UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

INSTITUTE OF DIPLOMACY AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

RETALIATORY TERRORISM ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

TOM AYORA

R51/67652/2013

A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN DIPLOMACY

© NOVEMBER 2018

DECLARATION

I, Tom Ayora hereby declare that this research project is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other University.

Signed: …………………………   Date…..............................

Tom Ayora

Declaration by the Supervisor

This project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the University supervisors.

Signature: …………………….....   Date: ………………………….

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my wife Jackline Bonareri for her continued support and inspiration which has brought me this far. My love, thank you and May the Lord keep and bless you abundantly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I hereby acknowledge The Almighty God in Heaven for enabling me to successfully pursue this course.

Secondly to my beloved immediate and extended family and relatives for your support during my studies.

To my classmates and friends I appreciate your support that proved invaluable in putting this together.

To my supervisor Dr. Patrick Maluki, I am grateful for the sacrifice and guidance.

God bless you all abundantly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AICOC	Anglo-Iranian Oil Company
AOR	Area of Responsibility
ASALA	Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia
CENTCOM	Central Command
CENTO	Central Treaty Organization
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
DFLP	Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine
FLN	National Liberation Front
JKML	Jomo Kenyatta Memorial Library
IDIS	Institute of Diplomacy & International Studies
ISI	Inter-Service Intelligence
ISIS	Islamic State in Iraq and Syria
KDF	Kenya Defence Forces
KKK	Ku Klux Klan
MA	Master of Arts
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NSS	National Security Strategies
OLN	Operation Linda Nchi
OPEC	Organization of Oil Producing Countries
PKK	Partiya Karkendu Kurdistan
PLFP	Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine
PLO	Palestinian Liberation Organization
PMOI	People's Mujahedin of Iran
RDJTF	Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force
SEATO	South East Asia Treaty Organization
SoCal	Standard Oil of California
UN	United Nations
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSCOP	United Nations Special Committee on Palestine

US	United States
USA	United States of America
USSR	United Socialist Soviet Republics
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WWI	World War I
WWII	World War II

ABSTRACT

Terrorism has become a global issue over the years and in the recent years the international system has marshalled efforts to deal with this menace in what is commonly denoted to as 'Global War on Terror'. Since the rise of terrorist activities in the 80's, there has been an upward trend and new forms of terror which culminated in the September 11, 2001 attacks on USA soil and subsequent rise of factions such as ISIS and Al Shabaab. The then President of USA George W. Bush declared 'War on Terror' which saw a drastic reaction to terror networks and their 'sympathizers' a group he referred to as 'the Axis of Evil.' Afghanistan and Iraq were the immediate casualties of this. But then terrorism against the United States had its roots back in the 1980's when the USA became an active player in Middle East affairs. A section of the natives of the Middle East region, key among them being Osama Bin Laden, became infuriated by the presence of USA military and soon afterwards declared that they were opposed to the presence and demanded that the USA leaves. However, this did not happen as the USA was and is still pursuing its interest in the region. Then came the attacks targeting the USA and her Allies which have now spread across the globe. To this end, different USA governments have instituted foreign policies that cater for their needs in the region while at the same time guarding Westerners against the attacks. There has been a protracted battle between the USA and her Allies on one side and the terrorists and their supporters on the other. It has been argued over the years that the USA and her Allies are to blame for the continued attacks on them because of their foreign policies on the Middle East region which have put them on collision mode. This research seeks to find out if indeed the USA foreign policy on the region has an effect on the retaliatory terrorism experienced against the USA and her Western Allies.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0.Background of the Study

Terrorism is a disturbing menace in the contemporary World. Barnett and Reynolds posit that a definition of terrorism that is unanimously accepted does not exist. To this end, the widely recognized definition is that terrorism involves the violence aimed at generating fear. It has been argued that this can be for religious, political or even ideological purposes. Such terror is usually directed towards civilian or non-armed targets to publicize the aggressor. According to Barnett and Reynolds, the definition of terrorism is socially constructed[1].Similarly; the US Department of Defense on its website defines terrorism as using violence in a premeditated way or threatening to use violence in a way that instills fear aimed at coercing or intimidation of administrations or civilizations to attain religious, political or ideological objectives.[2]

On the other hand Hoffman adds that unlike murder, beating, arson or destruction of property, terrorism has greater effects that spill beyond the actual targets i.e. collateral damage. These targets encompass a huge range of the societal framework. The vice differs from regular criminal activities given its dominant aims. In this regard, the transformation sought is seen to be more important than even people's lives that might be lost in the process or activities undertaken to effect the change.[3]

Hoge & Rose, promulgate that terrorism is a means applied in both peaceful and conflict situations. Terrorist organizations are illegitimate groups that are largely secretive consisting of planners,

---

[1]Barnett, B., Reynolds, A, *'Terrorism and the Press: An Uneasy Relationship',* 2009, New York, Peter Lang.
[2] http://www.terrorism-research.com/terrorism/bpart.html
[3] Rush, George E., '*The Dictionary of Criminal Justice, (5th Ed),* 2002, Guildford, CT, McGraw-Hill

trainers, and actual killers[4]. The organization is structured with a recognized command hierarchy, leaders at various levels or a scenario in which extremists act as "lone wolves." In addition, terrorism is said to be lopsided in that it involves a weak group launches random violent activities against a strong force e.g. government, military or an entire society to achieve a particular gain. This kind of warfare is fought between sides that are exceptionally distinct.[5] In the contemporary world, most nations use retaliation in an attempt to stop terrorists in their tracks. However, it has become evident that terrorists have also resorted to what is commonly referred to as retaliatory terrorism in which they hit back on those pursuing them. In its history acts of terrorism have been directed at Western countries targets and the US has been the most hit. Over lengthy time, the USA concentrated on trying to stop terrorists before they hit by disrupting the activities of terrorist organizations. This strategy was applied by successive USA governments in countering communism.

Scholar David Rapoport argues that international terrorism has evolved in four major waves namely: the first wave which he calls the 'anarchist', the second wave which he refers to as'anti-colonial', the third wave referred to as 'new left' and the fourth wave 'religious.' These waves are characterized by the events that happened in those respective times. The fourth wave is the one that is being witnessed currently. It is anchored in Islam and its main feature is suicide terrorism whereby the terrorists blow themselves up leaving a trail of destructions or evendeaths. It is this wave that has seen a rise in terrorist activities aimed at revenging on particular targets.

In their article in the Washington Quarterly of 2012, Kroenig and Pavel explain that the USA used detterence as its key strategy to prevent the Soviet Union aggression. The USA threatened to

---

[4]Hoge, J. F. and Gideon R. 2001. *How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War.* New York: Public Affairs.
[5] White, Jonathan R., '*Terrorism and Homeland Security*,' (7th Ed), 2011, Belmont, CA, Wadsworth.

launch nuclear attacks on the Soviet Union in the event it attacked the West.[6]. However, after the9/11 terrorist attacks on the US experts and analysts contend that the deterrence strategy cannot work given that terrorists are mostly irrational. Moreover, they are willing to cause havoc and go to any extent the consequences notwithstanding because terrorists do not fear even death in pursuit of their objectives. Hence, use of threats against terrorists is seen to be a strategy in futility. In its 1997 report, the Defense Science Board's report observes that terrorist activities against the USA are directly linked to the foreign policy of the country. Being a Superpower the United States continually finds itself actively involved in most situations all over the world including sanctioning military intervention. This has inevitably put the US in a precarious position and collision path with many other international actors. Historically it has been proved that there is a strong relationship between USA activities in the international arena and a rise of attacks against the United States[7]. It has been revealed that a third of the total number of terrorist attacks across the world is committed on U.S. interests[8]. The high proportion of terrorism activities targeted at the United States can be attributed to the USA's interventionist policy i.e. getting involved in matters affecting other States and regions. Perl notes that USA has resorted to use of diplomacy, economic sanctions, coercion, the military, etc. to deal with the terrorism menace.[9]Eland argues that in the contemporary world terrorism and related activities are handled as foreign policy issues.[10] This notion has been validated by cases of state-sponsored terrorist activities and other foreign policy players across the world. The USA has suffered casualties and losses in international terrorism for

[6]Kroenig, M, and B Pavel. 2012. " *How to Deter Terrorism*." The Washington Quarterly 35 (2): 21-36.
[7] Wright, R. 2008. *Dreams and Shadows: The Future of the Middle East.* New York: Penguin.
[8]Hadar, L. 2005. *Sandstorm: American Blindness in the Middle East.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan
[9]Perl, R. F. 2001. *Terrorism, the Future, and U.S. Foreign Policy.* Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service.
[10] Eland, I. 1999. "*Does U.S. Intervention Overseas Breed Terrorism? The Historical Record." Foreign Policy Briefing* 50: 1-24.

example in the year 2000 US citizens and property targets accounted for about 47% of terrorism casualties across the World. However, this changed on September 11, 2001 when terrorists brought their activities on US soil. Since then there have been several incidences of homegrown terrorism inspired from overseas. The USA and her allies swung into action to stem out terrorists and frustrate their activities. The Bush administration went after the Al Qaeda network as well as its leadership under Osama bin Laden which were based in Afghanistan. USA in conjunction with British armed forces entered Afghanistan on 7 October, 2001. They launched aerial bombing on Taliban and Al Qaeda targets. Ground troops and Special Forces were also involved in the operation that resulted in the removal of Taliban from power in Afghanistan. Another casualty of US retaliation was President Saddam Hussein of Iraq who the USA suspected was aiding and harbouring terrorists. Saddam was also accused of production of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs). After the victory in Afghanistan, the US and her Coalition allies invaded Iraq on March 20, 2003 overthrew and subsequently captured Saddam Hussein in December 2003. Saddam was executed in 2006 leading to insurgency against the US and coalition forces. Ever since Iraq has been unstable as various terror groups have sprung up most recent one being ISIS.

The Middle East has been the hotspot of terrorist activities given that the main terrorist organizations are based there. From Al Qaeda to ISIS as well as Hezbollah, the region is undoubtedly the breeding ground for terrorist activities. This can be attributed to the instability being witnessed in the region especially the Arab-Israeli conflict, Iraq, Afghanistan and Syria. Post 9/11, saw the US change its Middle East foreign policy whereby the USA resorted to use of its military capability to effect a shift in the equilibrium of power in the region.[11]The new strategies

---

[11]Gholz, E., and Daryl G P. 2007. "*Energy Alarmism: The Myths That Make Americans Worry about Oil*." *Cato Institute Policy Analysis* 589.

that were chosen included use or threat to use force to oust 'dictatorial' regimes as well as wooing regional leaders to facilitate stability and peace[12]. In addition, Freedman explains that over time successive US governments have instituted US interests to include getting Middle East oil, preventing rise of the region's hegemon and restricting production and spread of WMDs. In this regard the US has employed an integrated approach to achieve this by building alliances with key nations in the region who are now strategic partners e.g. Israel, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt. It has also sought to put to an end the Israeli- Palestinian conflict that has plagued the Middle East for a long time.[13]

Miller argues that the big numbers of attacks against the USA are attributable to its interventionist policy and these attacks are a form of retaliation. He advises that the USA needs to change its strategy especially abandoning its military interventions overseas[14]. This is informed by the fact that retaliatory terrorism has developed to such advanced levels that the USA may find itself enormously devastated by what could normally pass as 'weak' entity acting on a terrorism network. Given that current approaches have increased US security but has been very costly it is high time the US adopted new strategies that do not put it on a collision course with other actors in the international system. Strategic counter-terrorism has been cited as the most appropriate mechanism that the USA needs to adopt to prevent retaliatory attacks. Largely, the strategies all point to USA actively participating in stabilizing the Middle East.

---

[12]Hadar, Leon. 2005. *Sandstorm: American Blindness in the Middle East.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
[13]Wright, Robin. 2008. *Dreams and Shadows: The Future of the Middle East.* New York: Penguin.
[14] Miller, A. D. 2008. *The Much Too Promised Land: America's Elusive Search for Arab-Israeli Peace.* New York: Bantam.

1.2   Statement of the Problem

Scholars and experts on terrorism stipulate that governments and other non-state actors put in enormous efforts into combating terrorist activities by putting in place measures to prevent them from happening or hitting back if they happen. In this quest though nations do find themselves in dilemma in that they have to secure their borders so that no terrorist activities happen while at the same time they have to ensure individual freedoms and human rights are strictly adhered to. In addition, the measures put in place to combat this vice are largely frustrated by the aspect of globalization whereby there is free movement of persons across borders and increased commerce in this era. Globalization is characterized by mass migration across states and even continents hence it has become increasingly difficult to curtail movement of people.

