Sinister Trade" *West Africa*, December 5-11.

Obiukwu, J. (1989), "Africa and the Super-Powers: the Implications of the involvement of the Superpowers in African conflicts", in *A Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, June, 1989.

Rosenberg, E. S. (1982), *Spreading the American Dream*, New York: Hill and Wang

Rourke J. T. (1997), *International Politics on the world stage*, 6th Edition, USA: McGraw Hill Company.

Stafano, D. (2001), in "War on Terror", *NEWSWEEK*, November 26.

Stockwell, S., in Marshal, O. (2007), "The Demystification of American C.I.A." *Fresh Facts*, Vol. 1, November 19-25.

Stookey, R. W. (1975), *America and the Arab States: An Uneasy Encounter*, New York John Willey and Sons Inc.

Time, "Why the War on Terror will never End" May 26, 2003, P.24.