In this era of religious terrorism in which terrorists use radical Islamic ideologies and anchor their actions on Islamic religion, there is a raging debating on how Islam as a religion is connected to terrorist activities, which cause death and destruction. By virtue of being a Superpower, the USA has found itself actively involved in affairs of almost all states. It is a fact that has seen the US collides with many states who view the USA as an intruder in internal affairs of countries. Since the Gulf War, the presence of US troops in Saudi Arabia and later in other parts of the Middle East evoked suspicion and hatred against the USA and radicals like Osama bin Laden declared war on the US to expel it from their region. Since then the US has been a victim of terrorist attacks against its installations and interests notably, when the US Embassies headquartered in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam were bombed on 7th August 1998 the worst being the September 11, 2001 attacks that happened on US soil. It is after this that the US declared a Global War on Terrorism. It has been argued that the USA can have terrorist activities against it significantly reduce if it abandons its military intervention in other regions of the world. This is what this project paper will examine

given that other Western countries of the same industrial, military and economic status as the USA have not been targets of terrorists to such levels as witnessed in the USA. This study seeks to explore the magnitude to which retaliatory terrorism has increased across the globe with special interest to the USA due to its Middle East foreign policy. It specifically interrogates whether US foreign policy and retaliation strategy increases terrorism activities in the in the Middle East, as well as the extent to which the policy of military restraint as well as strategic counter-terrorism overseas reduce terrorism against United States and its interests.

1.2.1 Research Questions

1. What has resulted to retaliatory terrorism?
2. Why has the USA become a target of retaliatory terrorism?
3. What are the possible measures that need to be adopted to mitigate retaliatory terrorism?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective

The overall objective is to assess the effect USA's retaliatory approach has on terrorism in the Middle East.

1.3.2 Specific objectives

1. To examine the USA's Middle East foreign policy
2. To examine the history of terrorism as well as retaliatory terrorism in the Middle East
3. To assess effect of USA retaliation on terrorism activities against the USA and its interests

1.4   Justification of the Study

1.4.1 Policy justification

Foreign policy is an important aspect in international relations. States formulate foreign policies that serve their interests. Since 9/11, the USA adopted a reactionary policy as a result of the extremist attacks that had been brought on American soil. The role of the USA foreign policy in the Middle East is becoming critical in the fight against terrorism across the globe. This policy by the USA is crucial to other countries that are grappling with terrorist attacks because of international terrorism, which is on the rise. Threats that terrorist organizations pose to the world today are increasing at an alarming rate in different regions of the world. Al Qaeda was seen as the major terror organization with active cells in the Middle East, Afghanistan and the Horn of Africa but recent developments have seen the rise of Al-Shabaab, ISIS and Boko Haram. This state of affairs has put the USA, its allies and most countries across the world on highest alert levels. USA government sees the threat that Al Qaeda and its associates pose to be of increasing concern. The last three US administrations of Clinton, Bush and Obama were seriously concerned about the terrorist activities that were seen to be continually rising. Actually, the National Security Strategy (NSS) report of May 2010noted that Somalia, the Maghreb and the Sahel are hotspots of terrorism activities in Africa where Al Qaeda terror group cells are thriving. Within the last ten years, US State Department has constantly classified terrorist threat in East Africa to be the most serious in Africa[15].Given such situation, USA foreign policy in the Middle East may serve as an important tool and benchmark for the fight against terrorism across the globe.

---

[15]U.N. Security Council. 2007. *Report of the Monitoring Group on Somalia Pursuant to Security Council Resolution.* New York: United Nations

It is envisioned that new knowledge on lessons learnt, best practices and the recommendations arising from this study could be helpful to policy makers in governments and non-state actors to refine existing strategies on countering terrorism.

1.4.2 Academic Justification

The effect of terrorism on foreign policies of different States continues to draw diverse interest from scholars of international relations. In this regard, information that will result from this study will add to the pool of knowledge that will be valuable to future investigators in the field of terrorism and how to address it. Recommendations for further studies will open new vistas for those who will be interested in this area of research.

1.4.3 To the General Public

Since terrorism is now a cross border issue and affects all humanity regardless of the race, social standing and belief-system, all countries are united in tackling the vice. They have invested heavily in the anti-terrorism campaign through public resources, and since the initiative has impact on all humanity psychologically, socially and emotionally, it will be imperative to establish the morality or lack of it regarding the exercise. This is for the public appreciation of what is happening, what is working, what has failed and what lessons the world can learn.

1.5   Literature Review

A study by White posits that terrorism has been in existence for over two centuries is old having been in existence for over 2,000 years[16]. To date universal explanation on what terrorism is. As earlier stated, the definition that is accepted across the board is that terrorism involves creating

---

[16] White, J. R. 2011. *Terrorism & Homeland Security (7th Ed.).* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

fear through violence to attain religious, political or ideological goals. There exists what can be referred to as ancient and new terrorism in which ancient terrorism is directed towards particular targets whereas new terrorism in the contemporary world is indiscriminate. Given its nature, new terrorism leads to multiple casualties including collateral damage. In his article, '*Clash of Civilizations'* Sam Huntington notes that differences that exist especially on cultural and religious aspects are the main causes of terrorism.

As earlier stated, David Rapoport traces the four waves of the development of international terrorism[17]. According to him, the first wave begun in Russia in 1880s ending in 1920s. This wave was associated with anarchists who were disillusioned by the slow reforms that were taking place in society. They wanted a more systematic way to effect rapid change and resorted to terrorism to achieve this. The second wave existed between 1920s and 1960s and was called the 'anti-colonial' wave. The Treaty of Versailles whose principle of self-determination saw the disintegration of the defeated empires during WWI inspired this wave. Terror campaigns during this wave sought to dislodge colonialists from the territories they occupied. An example was the Irgun Jewish Organization, which fought against the British government in Palestine. The terrorists during this wave were generally known as 'freedom fighters'.

The third wave of international terrorism was referred to as the 'new left' and existed in the 1960s until1980s. The Vietnam War caused it because young people were dissatisfied with existing systems and formed terror groups to bring about new establishment. The terrorists targeted prominent personalities and carried out more than 700 hijackings, 409 international kidnappings and murdered Prime Ministers of Spain and Jordan. Notably, a third of the new left terrorists'

---

[17]Rapoprt D.C., *Four Waves of Modern Terrorism- Attacking Terrorism: Elements of a Grand Strategy*. Audrey Kurth Cronin, James M. Ludes (Eds). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2004, p.47

victims were US targets. The fourth wave which is the current wave begun in 1979 and is called 'religious wave'. This wave has Islam at its core and relies on Islamic ideology. It all started in 1979 with the Revolution in Iran; the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan and the start of a new Islamic Century. Around this time, the USA was nicknamed the '*Great Satan*' by Iran. The Afghanistan crisis and war gave Islamic extremists and other volunteers from the Arab region an ample platform for extremist teachings and Islamic indoctrination.[18]

During this period, suicide terrorism is the main strategy and mass casual ties have been witnessed. For example, a sect called the Aum Shinrikyo used chemical weapons in Tokyo resulting to mass casualties in 1995, Hezbollah with support of Iran perpetrated substantial suicide attacks on United States Marines and French commandos in Beirut, Lebanon leading to the withdraw of the forces. When the Gulf War ended and the Soviets left Afghanistan, Islamic extremists declared the US as their main enemy. Osama bin Laden was one of those who detested the staying of US troops in Saudi Arabia. He relocated to Sudan and from there launched attacks on US targets. Over time bin Laden's terror network Al Qaeda incessantly attacked US targets ending in the 9/11, 2001 attacks on US soil ostensibly changing the history of terror. The Bush administration declared Global War on Terror and led a global coalition to pursue terrorists and their sympathizers. The first casualty was the Taliban in Afghanistan followed by Saddam Hussein of Iraq who was accused of harbouring terrorists and making Weapons of Mass Destruction'

In what is commonly referred to as Bush Doctrine, the USA made drastic moves to protect itself, its citizens and its interests from terrorists. Then it begs the question, 'What actually motivates terrorists?' There are a number of theories that try to explain terrorism and the motivations behind

---

[18]Rapoprt D.C., *Four Waves of Modern Terrorism- Attacking Terrorism: Elements of a Grand Strategy*. Audrey Kurth Cronin, James M. Ludes (eds). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2004, p.61

it. Psychologists delve into the psycho-pathological theories which outline that terrorism is a violent behaviour and since violent behaviour is not accepted in most communities then those who engage in terrorism are abnormal. The relative deprivation theories connect aggression and violence to the prevailing socio-eco-politico circumstances. According to these theories, frustration can lead to aggression and conclude that if one's economic and political expectations are not met they resort to violent behaviour. In the book '*Why Men Rebel*' by Ted Robert Gurr it is explained that there arises discontent when what is achieved is not equal to what was anticipated. Individuals who realize that their achievements are not at par with their counterparts whom they are comparing themselves with also fall under the arguments of this theory. Gurrit points out that relative deprivation leads to political violence, as it is the difference between the real situation and the anticipated one. This fissure between what is expected and what is ultimately achieved results in referred to as collective dissatisfaction. It further offers that this mechanism of frustration caused by anger is the main cause of the human capability for violence. It's a rousing vigor, which sets men to belligerence, notwithstanding its instrumentalities.[19] The gap between the expectations of an individual and what they actually achieve leads to collective discontent.

However, other scholars such as Krueger and Maleckovia as well as Azan who tabled evidence that the majority of terrorists are in their mid-20s and most have tertiary education training challenged this.

Moreover, another study by Nevin (2003) tries to evaluate the effect of of retaliation on terrorism. Nevin examines seven case-studiesof terrorist attacks to find out the motivation behind them and the respective governments' responses towards them. These case studies were: Palestine, Morocco,

---

[19]Gurr, Ted R. *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Center of International Studies, Princeton UP, 1970.

Algeria, Sri Lanka, Northern Ireland and Peru in the years spanning 1945 to 1993. The study made a discovery that there was no evidence to link increased or decreased terrorist activities to retaliation. However, it was found out that retaliation immediately after a terrorist attack led to an acute increase of terrorist activities. This was observed in six out of the seven scenarios hence retaliation was found to be counterproductive since it was aimed at deterrence but the opposite happened. Similarly an analysis of terror meted on the USA before and after retaliation on AL Qaeda in Iraq and Afghanistan indicate that retaliatory measures emboldened the terrorists who increase the frequency and intensity of their attacks. Hence the USA and the global coalition against terror need to change strategy in dealing with terrorism because retaliation only serves to embolden and make terrorist harsher.

Another study that was carried out by Mallow in 2007 stipulates that acts of retaliation involve the use of violence, which has a number of effects. Such impacts include strengthening public opinion, destruction of terrorist structures and disrupting terrorist tactic.[20]Symmetry, perceptions and proportionality of retaliation efforts have varied impact on the target groups. Credibility, prudence and unity of purpose are key factors that can ensure defeat of terrorists and their supporters in retaliation efforts. These factors are contained in the deterrence theory and states that intend to use the retaliation are alive to the fact that retaliation is indeed a tough path to follow. Retaliation needs proper planning with precision to ensure the desired results are achieved. Since retaliation usually seeks to disempower and deter, if it fails it has far reaching consequences which include, but not

---

[20] Mallow, B. P. 1997. *Terror vs. Terror: Effects of Military Retaliation on Terrorism.* Washington D.C.: National Defense University.

limited to, mass protests, condemnation by the international community and lack of goodwill and backing from allies. To this end, retaliation is not an easy policy choice to make.

Eland laments that focus is directed at battling terrorism through discouraging as well as upsetting it in advance and responding to it through retaliation once it happens. Not as much attention is being given to what really inspires terrorists to attack. Pentagon's Defense Science Board offers that US interventionist policy that sees it get involved in different situations in the world has seen it being terrorists' number one target. They do acknowledge the link exists and something needs to be done. However, no empirical data has been provided to support this conclusion.

Lumet sought to find out the usefulness of strategies used to counter terrorism. They wanted to find out the effectiveness of the strategies using available data as well as evaluate the efficiency of expenses incurred in implementing the strategies.

On the other hand, the contagion theories of terrorism postulates that terrorism is contagious i.e. terrorist activities are closely placed. It has been proven that terrorist attacks are not random occurrences but have a definite pattern. A series of terrorist attacks in a particular month are followed by similar attacks, though fewer, in the subsequent month(s). This gives the impression that terrorists carry out attacks based on an already set pattern. This is the 'concept of contagion'. This pattern of launching attacks may be attributed to the desire by terrorists to remain relevant especially in the media[21]. They add that there is overwhelming observed proof which points to the contagious nature of terrorism concerning the scheduling of terrorist attacks.

---

[21]Weimann, G. and Hans-Bernd B., 'The Predictability of International Terrorism: A Time-Series Analysis', *Journal of Terrorism* 11 (6) (1988), pp. 491-502.

Moreover, contagion theory encompasses a rise in terrorist activities in a country and is connected to a similar pattern in the country's neighbours. These terrorist activities could be carried out by the same terrorist group, its affiliates, and supporters or by imitating. [22]Data gathered from ITERATE study on countries in the years 1968-1977 supports the notion that an increased rate of terrorist activities in a country in a particular year translates to a similar trend the following year.

Another feature of contagious terrorism is that terrorists copy each other in that one group of terrorists imitates successful operations from another group. A case in point is the terrorist activities that took place in the late 1960s characterized by hostage taking of high-profile personalities and hijackings. This trend of terrorist activities resulted to introduction of advanced security strategies such use of metal detectors for screening at airports. Airborne terrorism took over and its full impact was felt during the 9/11 attacks in the USA. Interestingly, this incident was copied soon afterwards. A Cessna aircraft was crashed into the Bank of America plaza building by a young American man who left a note praising Al Qaeda's acts claiming that he was 'acting on their behalf'.[23] Apparently, he was imitating Al Qaeda's crashing of planes on the Twin Towers. A similar incident happened some months later when a man from the FARC faction in Colombia set out to smash the Presidential Palace with an explosive-laden aircraft in Bogotá. [24]Another attempt of crashing a plane on a high-rise building was made in Tel Aviv, Israel. An Israeli of Arab descent tried gaining access into cockpit of a plane to execute this mission. Sharing of techniques amongst terrorist also happens especially in the making of the weapons they use for example the

---

[22]Crenshaw, M., *Terrorism in Context* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press, 1995).

[23] Transcript of the two-page suicide note, available at www.thesmokinggun.com/archive/tampasu1.html. Accessed October 2004. See also 'Police: Tampa Pilot Voiced Support For Bin Laden Crash Into Bank Building a Suicide, Officials Say', *CNN.com*7 January 2002.

[24] Hodgson, M., 'Thirteen Die in Bogota Explosions as Hardline President is Sworn In', *The Guardian* 8 August 2002.

Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs). Investigations into terrorist attacks spanning three regions: Asia, Africa and the Middle East show a common technology in the design of bombs and IEDs that are in the terrorist attacks.

The counter terrorism and realism theory is related to the fact that war on terror is now a global endeavor that is asymmetrical in nature. It gained impetus in 2011 when the al-Qaeda terror network brought down the Twin Towers in New York on 9/11, 2011. This terror strike marked a turning point on how the World would react to terror and its agents going forward. After September 11, the US President declared a battle on terror and that the United States faced two enemies: the terrorists' underworld and the allied states that were supporting it and were seeking to develop WMD. He called these allied powers 'the Axis of Evil.' He reiterated that the USA would employ all means necessary to thwart the activities of the rogue states so that they do not aid terrorist activities and produce WMD. Post September 11, 2001 saw a shift of the US Middle East policy whereby the USA resorted to use of its military capability to cause a balance of power shift in the region.[25]New strategies that were chosen included use or threat to use force to oust 'dictatorial' regimes as well as wooing regional leaders to facilitate stability and peace.

 The realism theory is best fitted to explain these strategies. Although there are other theories that try to probe foreign policy and diplomacy, this study will use realism theory. Realism comprises of different approaches and it has a lengthy theoretic background. The theory's famous proponents include Hobbes, Machiavelli and Thucydides. Currently neorealism has replaced this classical theory. This is because neo-realism seeks to facilitate a more scientific approach to international

---

[25]Gholz, E., and Daryl G P. 2007. "*Energy Alarmism: The Myths That Make Americans Worry about Oil*." *Cato Institute Policy Analysis* 589.

relations. However, realism has been criticized for fronting psychological motivations as its key pillar. Morgenthau argues that universal and objective laws govern international affairs that are largely influence by national interests rather than psychological intentions of those making decisions is that the politics of the international system is driven by national interest characterized by a crave for power as opposed to emotional intentions of those making decision. Realism notes that states are lucid and unitary players that pursue their own interests. The relationship between states are seen to be power-driven. The theory favours use of armed force in the pursuit but it is also cognizant of other means to resolve cross-border issues like terrorism.

The sane quest of national interests through foreign policy involves different diplomatic approaches. [26]Foreign policy of the United States in the Gulf region is indeed a key component of the country's State power which influences the nature of relations it will have across the region. National quests see the coming together of different. Realism holds that there is a continuous battle for power in the international system given its anarchical nature. Accordingly, Middle East countries may be harbouring such sentiments on the United States foreign policy that they seek to influence retaliatory terrorism. Middle East countries share apprehension, unevenness, and resentment in their various areas of projecting foreign policy intentions and goals that push for their national quests. Strategies projected by the United States and elsewhere, are assumed to disseminate the welfare of the state in an unfriendly or intimidating environment.[27]

Realism is threatened by forces of globalization. Its critics note that the theory's arguments do not have the rationale for submission and cooperation in the international system. Further, they aver

---

[26]Morgenthau, Hans J. 1973. *Politics among Nations; The Struggle for Power and Peace, 5th ed. .* New York
[27] Dunne, T. & Brian C. S. 2008. "Realism." In *The Globalization of World Politics. An introduction to international relations*, by John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 91. New York: Oxford University Press.

that the theory doesn't appreciate the role that common interests and non-state actors play. However, these reservations are resolved by the liberal institutionalism approach which argues that cooperation is facilitated by institutions that provide the framework. This reduces paranoia and lessens competition among actors in the international system including states.

To understand the effect of USA Middle East foreign policy as relates to retaliatory terrorism, we shall consider theoretical contribution of realism and psychology & decision- making on foreign policy. The study therefore relies on both theories to explain and analyze the effect of USA Middle East foreign policy.

1.6   Research Gaps

An analysis of the counter-terrorism policies and strategies used by the USA will undoubtedly give a clearer picture of whether they are effective or not and the impacts they have. There have been arguments by experts that the existing frameworks and strategies are not strong enough rendering them ineffective and counterproductive. Hence concerted effort is necessary to formulate appropriate approaches to deal with the ever evolving terror activities. This implies that all processes involved from planning to policymaking and implementation to evaluation require objective input from counter-terrorism experts, strategic thinkers to military personnel. Openness and intelligence-sharing need to be emboldened to eliminate secrecy that usually shrouds counter-terrorism efforts. Since terrorist keep developing newer strategies every new day, the counter-terrorism agencies need to be ahead of the game and this can only be done using the most up-to-date and state-of-the-art scientific methods.

More of the research on terrorism and United States foreign policy needs to be pragmatic in that it can be evaluated using verifiable methods. This study attempts to fill that gap by reference to a

numerical figure of attacks by terrorists on the US in response to its foreign policy and intervention overseas. The cases referred to do suggest that the USA could decrease the chances of the shattering terrorist attacks by adopting other foreign policies like military restraint in the Middle East.

1.7   Theoretical Framework

This section turns to realism to explain the effect of the foreign policy of the United States in the Middle East and how it can be applied to the proposed study. Although various theories have been used to probe foreign policy and diplomacy, this study will use the theory of realism. Realism comprises of different approaches and it has a lengthy theoretic background. The theory's famous originators include Hobbes, Machiavelli and Thucydides (Holsti, 1989). Currently neorealism has replaced this classical theory. This is because neorealism seeks to facilitate a further technical methodology to international relations. However, realism has been criticized for fronting psychological motivations as its key pillar. Morgenthau (1973) argues that universal and objective laws govern international affairs that are largely influence by national interests rather than psychological intentions of those making decisions is that the politics of the international system is driven by national interest characterized by a crave for power as opposed to emotional intentions of those making decision. Realism notes that states are lucid and unitary players that pursue their own interests. The relationship between states are seen to be power-driven. The theory favours use of armed force in the pursuit but it is also cognizant of other means to resolve cross-border issues like terrorism.

The sane quest of national interests through foreign policy involves different diplomatic approaches. [28]Foreign policy of the United States in the Gulf region is indeed a key component of the country's State power which influences the nature of relations it will have across the region. National quests see the coming together of different. Realism holds that there is a continuous battle for power in the international system given its anarchical nature. Accordingly, Middle East countries may be harbouring such sentiments on the United States foreign policy that they seek to influence retaliatory terrorism. Middle East countries share apprehension, unevenness, and resentment in their various areas of projecting foreign policy intentions and goals that push for their national quests. Strategies projected by the United States and elsewhere, are assumed to disseminate the welfare of the state in an unfriendly or intimidating environment.[29]

Realism is threatened by forces of globalization. Its critics note that the theory's arguments do not have the rationale for submission and cooperation in the international system. Further, they aver that the theory doesn't appreciate the role that common interests and non-state actors play. However, these reservations are resolved by the liberal institutionalism approach which argues that cooperation is facilitated by institutions that provide the framework. This reduces paranoia and lessens competition among actors in the international system including states.

To understand the effect of foreign policy of USA in the Gulf region in relation to retaliatory terrorism, we shall consider theoretical contribution of realism and psychology & foreign policy

---

[28]Morgenthau, Hans J. 1973. *Politics among Nations; The Struggle for Power and Peace, 5th ed.* . New York
[29] Dunne, T. & Brian C. S. 2008. "Realism." In *The Globalization of World Politics. An introduction to international relations*, by John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 91. New York: Oxford University Press.

decision-making. The study therefore relies on both theories to explain and analyze the US foreign policy of the in the region.

1.8   Hypotheses

1. Retaliation by the United States significantly increases terrorism activities in the Middle East.

2. The United States policy of military restraint overseas significantly reduces terrorism against its targets.

3. Retaliation by the United States does not have any effect on terrorist activities in the Middle East.

1.9   Research Methodology

The study used both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Quantitative methods involved primary data collection (questionnaires and interviews). This method wasused bysecurity and anti-terrorism experts to shed light on these issues and US embassy officials who are privy to goings-on on US foreign policy and counterterrorism efforts. Soldiers who have participated in the Operation Linda Nchi in Somalia to neutralise Al-Shabaab were also interviewed to give their opinion on counterterrorism. The researcher also interviewed officers of agencies and International NGOs that are actively involved in counterterrorism. These include Human Rights Watch, International Community of the Red Cross, the European Union, Transparency International and the UN Monitoring group. This involved purposive random sampling in which informants have specific information required for the study.

Qualitative method involved an in-depth study of documents (treaties, reports and protocols), published books, papers, journals as well as the internet and unpublished works were used as

secondary sources of data. This study utilized counter-terrorism approaches fronted in the Campbell Systematic Review. The overall evaluation of terrorism research described herein helped to define type research on terrorism but then the task is to explore the extent to which retaliatory terrorism has increased across the globe with special interest to the USA and its foreign policy in the Middle East. It specifically examined whether retaliation by the United States increases terrorism activities in the in the Middle East; and the extent to which the policy of military restraint overseas reduces terrorism against United States and its interests. To do this, the study narrowed our attention to establish principles that need to be considered in the resources to be used. After this, the study engaged a methodical plan in selecting assessments considered to be reasonably demanding. In the last segment, researcher dug out facts from each study and employed meta-analytic methods to scrutinize research findings. Unpublished works such MA Theses from IDIS was also consulted. The Jomo Kenyatta Memorial Library (JKML) and other libraries were visited during the research.

1.10 Research Design

Case study research design was employed. It was exhaustive reading on the United States of America foreign policy towards the Middle East since 1945. It therefore involved studying the foreign policy of the United States on the Middle East region, the changing policies and approaches adopted by various US Presidents since WWII as well as the effects thereof. More importantly, focus was on how US Foreign Policy has contributed to anti-Americanism and retaliation in the Middle East region and eventually drawing of conclusions on the effects of the US Foreign Policy in the region.

1.11Instruments for Data Collection

The researcher used the following instruments to collect data for this study: questionnaires, interviews and readings.

1.11.1 Data Collection

The study utilized both primary and secondary data. Questionnaires and interviews were administered on officials of organizations and state agencies involved in the OLN including KDF, Ministry of Defence officials, International Law and Security experts. Secondary data was obtained from intensive reading conducted on relevant literature to extract required facts about US foreign policy. These included Foreign Policy documents, US International Treaties, Academic papers, Conference proceedings, expert opinions, speeches, theses and dissertations on the subject, journals and books.

1.11.2 Sample size and Sampling procedure

The study targeted 100 respondents who had experience and knowledge on terrorism and counterterrorism strategies. Purposive sampling was used to choose study contributors. The selection was on the basis of snowball sampling; hence respondent introduced the researcher to the next participant who appropriated for the study.

1.11.3Data Reliability and Validity

The validity of the data used in this research is upheld by obtaining it directly from relevant officials of the agencies and organizations involved in counterterrorism.

Secondary data was extracted from internationally accredited books, journals and articles and official USA government documents, treaties, protocols and reliable online sources.

1.11.4 Data Analysis

The researcher put into use content analysis for qualitative data while Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze quantitative data.

1.11.5 Ethical Considerations

The researcher maintained high level of confidentiality in relation to information gathered and the protection of interviewees. The researcher also dully acknowledged all the secondary sources of data as well remain objective in the handling and analysis of obtained data.

1.12 Scope and Limitation of the Study

Terrorism is a very controversial issue and it involves secretive and dangerous activities. Therefore, ordinarily, researchers on topics related to terrorism, its activities conduct and counterterrorism efforts heavily rely on reported and documented data. This research will be constrained by the fact that the researcher is not directly involved in terrorism and counterterrorism activities hence lacks real time information on the planning, execution and intelligence on terrorism. The researcher was not able to travel to the Middle East nor the USA to get the information sought on terrorism and US Foreign Policy in the Middle East. However, to mitigate on these challenges, the researcher engaged security and anti-terrorism experts to shed light on these issues and US embassy officials who are privy to goings-on on US foreign policy and counterterrorism efforts. Soldiers who have participated in the Operation Linda Nchi in Somalia to neutralise Al-Shabaab were also interviewed to give their opinion on counterterrorism. The researcher also interviewed agencies and International NGOs that are actively involved in counterterrorism. These included Human Rights Watch, International Community of the Red Cross, the European Union, Transparency International and the UN Monitoring group. Scholars and experts on war and conflict helped generate intelligent conclusions.

1.13 Chapter Outline

Chapter One- This provides some background information on the area of study. This also included justification of the study, literature review and research methodology.

Chapter Two– Focuses on the USA Middle East foreign policy in Post-WWII.

Chapter Three –Examines the history terrorism and retaliatory terrorism in the Middle East

Chapter Four-. Presents the findings from the questionnaire and analyzed the effects of USA foreign Policy on terrorism in the Middle East.

Chapter Five –Provides the summary, conclusions and recommendations from the study.

CHAPTER TWO

USA FOREIGN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST SINCE THE END OF WWII

2.1 Introduction

This chapter delved into the United States foreign policy in the Middle East since 1945 and traces the history of the interaction between the two. The motivating factors behind the U.S presence in the Middle East region and the shift of the U.S foreign policy on the Middle East region were also explored. It included the various actors from the Middle East region involved in the interaction.

2.2 The Middle East Region

The Middle East region covers three Continents: Africa, Asia and Europe. It is close to the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf and the former USSR. It includes 18 countries i.e. United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Cyprus, Lebanon, , Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Syria, Turkey, Northern Cyprus and Yemen. The region constitutes of several ethnic groups with the Arabs, Persians, Turks and Kurds being the largest while the Jews, Greeks, Baloch, Assyrians; Arameans are part of the minority in the region.[30]

The region is endowed with massive crude oil stocks, which gave the region a fresh strategic and commercial prominence in the 20th Century. The mass extraction of oil in the region started soon after WWII with countries such as the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Iran being the pioneers. Over time, the entire region boasts of crude oil reserves, which has made other countries like the USA, forge ties with the region in order to meet their energy needs[31].

The United States has presence in literary every part of the world since it is the sole Super Power in the World. To this end, the U.S has policy on how it interacts with other States and other actors in the international system. This is referred to as the U.S Foreign Policy and it is developed and customized for each state, actor or region depending on the interests the United States has towards the State or region. U.S interests in the Middle East are largely influenced by the need to strategically access oil in the Gulf region, project Israel's Sovereignty, maintain its military bases, and defend friendly government and weeding out terrorist groups in the region.

---

[30]http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Middle_East Accessed on 1 May, 2018 at 1748hrs

[31]Lenczowski, G. (1984). *U.S. Policy in the Middle East: Problems and Prospects*. In Bark, D.L (Ed.), *To Promote Peace: U.S. Foreign Policy in the Mid-1980s (pp. 163-165).*Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

2.3   USA Interests in Middle East Before 1945

US ties with the Middle East can be tracked to about two centuries ago when the American Society established trade with Turkey. In fact, products from Smyrna, an ancient city in Turkey, appeared in the America in 1967.Missionary work in region by the Americans also created a connection with various park of the Middle East region. This was through their charity, medical as well as educational activities. Notably, the missionaries established renowned educational institutes for example, Robert College in Turkey, which was established in 1863, American University of Beirut (formerly Syrian Protestant College) established in 1866, the American University of Cairo founded in 1919.[32]Generally, during the pre-WWI period the U.S.A had contact with the Middle East region of such areas as education, missionary work and business.

At the end of WWI, the British and the French controlled the region which all along had been the Ottoman Empire which collapsed during the war. The USA kept contact in petroleum businesses especially in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iran and Bahrain[33] but largely kept off because of its post-WWI isolationism Policy. The then USA President Woodrow Wilson pushed for self-determination of nations and this impressed nationalists across the world including those in the Arab World. Indeed, they boosted Arab nationalist activities for subsequent years and this earned the U.S.A admiration until 1948 when the State of Israel was created[34]. The USA was seen to have played a pivotal role since 1917 when the Woodrow administration endorsed Britain's Foreign Secretary, Arthur Balfour's letter to British Zionist leader, Lionel Rothschild, seeking to establish

---

[32]Howard, H. N. (1974). *The United States and the Middle East. In T. Y. Ismael* (Ed.), *The Middle East in World Politics: A Study in Contemporary International Relations (pp. 117-118*). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
[33]Peretz, D. (1968*). The Middle East Selected Readings (pp. 1-14).* New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
[34]Crabb, Jr., C. V. (1983*). American Foreign Policy in the Nuclear Age*(4th ed., pp. 399-400). New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

a national home for Jews in Palestine. This came into reality in May 1948 when Israel declared itself a state.

2.3 United States Contact with Middle East Since 1945

U.S interests in the Middle East can be summarized into three: Security, the Palestinian Question and Oil. On security, the U.S.A is actively involved in the safeguarding of the sovereignty of the state of Israel, maintaining its military bases, helping and defending its allies in the Middle East and keeping in check extremist organizations such as Al-Qaeda, ISIS, Hezbollah and Hamas. The United States is more concerned on the Middle East region's security because the stability of the region determines the success of the other interests especially accessing the Gulf region's oil.

After WWII, the USA and the USSR were the World's Super Powers and this led to the Cold War. At the same time, Britain and France could no longer sustain their control in the Middle East. This led to the Middle East region becoming a battleground for the two Super Powers. The U.S.A was keen not to allow Soviet encroachment of the region and hence moved to take charge to foster economic development of the region's people as well as facilitate freedom from external meddling and exploitation. [35] The U.S came up with various strategies with incentives to lure the Middle East countries. One of these strategies was the Truman Doctrine of 1947, which included the provision that the USA could 'take care' of Greece and Turkey, previously under Britain. Their efforts went as far as the USA helping form the Baghdad Pact Organization also called Middle East Treaty Organization (METO) in 1955, which brought together Britain, Pakistan, Iraq, Iran

---

[35]Little, D. (2002).*American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East since 1945* (pp. 119-120). Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

and Turkey. These were nations are geographically closest to the USSR and it targeted to limit the spreading out of the USSR in the area. [36]

After the 1956 Suez Canal War, the USA came up with the Eisenhower Doctrine, which aimed at countering the USSR's penetration of Arab countries and Egypt's President Nasser's Pan-Arabism ideology. In 1959, Iraq withdrew from METO and its name was changed to the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) and its HQs were moved to Ankara from Baghdad. CENTO was dissolved in1979.

In the 1960's Britain completely gave up its remaining areas of influence in the Gulf region and Arabic Peninsula and the USA through the Nixon Doctrine enlisted Iran and Saudi Arabia to counter Soviet Union infiltration in the region. However, these were not successful leading President Jimmy Carter's declaration in 1980 that the US would battle for its key interests in the Middle East whether alone or with allies in the region. [37]

2.4 USA Foreign Policy under the Various USA Presidents since 1945.

2.4.1   Harry Truman Administration (1945-1952)

USA stationed its soldiers in Iran during World War 2 where they would transfer military supplies to the USSR at the same time protecting Iran's oil. President Harry Truman worked towards keeping the soviets out of Iran and to achieve this, he emboldened the US- Iran relations. He fostered cordial relations with the show of Iran and enlisted Turkey into NATO.

---

[36]Lenczowski, G. (1984). *U.S. Policy in the Middle East: Problems and Prospects*. In D. L. Bark (Ed.), *To Promote Peace: U.S. Foreign Policy in the Mid-1980s* (pp. 163-165).Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.
[37]Little, D. (2002).*American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East since 1945* (pp. 119-120). Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

The other notable incident of Truman in the Middle East was his immense support of the UN's plan of partitioning Palestine into Israel (53%) and (47%). However, this partition plan was not supported by a majority of UN member states because of the fluid situation in the region whereby hostility between the Jews and Arabs intensified. But then when the state of Israel was created on 14 May 1948, Truman recognized it exactly 11 minutes later.

2.4.2 Dwight Eisenhower's Administration (1953-1960)

Three events shaped US policy in the Middle East during Eisenhower's reign. The first one which tarnished US image in the region was when President Eisenhower ordered the overthrow of Mohammed Mossadegh by the CIA. Mohammed was a popular, elected leader of Iran's Parliament but was against Western influence in Iran. This incident put in doubt in US assertions that it protected democracy yet it had deposed a popularly elected leader. The US carried this out under the name 'Operation Ajax' with the help of the UK under the tag 'Operation Boot.'

The deposed Prime Minister had embarked on auditing documents of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (AICOC) which was owned by Britain to limit AICOC's influence and control over Iran's oil reserves. AICOC refused to cooperate and the parliament noted to rationalize the oil industry and expel foreigners.

Corporates from Britain initiated a worldwide boycott of Iran economically. It went further to use Iranian agents to undermine Mossadegh's administration and eventually settled for an overthrow for fear of Soviet intervention.

The 1956 Suez Canal war saw the USA refuse to join its allies, France and Britain, but instead ended the war through UNSC Resolution. In 1958, the USA authorized military in Lebanon to protect President Camille Chamnon who was being fought by nationalist and religion forces.

2.4.3   President John F. Kennedy Administration (1961-1963)

For President Kennedy, he was keen to normalize the US- Middle East relationship. He developed a robust relationship with Israel and sought to reduce tensions in the region especially on Cold War. The US-Israel relationship was emboldened throughout his tenure. Kennedy was indeed keen on the events in the Middle East[38].

2.4.4   President Lyndon Johnson Administration (1963- 1968)

He got entangled in the Middle East Affair in the course of the Six Day War of 1967 whereby he forced Israel into stopping the hostilities. Israel had occupied the Gaza Strip, Sinai Peninsula, the Golan Heights and the West Bank. It is worth noting that Israel had acted as a precaution against impending attacks from her Arab neighbours. The Israelis were able to push back the Arab neighbours and occupied their territories. It is a war that lasted just six days but its effects are felt till this day. It took Egypt's Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza Ship, took the Golan Heights from Syria and took from Jordan the West Bank and East Jerusalem. To this day, Israel still occupies the captured territories and has even built settlements for the Jews against provision of International Law which states that citizens of captor countries cannot be settled on the captured territory.

The Six day war saw the USSR threaten to attack Israel if Israel did not stop the war. President Johnson stationed US Navy on alert but made Israel get into a cease-fire.

2.4.5   President Richard Nixon-Gerald Ford Administrations (1969-1976)

He got entangled in the Middle East crisis- when the Arab States (Egypt, Syria and Jordan) tried to regain their glory that had vanished in 1967. They launched an attack on Israel on the Yom Kippur. Israel once again defeated the Arab States but then the USSR threatened to act on Israel

---

[38]*AL ARABIYA, August 9, 2018*

and this put the Cold War antagonists at near nuclear confrontation. President Nixon put his Armed Forces on highest alert but then was able to persuade Israel to accept a cease fire. 1973 had far searching effects on USA when OPEC Arab countries imposed an oil embargo. The oil embargo of 1973-1974 was enforced by OPEC Arab members to protest US continued supply of Israel Military to gain leverage in the post- 1973 negotiations for peace. The embargo was extended to those countries that were in support of Israel i.e. Portugal, Netherlands and South Africa. The embargo did actually destabilize the US economy and this made President Nixon and US enacted strategies to address the short-comings of continued reliance on foreign oil. President Nixon came up with a project independence strategy to escalate the production of oil domestically to reduce US dependence on foreign oil. Secretary of state who at time was Henry Kissinger negotiated with the Arab Oil producers and the restriction ended in March 1973. The embargo had far-reaching effects on US on its economy and International leverage. To this end, US government focused on energy conservation and development of domestic energy sources. Ultimately, it led to the establishment of the International Energy Agency which was wished-for by US Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger. Notably, Israel required some land to Egypt and Syria but the Palestinian issue was not solved. At that point in time Saddam Hussein was fast rising in Iraq military ranks.

2.4.6 President Jimmy Carter Administration(1977-1980)

The US greatest victory and loss since World War 2 happened during Carter's administration. President Carter mediated a peace pact between Israel and Egypt in the 1978 Camp David Accord. US increased its aid to Egypt and Israel and Israel returned the Sinai Peninsula. President Carter was in the centre of the Accords in that; he personally spoke to Egypt's Anwar El-Sadat and Israeli's Menachem Begin separately before they met to reach a consensus. The Camp David Accords resulted in two accords- The initial one was '*A Framework for Peace in the Middle East*'

which demanded that a self-governing authority be established in the Israeli "Occupied territories" i.e. Gaza and the West Bank and that the rights of the people of Palestine be recognized.

The flipside of the interaction between USA and the Middle East during the Carter administration came during the Iranian Islamic Revolution in 1978 in which the protesters demonstrated against the US backed Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi who was forced to flee the country and was substituted by Grand Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini who led the Revolution. The Revolution brought an end to 2,500 years of uninterrupted Persian monarchy. Iran later became an Islamic Republic with a new theocratic –republican constitution and Khomeini became Supreme Leader. President Carter's administration entered into negotiations and it is said to have facilitated the rise of Khomeini into power after it was apparent that he would be moderate and with progressive intentions.

The Tehran hostage crisis of November 4, 1979 that lasted for 444 days was another low side for the Carter administration. It actually cost him a second term as President of the Unites States. Iranian students had attacked the US Embassy in Iran's Capital, Tehran and seized 60 American hostages in protest to Carter administration allowing the deposed Iran Shah to enter USA but then there was more to it. The students were declaring a shift from Iran's earlier period and a halt to American meddling in its affairs. Another undoing of the Carter administration was the Operation Eagle Claw that was meant to rescue the hostages but failed. The hostage crisis exhibited Carter as unable to resolve the crisis and this made him look weak and incompetent. This cost him the 1980 presidential race.

2.4.7   President Ronald Reagan Administration (1981-1989)

Nothing substantial was achieved in the Middle East during the decade-long Reagan Administration. Israel invaded Lebanon for the second time but soon Reagan forced a ceasefire.

The Iran-Contra Affair whereby the USA secretly transacted arms and missiles to secure the freedom of some American citizens who were taken hostage by terrorists in Lebanon nearly brought Reagan's administration to its knees.

During his reign, President Reagan was in support of Israel expanding Jewish settlements in the zones it occupied. In addition, Reagan supported Iraq's Saddam Hussein's war with Iran which took eight years by providing logistical and intelligence support to Saddam with the hope that Saddam could defeat the Iranian Islamic government hence undo the Islamic Revolution.

2.4.8   George H.W Bush Administration (1989-1993)

The government of George Herbert Bush was vigorously immersed in the Middle East when it initiated *Operation Desert Shield* to protect Saudi Arabia from possible Iraq invasion. It was a reaction to Iraq's incursion of Kuwait. During the 1980's Iraq President Saddam Hussein had unwavering support from the US administration of President Ronald Reagan.

With his confidence, the Iraq President began to harbor expansionist ideas. His invasion of Kuwait was however, nit condoned by the United States. Saddam Hussein and other Iraq nationalists claimed that Kuwait was part of Iraq but then he had other interests: the Kuwait Oil and Kuwait's being strategic militarily. On the day Iraqi forces entered Kuwait, US President George H.W Bush declared that the invasion would not be left to be and pledged to help Kuwait and Saudi Arabia chase out Iraqi forces. This matter saw the intervention of the UNSC which gave Iraq an ultimatum to leave Kuwait soil, failure to which the Iraq forces would be forcefully ejected.

President Bush shifted strategy and changed Operation Desert Field to Operation Desert Storm in which the US soldiers led an international alliance to counter Hussein's army in Iraq and Kuwait. This was significant of US relationship with Iraq which was cordial in the Reagan administration.

The Gulf war had started with Bush claiming that Saddam Hussein might be developing nuclear weapons. The coalition was made up of 30 countries with more than 500,000 troops. The US employed superior technology and eventually defeated Iraq. President Bush was largely uninvolved in Israel and Palestine affairs.

2.4.9   President Bill Clinton Administration (1993-2001)

President Bill Clinton oversaw the Oslo Accords of 1993 and the flipside of his administration on the Middle East was when the Camp David Summit collapsed in 2000. The 1993 Oslo Accord was significant in that it established self-determination rights of the Palestinians in Gaza and West Bank by establishing the Palestinian Authority.

Moreover, this Agreement called for Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories. The Oslo Accord of 1993 that was signed in Washington DC saw the PLO officially recognize Israel. On the other hand, Israel allowed Palestinians to govern themselves in Gaza and West Bank, through in a limited manner. A letter of Mutual Recognition was signed and this is the one that facilitated the recognition of the State of Israel by the PLO. Oslo I also created the 'Declaration of Principles of Interim Self Government arrangements. This facilitated the establishment of the Palestinian Legislative Council and set out the map for the pulling out of Israeli militaries from Gaza over the subsequent 5 years.

Oslo II took place in 1995 and was signed in Taba, Egypt. It accorded the Palestinian Authority partial governance over the West Bank and part of Gaza. It also called for cooperation amid the two sides. However, the Oslo Accords did not resolve vital issues which comprised the status of

Jerusalem, the rights of Palestinian refugees returning to Israel and the continued establishment of

Jewish settlements in occupied territories.[39]

Unfortunately, the Oslo Accords did not hold for long because Palestinian attacks on Israel

continued. Israel did not pull out its troops from the occupied territories as it had been agreed and

in 2000, Israel started building more settlements in the territories they occupied. With this tension,

the spirit of the Accords collapsed thereby and attempts were made by President Clinton's

administration to revive the peace negotiation. But the Camp David Summit in 2000 between PLO

leader Yassir Arafat and Israeli leader Ehud Barak failed and this led to the second intifada. The

failure is attributed to the transition in US Presidency whereby President George W. Bush was

replacing Bill Clinton.

The administration had its lowest moment when terrorists struck on September 11, 2001. The Bush

Doctrine was a drastic change in the way US related with the Middle East. In contrast to President

Woodrow Wilson's policy of self-determination of peoples, President Bush sought to suffocate the

sovereignty of Middle Eastern countries to promote democracy and limit WMD and terrorism. The

Bush Doctrine saw the rise of anti-Americanism ideologies across the Middle East region. After

9/11, President Bush avowed war on terror and that the United States faced two enemies: the

terrorists' underworld and the allied states that were supporting it and were seeking to develop

WMD. He called these allied powers 'the Axis of Evil.' He reiterated that the USA would employ

all means necessary to thwart the activities of the rogue states so that they do not support terrorism

and manufacture Weapons of Mass Destruction. President Bush had the backing of the World

when USA led coalition attacked Afghanistan and toppled the Taliban Regime. However, he did

---

[39] *The Oslo Accords. Office of the Historian. United States State Department, https://www.history.com/topics/oslo-accords*

not garner substantive support to invade Iraq which led to the toppling of Saddam Hussein. For President Bush, the collapse of Saddam Hussein's regime signaled the rebirth of democracy in the Middle East. The most notable foreign policy shift was in the course of President George W. Bush's reign after September 11. Paradoxically, Bush's proclamation of democracy in Iraq and Afghanistan was during a time he supported autocratic and autocratic governments in Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and several Arab countries. His democracy agenda in the Middle East was however, short-term because soon afterwards Iraq sank into domestic war, Hamas triumphed in Gaza elections while at the same time Hezbollah became more popular.

This Bush Doctrine was met with outright hostility and anti-American ideologies across the region. Back home, the American People and majority of the government officials became skeptical of the invasion of Iraq in the first place. This opened a new frontier of retaliatory terrorism to respond to the US foreign policy on the Middle East. But according to President Bush, he tried to deal with issues head-on. In 2008, The New York Times magazine interviewed President Bush where he talked of what he hoped his Middle East legacy would be and he said that history would justify his actions for his willingness to do something about the threats in the Middle East.

2.4.10 President Barrack Obama (2008-2016)

President Barrack Obama inherited a shambolic Middle East with two wars to confront: in Iraq and Afghanistan. When he got into office Obama was determined to scale down the USA military participation in the region. For Obama, the continued occupation of the Iraq by US forces and the impact of terrorism had strained the USA both economically and its national interests. Obama worked towards emboldening the US national security interests. Indeed, President Obama had a lot to handle in the Middle East: the Iraq war, the nuclear programme of Iran, terrorism and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Some critics argue that Obama's Middle East policy floundered and

there is not much that his administration achieved since it is during Obama's tenure that conflicts raged in the region and Israeli scaled up its project of building more Jewish settlements in the occupied territories. Conflicts arose in Syria, Iraq, Yemen and Libya. In fact it is during Obama's tenure that Arab Spring arose across the Arab world and destabilized many Arab nations notably Libya, Tunisia and Turkey. Obama was unable to institute the two-state solution for the Israeli-Palestine conflict. Most significant of all was the Iran Nuclear Deal in Obama sought to stop Iran's nuclear programme in swap over lifting sanctions on Iran. On the flipside, it was during Obama's reign that ISIS arose and wreaked havoc in Iraq and Syria. Moreover, Obama did not take a decisive action to arrest the situation in Syria and for many observers; this gave Russia leverage in the region.

2.5 United States Foreign Policy Interests in the Middle East

As earlier indicated, USA has vested aims in the Middle East region largely became of its oil resources, support of Israel, keeping its military bases in the region, fighting Islamist and terror groupings in the region (Al-Qaeda, ISIS, Hezbollah and Hamas) and protecting US allies and their interests in the region

2.5.1 Accessing Oil in the Gulf Region

In the 19th and early 20th centuries during the industrial Revolution in Europe and the USA, oil became the main source of energy and the USA, Mexico, Romania and Russia were the main suppliers of the much needed crude oil at the time.[40] However, WWI saw decline in oil production a scenario that made the USA wary at the end of WWII. The USA made deals with a number of countries in the Middle East i.e. Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait to secure the supply of this

---

[40]Gelvin, J. L. (2005). *The Modern Middle East: A History* (pp. 247-248, 260, 214-215). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

important commodity through American oil companies namely like Mobil, Standard Oil of California (SoCal) and Exxon.

Given the long-term oil reserves prospects in the Middle East, The USA aimed at securing oil sources overseas to meet its future oil needs in future. This would take care of its economic growth plans and for purposes of supplementing its own oil sources back at home. After the oil Embargo crisis of 1973, when Oil Producing Countries (OPEC) countries withheld oil the USA realized that indeed oil was a very important resource and needed to do everything possible to have uninterrupted access to this resource. During the embargo, the USA's economy was adversely affected as it largely relied on oil from overseas.[41]

2.5.2 Supporting Israel

Israel and the United States are very close allies and the USA does everything it can to secure its ally which faces constant threats from its neighbours. After the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948, the USA has singular focus on ensuring the well-being of Israel and it has inculcated if in its foreign policy. The history of USA support for Israel goes back to the Balfour Declaration of 1917 when in 1922; the USA congress adopted the declaration.[42]After the adoption, the USA supported the migration of Jews into Palestine. Fast forward to 1947, the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) came up with a proposal of dividing Palestine into two states: Arab state and Jewish state. This arrangement was approved by the United Nations General Assembly on November 29,1947 and the Truman administration went ahead to support it and promoted Jewish in flux into Palestine. On 14th May, 1948, the state of Israel pronounced its

---

[41]Gelvin, J. L. (2005). *The Modern Middle East: A History* (pp. 247-248, 260, 214-215). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
[42]Mulhall, CSP, J. W. (1995). *America and the Founding of Israel: An Investigation of the Morality of America's Role* (pp. 64-65). Los Angeles, CA: Deshon Press.

independence. Shortly afterwards, the USA led in recognizing Israel's independence and other world powers, including USSR followed suit. Israel's Arab neighbors retaliated leading to the first Arab-Israel war of 1948. This would be followed by three more wars i.e. the 1956 Suez War, the 1967 Six Day war and the 1973 Yom Kippur war. It is after the 1967 Six Day War, that the USA endorsed the UNSC Resolution 242, which sought to secure a fair and permanent peace through resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Several attempts have been made to foster stability in the Middle East region especially for Israel and to this end, the USA has been the main actor. Various US Presidents have sponsored several initiatives aimed at securing tranquility on Israel. President Jimmy Carter midwifed the 1979 Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty, under the Bush Snr. administration the Oslo Accords I of 1993 (Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-government Arrangements commonly referred to as Oslo I), the Jordanian- Israel Peace Treaty of 26 October 1994 and the Israel-Palestinian Interim Agreement (Oslo I) of 28 September 1995 under the Clinton presidency.

The USA supports Israel in areas such as the military, economically and diplomatically. As USA's ally in the Middle East region Israel plays a vital role to America's national Security interests and helped tame communism and Arab nationalism in the region during the Cold War era.

2.5.3 To Maintain United States Military Bases

The USA runs several military bases across the world. These are meant for training, planning, stocking military equipment and running USA military operations across the World. The bases include the Air Force, the Army, the Navy and Communication/ Spy Units[43]. US military bases

---

[43]Dufour, J. (2007). *The Worldwide Network of US Military Bases.Global Research*. http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-worldwide-network-of-us-military-bases/5564

rose in number when the Cold War set because the USA had to secure its interests across the world and outdo the Soviet Union.

United States Military activities in the Middle East can be traced to the 1970's when the US struck an agreement with Bahrain to allow US Navy use Bahrain Naval facilities. However, the Bahrain government terminated the agreement following the Yom Kippur war in 1973.[44]

In 1979, two incidents happened that aggravated the US military presence in the Middle East region. The Iranian Revolution and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan were taken to be serious threats to the USA interests in the region. This was largely because the region held substantive oil resources estimated to be up to nearly three-quarters of the global oil resources. The then US President, Jimmy Carter swung into action and announced that the US would do anything possible to secure its interests with or without allies. He directed that the Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force (RDJTF) be formed. This taskforce would oversee the relations between the USA and the Middle East region. Then in January 1983, the Central Command (CENTCOM) was created to coordinate U.S activities in states in North Africa, Central Asia and the Middle East. The main role of CENTCOM is to ensure the region's stability, security, prosperity, respond to crisis, limit or rather prevent aggression and supporting development in the region.[45]

CENTCOM maintains US contact with various services in the Middle East and foster relationships with region's leaders. The CENTCOM has four bases and one unified command in the Middle East: the United States Naval Force, Middle East based in Bahrain, the United States Air Forces, Middle East based in Qatar, the United States Army Forces, Middle East in Kuwait and the United

---

[44]Sandars, C. T. (2000). *America's Overseas Garrisons: The Leasehold Empire*(p. 293). New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.
[45]U.S. Central Command History.(n.d.). Retrieved fromhttp://www.centcom.mil/ABOUT-US/HISTORY

States Marine Forces, Middle East located in Bahrain. The unified command is the United States Special Operations Command, Middle East based in Qatar.[46]

CENTCOM coordinated the US led coalition intervention in the 1991 Gulf War. This was in line with the CENTCOM's Area of Responsibility (AOR) when it was established in 1983.After the September 11, 2001 Terrorist attacks on U.S, CENTCOM's AOR was expanded and focused on the Global War on Terrorism. In this regard, CENTCOM coordinated various activities in Afghanistan, Iraq and the Horn of Africa. Notably, the George W. Bush administration invaded Iraq on the premise that the Iraq government had refused to co-operate with UN inspectors to inspect Iraq's nuclear sites and destroy Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). The Bush administration also accused the Saddam Hussein's Iraq government of aiding terrorism

2.5.4 Defending US Allies, Clients and Friends in the Region

The Cold War saw the Middle East region split into two. Some states including Egypt and Syria were pro-USSR while on the other side; other countries including Greece, Turkey and Israel were pro-capitalist and supported the U.S ideology. For purposes of ensuring allegiance, the two Super Powers would offer economic military diplomatic and any other form assistance necessary to their allies.

Client- states have been defined various to refer to states that depend on another state be it economically, politically and/ or militarily[47]. According to Fry et al, the two Super Powers had client states during the cold war. Israel and South Korea were client states for the United States

---

[46]2015 Index of U.S. Military Strength (n.d.). Retrieved from http://index.heritage.org/militarystrength/chapter/op-environment/middle-east/

[47]Fry, M. G., Goldstein, E., & Langhorne, R. (2002*). Guide to International Relations and Diplomacy* (p. 9). London: Continuum.

while Syria and Iraq were part of the client State for the USSR. They further offer that a client state is usually powerful military but economically weak.

It is important to note that during the cold war the USA used containment, difference and détente policies to limit USSR's communist expansion in the Middle East. The formation of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in 1954, METO in 1955 and CENTO in 1959 were part of this strategy. As the Cold War intensified Saudi Arabia, Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Lebanon, Jordan, Tunisia, Egypt, Kuwait, Bahrain, Israel and Oman became part of U.S client states. [48] This way the US has been able to maintain patronage in the region and gain strategic access to the resources in the Middle East especially oil.

The US has been able to establish its military bases and increase its presence in the region but the 2010-2011 Arab Spring saw the U.S shift its relationship with the regimes in the affected states in the region. The US chose to support the revolutionaries that finally led to the ouster of the leaders in the affected states. Currently the U.S supports rebels fighting President Al Bashar Assad in Syria but Russia stands with President Assad who has been able to survive ouster. This change of policy has many confused in that the U.S has been seen to shift policy depending on its interests at a particular time.

2.5.5. Countering Islamic Movement and Terrorist Groups

Islamic extremist movements and terror groups infest the Middle East region. After the USSR invaded Afghanistan in 1979, President Jimmy Carter decreed that the US would employ all means that would be necessary including military force to secure its targets in the Persian Gulf.

---

[48]Sylvan, D., &Majeski, S. (2003). *An Agent-Based Model of the Acquisition of U.S. Client States* (pp. 1-5). Portland, OR: Paper Prepared for Presentation at the 44th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association.

After the Soviet invasion, the U.S, China and Arab states openly and subversively supplied money and military and in form of weapons and training to the Mujahidin. The Afghanistan rebels got sophisticated weapons including Stinger missiles to shoot down Soviet planes. Unfortunately, the same weapons and skills would infiltrate into unintended insurgents that would later become a menace, the Taliban[49].

The Taliban ruled Afghanistan between 1996 and 2001 though it was not universally recognized internationally. Only UAE, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan recognized it. Moreover, the Taliban was accused of hosting terrorist group Al- Qaeda and the UNSC imposed sanctions on it. The Taliban said nothing about this and matters worsened in 1998 when Al-Qaeda bombed US embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. The USA accused the Taliban regime of sheltering Al Qaeda and its leader Osama Bin Laden. After the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the USA, the U.S declared war on terror and on 7th October, 2001, the USA together with the British and their NATO allies Forces invaded Afghanistan on *Operation Enduring Freedom* to topple the Taliban regime for its role in harbouring terrorists.

The Post-September 2011 American foreign Policy focused on war on Terror. The US has since and terrorist pursued extremist groups and terrorist organizations notably Al Shabaab in Somalia, the Taliban in Afghanistan, Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Iraq, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) so that it achieves its national security interests. The USA views these groups as determined to oppose the US and her allies by radically interpreting Islam to demonize the USA hence they are a serious threat to the United States and its interests including regional and global stability.

---

[49]Rashid, A. (2001). *Taliban: Militant Islam, Oil and Fundamentalism in Central Asia* (pp. 13-18). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

In fact, the USA has not left anything to chance in ensuring its national security. In its National Strategy for Combating Terrorism, 2003 [50]the U.S government outlined strategies to defeat terrorists, destroy their networks as well as defend US citizens at home and abroad. Saddam Hussein of Iraq was the first casualty of this strategy when the USA and her allies invaded Iraq and toppled his regime, which had been accused of harbouring terrorists and secretly running a nuclear program that was aimed at production of WMD. In August 2014, the USA formed an international coalition against ISIS and its installations in Syria and this operation ongoing. The USA is keen not to allow there groups to take control of the Middle East region thereby destabilizing the region hence work against the U.S interests in the region

2.6   Conclusion

As outlined in this chapter the U.S foreign policy in Middle East has spanned over a century but intensified after WWII. The USA came up with strategies to hold a firm grip of the region lest the Soviet Union and its communism ideologies would infiltrate the region. The desire to have a continuous access to oil resources in the Middle East is the overriding motivation for the USA presence in the region. The USA moved into the region and even got involved in internal affairs of some countries in the region to secure the region's stability. For example, in Iraq the USA established an all-inclusive government whereby the Sunni faction, which had been sidelined for a long time by the Saddam Hussein regime, was included. They also depoliticized the military to stabilize the country after the ouster of Saddam Hussein. Recently, the Obama administration struck a deal with Iran famously known as the Iran Deal to curtail Iran's nuclear ambitions. Iran had begun rising as a hegemon in the region and the USA and her western allies are determined to

---

[50]National Strategy for Combating Terrorism. (2003). Retrieved from
http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/60172.pdf

ensure that such a thing does not happen. All these efforts including the interests discussed above are aimed to ensure the U.S patronage of the region. It is indeed important to reiterate that the United States will for a long time have its presence felt in the Middle East region.

CHAPTER THREE

HISTORY OF TERRORISM AND RETALIATORY TERRORISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

3.0   Introduction

This chapter traces the history of terrorism in the Middle East and when retaliatory terrorism began in the region. The factors for the rise of activities of terrorism in the Middle East and what causes retaliatory terrorism in the region were explored.

3.1   History of Ancient Terrorism

Terrorism can be traced back to the pre historic times as early as the first century when Jewish zealots took on collaborators of the Roman Empire at the time. The rebels are commonly referred to as Sicarii because they used daggers to murder their targets. They could hide their daggers under their clothing then mingle with crowds, kill their targets then disappear. Their targets included the clergy (Sadducees, Herodians and Priests of Temples). Fast-forward to the 11th century when an Ismail sect of Shia Muslims known as Hashshashin arose. This group was opposed to Fatimid rule

at the time. The militia numbers were too few to counter their enemy directly and they chose systematic elimination of key figures which included governors and military commanders.

Another incident that can be linked to terrorism was the Gunpowder Plot when some conspirators plotted to devastate the Parliament of England on its official opening by the King on November 5, 1605. The group had secretly planned to blow up large quantities of gunpowder placed under the Westminster Palace. The ultimate plot was to kill the King who at time was James I and members of both the House of Lords and House of Commons hence effectively have a coup. These perpetrators wanted to restore Catholic faith to England, but then the plot was unearthed way before it happened by the English spies. Had it materialized, it would have been the most devastating in the history of Britain and would have led to a religious war.

The plot became famous as the Gunpowder Plot and there is annual anniversary in Britain every November, 5 whereby fireworks are displayed and large bonfires lit. Dummies of Guy Fawkes (the one who procured and placed the gunpowder) and the Pope are often set ablaze. This incident is usually compared with the modern- day religions terrorism especially Islamic terrorist activities against the United States.

3.2   The Emergence of Modern Terrorism

Modern terrorism is linked to the rise of nationalist movement in former Empires of Europe. The groups arose to generate publicity as well as exert influence globally. Through their activities, the groups mobilized sympathy for their cause and got support and this fascinated people who had similar situations elsewhere. Terrorism was now seen as the effective means through which local issues would be transformed into international matters. Anarchism became the major ideology that was linked with terrorism. Modern terrorism stems back to the 19th century when several technological advancements were made, powerful weapons were made, global interaction got to

high levels and radical nationalist movements arose. Modern terrorism originated in Ireland where the Fenian Brotherhood reined terror to oppose British rule. Another example of modern terrorist activities was in the USA where abolitionist John Brown led armed opposition to slavery and the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) which used violence, murder, lynching and scare tactics to oppress African Americans. The KKK was so powerful that it controlled the government of four states namely: Oklahoma, Indiana, Tennessee and South Carolina. It is estimated that the gang had over 550,000 members across the USA. A number of activities associated with terrorism have been recorded over time in the 20th century and they all have a pattern of anarchy, violence aimed at achieving certain ends. This can be said of the nationalist groups which used violence against the Ottoman Empire. These groups included the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization and the Armenian Revolutionary which used assassinations, Uprisings, hijackings and arms to coerce the Ottoman Empire to split up and create independent nations.

Revolutionary nationalism motivated, political violence in the 20th century and Western Colonial powers were the targets. The strategies, which included political assassinations, changed the course of history in many parts of the world. Notably, the assassinations precipitated events that led to the WWI. Additionally, in the 1930s the Nazis in Germany and Stalin's administration in USSR meted terrorism against opponents.

3.3 Rise of Terrorism in the Middle East

Terrorism activities in the Middle East spring back to nationalist movements that were established to champion for independence of different countries in the region. The Muslim Brotherhood which was founded in 1928 in Egypt attacked British soldiers and police stations as well as collaborators. In Algeria, the National Liberation Front (FLN) was a resistance movement against French rule that was founded in 1954 in Algeria. This resistance movement got inspiration from the Viet Minh

rebel that had ejected French soldiers from Vietnam. The group used compliance violence in which it would gain control over a village and then force the natives to kill any French collaborators among them. Its most significant attacks were the Toussaint Attacks of October 31 1954 in which it carried out coordinated shootings and bombings on French installations and the homes of collaborators. Subsequent systematic uprisings against the French saw the FLN gain popularity and immense support from Algerians and in 1962 the FLN secured Algeria's independence from France and became the ruling party.

In Palestine, Fatah was founded in 1954 as a nationalist group and it joined the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) IN 1967. The covers Palestinian nationalist groups and it was founded in 1964. The membership of the PLO comprises several paramilitary and political groups in which the largest include; the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PLFP), Fatah, and the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP). These factions have been associated with acts of terrorism. Black September was a splinter group of the Fatah which was organized in 1970 and it is popular for taking hostage eleven Israeli athletes at the September 1972 Summer Olympics in Munich, Germany. The PLFP, founded in 1967, is best known for hijacking 3 international passenger planes in 1970. The hijackers landed 2 of the planes in Jordan and blew up the 3rd.

The DFLP came into the limelight in 1974 when its three members killed 22 Israeli high school students in what is commonly known as Ma'alot Massacre.

In Iran, the People's Mujahedin of Iran (PMOI) was established in 1965 as a socialist Islamic group. It's been fighting the Iranian government ever since the Khomeini Revolution. It was established to counter capitalism and a perceived exploitation of Iran by the West.

The Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia (ASALA) was established in 1975 in Beirut and it sought to hit back for the Armenians who had been killed in the course of the Armenian Genocide and compel the Turkish authorities to allow creation an Armenian nation state. Notably, in August 1982, ASALA rebels opened fire in Esembuga International Airport in Ankara killing nine people and injuring scores.

In Turkey, the Partiya Karkendu Kurdistan (PKK) Kurdistan workers Party) was founded in 1978 with inspiration from the Marxist theory of people's war and used FLN in Algeria's tactics of compliance violence. The group: objective has been established of an independent Kurdish state comprising North Eastern Iraq, South-Eastern Turkey, North Western Iran and North Eastern Syria. The group launched several attacks (bombings) against Turkish government installation, and this was more pronounced after it changed into a paramilitary army organization in 1984.

3.4   Terrorism in the 21st Century in the Middle East

Terrorist activities in the Middle East got a new dimension after Osama bin Laden, Al- Qaeda' aim was to establish Islamic fundamentalist regimes in Muslim countries to replace Western Dominance in those countries. Bin Laden, had in 1996 proclaimed violent Jihad against the US and 1998, Al-Qaeda simultaneously attacked US embassies in Nairobi and Dar-es Salaam.

In the 20th Century, the contemporary Middle East was characterized by three major events. European power exited; the state of Israel was founded and oil became an important commodity. It is at this juncture that the USA moved in to influence affairs in the region. The USA became a key player in the stability of the region and a force to reckon with in oil matters after 1950. However, revolutions sought across the region bringing onto power anti-western regimes in most parts of the region. Notably, in Egypt (1954), Syria (1963), Iraq (1968) and Libya (1969).

The new regimes had the support of the masses as they promised to annihilate Israel defeat the USA and her allies as well as prosper the region. However, the popular support waned when Arab states that were untied against Israel lost the six day war of 1967. A vacuum was created in the region leading to the rise of fundamental and militant Islam. The USA re-asserted itself so as to defend its Arab Allies in the region namely: Jordan, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Persian Gulf Emirates.

The major clash in the Middle East which remains until this day is the Palestine – Israeli conflict. This conflict saw Arab states forces to destroy Israel leading to 4 wars i.e. Arab- Israel war (1948), Suez War (1956), Six –Day War (1967), War of Attrition (1970), Yom Kippur War (1973). Peace efforts have been attempted but a lasting solution hasn't been found yet. The Gulf War changed the history of the Middle East when Saddam Hussein led Iraq in an 8 year war with Iran and then invaded Kuwait. The USA led a coalition consisting of Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Syria to evict Iraq from Kuwait. After this, Gulf war, USA military remained in the Persian Gulf and this offended many Muslims.

3.5   The Middle East in the 1990's

Despite the fall of communism in 1989, no governance changes happened in the Middle East. What stood out more significantly was rise of Islamism especially after most Arab governments in the region failed. Islamism in the region was promoted by the Shia clerics in Iran and the Wahhabis sect in Saudi Arabia. Militant Islamism arose especially among educated Arab as well as other Muslims. It is imperative to note that most of the radical Islamists got their military prowess while they were fighting against Soviets in Afghanistan.

They were financed by the USA in operation Cyclone which was a component of the Reagan Doctrine. In operation Cyclone, the United States CIA armed and financed the mujahedeen in Afghanistan before and during the USSR's military involvement to back the Democratic Republic

of Afghanistan. It is said to be one of the most extensive and costly covert operations of the CIA ever.

The Reagan Doctrine was a strategy by the Reagan administration to counter USSR influence globally and end the Cold War. It marked the foreign policy of the USA in the 1980's till the end of the Cold War.

The operation cyclone was part of President Reagan's expanded program to aid anti-Soviet resistance movements overseas. CIA Special Activists Division officers were deployed to train and arm the Mujahedeen forces that were battling the soviet army. In this programme, the USA government worked closely with Pakistan. Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI) The ISI was responsible for distributing funds, military training and financially supporting the resistance groups in Afghanistan. This operation can be said to have facilitated the rise of insurgency in the Middle East. Between 1978 and 1992 the ISI trained over 100,000 insurgents and encourage volunteers from the Arab states to join in the resistance in Afghanistan. When USSR troops withdrew from Afghanistan, the USA cut off support to the new government but then already the damage had been done. Osama bin Laden had established Al-Qaeda and he is known to have had closer ties with Haggau and Hekmatya, who were Bin Laden's key allies for many years.[51]Haggani was an Arabist commander and received direct cash from CIA without the involvement of the ISI. Ultimately, Haggani immensely contributed to the creation and growth of Al Qaeda. Haggani allowed Bin Laden to train mujahedeen volunteers in Haggani territory.[52]

---

[51] The Haggani history: Bin Laden's advocate inside the Taliban. researchersguru.edu. retrieved 29 Sept.2018
[52]Cassman, D. Haggani Network – mapping militant organisations. Web. Stanford.edu retrieved 29 Sept. 2018

3.5.1 Terrorism Activities in the Middle East in the 1990s

Modern International Terrorism can be traced to have laid its foundations in the period 1968-1979 colonialism and the establishment of Israel saw the rise of movements across the Islamic and Arab world. The revolutionary movements resorted to use of terrorism and this acted as the trigger of modern international terrorism. Hijackings, kidnappings, bombing and murders.

Notably, the 1979 Iranian Islamic Revolution, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the Mujahedeen's war against the Soviets in Afghanistan had a direct impact on the rise and expansion of terrorist groups. Such groups in the Middle East include Hezbollah, Egyptian Islamic Jihad, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, HAMAs, and AL –Gamaat Al-Islamiya. All these groups are radical religious groups.

Hezbollah was formed in Lebanon in 1982 and it is known to be strongly against Israel and the west. The group is said to be directly linked to Iran from where it obtains finances, weaponry, training, organizational and political aid. The group is known to have been part of some terrorist attacks against the USA. These include: the 1983 suicide truck bombing of the US embassy and US Marine Barracks in Beirut; attack on Israel Embassy in Argentina in 1992.

3.6   The Globalization of Terrorism

Following the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the activities of the cold war facilitated the growth and spread of terrorism across the world. Instability in a number of states e.g. Afghanistan, Colombia, the Balkans and parts of Africa saw the establishment of training and recruitment bases for terrorists. A case in point is the Taliban militia which emerged in 1994 in Afghanistan. This group was well coordinated; with wide spread activities all over the region. The Taliban went ahead to rule Afghanistan between 1996 and 2001 when the US and her allies invaded toppling the regime. The Taliban regime had been accused by the USA administration of harbouring Al

Qaeda and Osama Bin Laden.[53] The Taliban was formed by a group of mujahedeen, Islamic fighters who had been trained to resist soviet forces in Afghanistan in Operation cyclone.

The key players in the international radical Islamic terrorism are: Al Qaeda Armed Islamic group (GIA), Aden-Abyan Islamic Army (AAIA), Harakat-ul-Mujahidiu (HUM), Jaish –e-Mohammed, Lashkar –i- Tarika, and in the middle east Al Qaeda was involved in Iraq, Israel, Palestine and Yemen. Osama bin Laden had interest in Iraq after Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990 in that he feared Iraq would want to engulf the region by setting eyes on Saudi Arabia.

Hezbollah on the other hand has been involved in a series of suicide bombing against Israel. Al Qaeda sought to remove western occupation in Iraq after the 2003 US led invasion. Abu Musab al Zarqani was in charge in Iraq but later formed ISIS. Al Qaeda's aim was to replace western- backed regime in Iraq with Sunni Islamist regime. Zarqani founded ISIS but was killed in 2006 by US air strike. ISI was involved in Syrian civil war in which it fought against Syrian government forces. The group was renamed ISIS – Islamic state of Iraq and Syria since it had expanded to Syria. ISIS spread fast in Iraq and Syria and was keen on establishing and implementing Sharia law. The group carried out several terrorist activities in the Middle East especially in 2014 when it attained the Yazidi's in Iraq killing several people, selling women into slavery and public televised executions of their targets. ISIS went a step further to carryout terrorist attacks in the West; the November 2015 Paris attacks, December 2015 Sari Bernardino attack, march 2016 Brussels bombings, June 2016 Pulse Nightclub shooting, July 2016 Nice attack, the December 2016 Berlin attack and the May 2017 Manchester attack. US led other nations to fight ISIS and as at now, the group has weakened.[54]

---

[53] Council of Foreign Relations. www.cfr.org/background/taliban/afgh.
[54] History.com/topics/A21st century/ISIS

3.7   Islamist Terrorism in the Middle East

Islamist terrorism in the Middle East is seen to occur in three formats. Al Qaeda and ISIS transnational terrorism; Islamist terrorism of national liberation movements (Hezbollah and HAMAS) and Islamic terrorism in domestic insurgencies (Egypt's Gamaa &Islamiya).

Over time retaliatory attacks have been recorded in the region. Just recently Iran's revolutionary guards vowed to retaliate an attack on its soldiers. Iran claims that the attackers have been backing of the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia and the USA.

In his article on "*The Endless Cycle of Terrorism*" Ivan Eland points out that retaliatory terrorism is a direct result of the USA and western countries' melding in the affairs of the middle east.

He offers that Muslim countries resent western interference in their affairs. Terrorism in Middle East and its subsequent global networks were due to the activities of western nations in the Middle East region. When Israel invaded Lebanon in 1982, the USA supported it and sent US troops to 'keep peace.' The troops fought alongside the Christian minority prompting the radical Shiite Muslim group Hezbollah to bomb the USA marine barracks in Beirut. The attack killed 241 US marines and President Reagan withdrew the US forces from Lebanon. Osama bin Laden later said that he had realized that western countries could be displaced from Muslim soil through such terrorist attacks. These sentiments were reinforced when Mujahedeen forced the soviet army out of Afghanistan. Bin Laden started attacking US forces and its interests in order to drive them out of the region. He was incensed when he returned home after the Gulf war to find US forces occupying Islam holy territory.

Interestingly, bin Laden's Al Qaeda network got a lot of sympathizers and supporters, volunteers as well as financial support. The first recorded retaliatory activity of bin Laden was when he helped

Muhammad Aideed drive out US forces in Somalia in 1993, followed by terrorist attacks on US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 and bombing USS Cole in 2000.

After 11th September 2001 attacks on USA, the then US President George W. Bush declared Global War on terror in which the first causalities were Afghanistan and Iraq. Consequently numerous new Islamic radicals arose to help fight against the western occupiers in Iraq. Al Qaeda in Iraq was born which later transformed into ISIS. All these can be attributed to western neo-colonial meddling in the matters of the Middle East and this is likely to continue unless the US and her western allies back off.[55]

3.8   Conclusion

The rise and increase of terrorism in the Middle East can be largely attributed to existence of foreign western powers in the Middle East region. As captured in this chapter, Islamist movements rose as a direct result of the involvement of non-Muslims in the affairs of the region and the discovery that the US and her allies wouldn't stand the attacks but would rather withdraw if attacked as was the case after the attack on US Marine Base in Beirut that saw President Reagan withdraw the US troops from Lebanon. This set a precedence whereby extremist groups adopted this strategy in order to expel the foreign Western powers from the region. The continued presence of the Western powers and their activities in the region facilitated the globalization of terrorist activities beyond the Middle East region. The extremists who abhorred the presence of the West in the Middle East region started targeting the interests of the USA and her Allies abroad.

---

[55] Eland I, www.huffingpost.com/ivan-eland/the-endless-cycle-of-terr-8574916.html accessed 29/9/2018

CHAPTER FOUR

EVALUATION OF RETALIATORY TERRORSM AS A RESULT OF USA FOREIGN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

4.1 Introduction

This chapter analyzed the United States Foreign Policy effects on terrorism in the Middle East. Specific focus was on retaliatory terrorism as a result of the USA foreign policy on the Middle East. The chapter focuses on study findings and analysis of both primary data and secondary data. Primary data was collected through interviews and questionnaires administered to security and terrorism experts; US Embassy Officials, International NGOs officials and KDF Officers privy to the Operation Linda Nchi in Somalia. Secondary data collected from materials and documents on US Foreign Policy in the Middle East, terrorism and counter terrorism was used.

4.2 USA Foreign Policy Motivations for Retaliatory Terrorism in the Middle East

To a large extent, scholars, experts and commentators agree that the USA activities in the Middle East have played a large role in occasioning retaliation against the United States by terrorists. An analysis of several events preceding and after September 11, 2001 attacks on the US show a systematic plan to 'revenge' on the US owing to its foreign policy and actions in the Middle East region. From a number of coordinated attacks against the US, the US government admits that retaliatory terrorism against the US is linked to its interventionist policy overseas. A number of factors stemming from USA policy in the region were outlined to explain the phenomenon.

4.2.1 Presence of USA Military in the Middle East Region

The US has been accused for its activist global foreign policy which puts it at loggerheads with factions across the world. In the Middle East, the USA has been in a number of military-related activities in the region. In the 1980s, the US military got involved in the Civil War in Lebanon.

Initially it was intended that the US would play a neutral peacekeeping role but soon afterwards, outright bias was evident. The US military started siding with the Christians and attacked Muslims. Consequently, a radical Shiite Islamic group known as Hezbollah carried out retaliatory attacks against USA forces. The Hezbollah kidnapped and killed Americans and blew up US installations including a Marine Barrack in Beirut, Lebanon. The US was forced to withdraw its military from Lebanon. This motivated the Hezbollah group and later on other similar-minded factions that this was the only way to deal with the Americans.

Similarly, after the Gulf War, the US had some troops in Saudi Arabia to oversee the region. This angered Muslims who felt that the US was interfering with their affairs unnecessarily. Osama bin Laden was one of the Muslims who were deeply incensed by their presence and he issued a fatwa demanding that the Americans get out of Saudi Arabia. This was after Saudi Arabia allowed the US and allied forces but declined Osama Bin Laden's request to have his *Mujahedeen* come in to protect Saudi Arabia from possible Iraqi invasion.

The Fatwa avowal of war against Americans for their occupation of Islam's Holy places marked the beginning of full blown war by Al Qaeda on the United States. Most of the late 1990's Bin Laden and his network were determined to carry out sustained attacks on USA and its interests. In 1996 Bin Laden came up with a scheme to kill the then US President Bill Clinton but then the plot was uncovered before its execution.

The culmination of this declaration was the famous September 11. 2001 attacks in the US. In 2001 and 2006 Osama bin Laden released a video in which he acknowledged his direct involvement which he said had been inspired by destruction of towers in Lebanon in 1982 by Israel. The presence of US military in Saudi Arabia irked bin Laden and his allies because Islam's holy cities of Mecca and Medina are in Saudi Arabia.

4.2.2 USA Support for Israel

From the time when the state of Israel was created and its subsequent recognition by the US, the most of the Arab world has been known to be unimpressed. It is recorded that US –Israel relationship has its foundation in the 1973 Yom Kippur war when the US helped Israel rebuff Arab invasion. During this period the Cold War had intensified and the US started to view Israel as a buffer against the control of the USSR in the area. Over the years the USA has helped Israel financially with recent estimates indicating that Israel has received over $118 billion and the USA vetoes any UN Security Council resolutions against Israel. This is one of the core grounds that Osama Bin Laden called for attacks targeting the USA in his 2002 '*Letter to America'*. In the letter, Bin Laden reiterated that the USA's support of Israel was one of the greatest crimes and that the USA had to pay for the crime. Bin Laden argued that the USA had ignored the atrocities of Israel against Palestine. As much as US- Israel relations flow with changes in US political leadership, the mutual cooperation is hinged on Israel's status as the only democracy in the Middle East as well as a close ally on security matters. Recent actions by the Trump administration of recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital city and intentions to establish a first permanent USA military base in Israel are a proof that the relationship is indeed solid. President Trump rolled back the US – Iran nuclear deal that had been sanctioned by his predecessor, President Obama.

4.2.3 Western Sanctions against Middle East Countries

Since the 1990 Gulf war, the UN Security Council improved economic sanctions on Iraq and this angered factions of the Arab world. Al Qaeda did confirm this as a motivation to kill Americans. In a fatwa released in 1998, Al Qaeda called upon all Muslims to kill Americans wherever because of trade embargo on Iraq. The sanctions on Iraq were occasioned by Iraq invading Kuwait in 1990. Evidently the sanctions publish civilians more than the government. Osama Bin Laden in 2004

video referred to the sanctions as the greatest mass slaughter of children. In the sanctions, rampant inflation masses felt, unemployment rose, people depended on food rations form the government. The suffering of Iraqi people emboldened President Saddam Hussein's anti-Western propaganda and the civilian saw him as a savior who was trying hard to feed them while the Americans tried to starve them.

In the recent times, western countries use economic sanctions to pressure countries into pursuing a particular direction for example, the west has applied severe sanction on Iran to make it abandon its nuclear program. These were the same sanctions that were imposed on Libya between 1992 and 1999. This strategy has put the Americans at loggerheads with the sanctioned countries which argue that the US uses the sanctions, so as to effect regime change in the target countries.

4.2.4 Religious Motivation – Islamism

It has been argued even by scholars that some terrorist attacks for example the September 11, 2001 one was inspired by religious extremism. The argument is that the activities are meant to restore global moral order which allegedly has been corrupted by the enemies of Islam. The argument further says that it is an act of redemption rather than being neither political nor strategic. Such factions such as Al Qaeda are defending Islam. As a result transnational terrorism of Al Qaeda, national liberation factions such as Hezbollah and Hamas, and domain insurgencies point to a systemic rise of Islamist terrorism in the Middle East region. Violent Islamist extremisms is landed as the motivation behind such groups as ISIS, Hezbollah which is said to have adopted suicide bombings after the concept of martyrdom was removed on and Islam reinterpreted. Religion extremism is seen as galvanize Muslims to join their cause.

4.2.5 Dislike of Western Ideologies

Retaliatory terrorism on the United States and her allies has been attributed to the USA perceived immoral behaviour. Osama bin Laden pointed out that America needed to stop its cruelty, lies wickedness and debauchery and become people of good manners, principles, honour and purity. Michael Schemer, a former CIA analyst argued that the USA is attacked by terrorists for what they do and not what they are.

4.2.6 To Provoke US into War

Retaliatory terrorism against the US has been seen as a strategy to provoke USA into war so as to incite Muslims against the USA. A pan –Islamist revolution is the ultimate objective. For example, Osama Bin Laden galvanized his followers to unite against the west. The intention was to spark revolutions in the Arab world to counter US presence in the Middle East. The attacks on US were projected to make the US deploy more military personnel in the region which is then expected to provoke Muslims who will then confront the issue of western domination hence rise against it.

4.7 Conclusion

From the discussion above, it is evident that the terrorist activities against the USA and her interest largely have to do with the country's foreign policy in the Middle East. The retaliatory approach by the United States in the Middle East takes a higher percentage of the motivating factors for terrorism against the USA. The retaliatory actions by the USA are exhibited through their presence in the region and the interventions that the USA has been involved in the region. Since the Gulf War, the US military has been active in the affairs of the region. In a way, the terrorism meted on the United States can be blamed on its interventionist foreign policy.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the whole study and then gives conclusions and recommendations from the study. It is hoped that the recommendation will be helpful to aid those who are keen on understanding US involvement in the Middle East. It will also help policy makers in coming up with counter-terrorism strategies as well as advice governments on foreign policy matters.

5.2 Summary

The objective of this study was to assess the effect of USA retaliatory approach foreign policy has on terrorism in the Middle East. The study sought to evaluate the foreign policy of the United State in the Middle East and the effect this has had on terrorism against the USA. The changing foreign policies of the US on the region over the years were evaluated as well as the rise of terrorism in the region. Specific attention was given to the link between the US foreign policy in the region and the terrorist activities targeting the USA.

The study was divided into five chapters. Chapter One is on the research proposal and it gave a detailed background of the study, objectives, the justification of the study, literature review and research methodology. Chapter Two gives an evaluation of USA foreign policy in the Middle East in the recent times since the end of WWII. The chapter explores the history of interaction between the two parties as well as the motivating factors behind the pretense of the USA in the Middle East region. Finally, the chapter examines the shift of the USA foreign policy on the Middle East under different US governments since 1945. This examination includes the reflationary approach and intervention strategy that the USA adopted for the region. Chapter Three analyses the history of

terrorism and the rise of retaliatory terrorism in the Middle East region. In this chapter the factors for the rise of the terrorist activities and the causes of retaliatory terrorism are explored.

Chapter Four is an evaluation of the effects of USA foreign policy on terrorism in the Middle East. The specific focus of the chapters was on retaliatory terrorism as a result of USA foreign policy in the Middle East. The chapter relies on research findings that resulted from interviews and questionnaires.

The study relied on both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection. Questionnaires were administered to experts in security and terrorism affairs, US embassy officials, international NGOs and KDF officers involved in OLN. Qualitative data was obtained from relevant materials on US foreign policy, Treaties, expert opinion, theories and books.

5.3 Conclusion

It is evident from the study that US foreign policy has far-reaching consequences on terrorism in the region as well as retaliatory terrorism against the USA and her allies. As noted earlier, the interventionist policy of the US in the region created ripples and provoked reactionary response from sections of nations of the Middle East region. Since the 1982 civil war in Lebanon, it was felt that the USA was biased against the Arabs and this was further escalated during and after the Gulf war. When the USA stationed its military in Saudi Arabia the anger seems to have risen to optimum levels. It is at this point that the USA became a direct target of those who didn't want it on the regions soil on the pretext that it would interfere with the holy places of Islam. Since then the US has been a recipient of both small and large scale terrorist activities against it and its interests at home and abroad. The ultimate price that the United States paid for this was the September 11, 2001 attacks on USA soil and this led to the USA government declaring Global War in Terror. The invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan remains the mark that this war on terror was all about.

Scholars and experts argue that the USA has itself to blame for the misfortunes it experiences but then there is an ambiguity of what the USA needs to do because it is the Super power which means that it had the responsibility over the world.

5.4 Recommendations

War on terror is indeed a phenomenon that should be embraced by all actors in the international system. However, to win this war, the factors that cause terrorism need to be well understood. It is through this that relevant strategies can be developed to be antidotes. Retaliating terrorism has been on the rise in modern times especially after the end of the Cold War. The West especially the USA has been on the receiving end. An analysis of the motivating factors gives interventionism as the leading factor. To this end the USA should adopt a different strategy in dealing with affairs of other countries across the globe especially in the Middle East region. This is because retaliatory terrorism against the United States has been proven to be as a result of its continued presences in the region that is perceived as being intrusion by factions in the region. The USA can seek partnership and collaboration with stakeholders in the region instead of sidelining them because it ought to come out clearly on its real intentions in the region rather than leaving it to the interpretations of parties who create anti-West propaganda to achieve their own selfish ends. If the USA can genuinely address concerns of the groups and be seen to be benevolent then the retaliatory terrorism can be adequately mitigated.

The USA needs to have a shift on its foreign policy on matters that portray it as an intruder on other nations' affairs. Over the years the USA has been seen to be prejudiced against some actors in the international system especially in the Middle East region and this has put it at loggerheads with some factions who gang up to counter the USA and her allies whenever an opportunity presents itself. The tag 'Axis of Evil' by US President George W. Bush served to confirm to the

Arab World that indeed the USA had a negative perception of some international actors in the Middle East region. This aggravated the situation whereby terrorists and sympathetic states coalesced to attack USA interest across the World in the name of 'defending' themselves. Owing to the USA position in the World it can objectively influence policy to ensure tranquility transcends the global setup.

References

Allport, G. (1945). Human nature and the peace. Psychological Bulletin , 42, 376-78.

Barnett, B., & Reynolds, A. (2009). Terrorism and the Press: An Uneasy Relationship. New York: Peter Lang.

Betts, R. (1998). The New Threat of Mass Destruction. Foreign Affairs , 77 (1): 28.Carter, J. (2001). *The Carter Doctrine: Third State of the Union Message,* Washington, DC, January 23, 1980. In J. Podell, & S. Anzovin (Eds*.), Speeches of the American Presidents* (2nd ed., p. 857). Bronx, NY: The H.W. Wilson Company.

Caporaso, J. A. (1997). Across the Great Divine: Integrating Comparative and International Politics. Florence: European University Institute.

Crabb, Jr., C. V. (1983). *American Foreign Policy in the Nuclear Age* (4th ed., pp. 399-400). New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

Crawford, N. C. (2000). The passion of world politics: Propositions on emotion and emotional relationships. International Security , 24, 116-56.

Defense Science Board. (1997). The Defense Science Board 1997 Summer Study Task Force on DoD Responses to Transnational Threats. Washington: Department of Defense.

Diller, D. C. (Ed.). (1991). *The Middle East: Revised to Include a Persian Gulf Crisis Supplement*(7th ed., p. 109). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc.

Dosch, J. (2006). The Impact of Democratization on the Making of Foreign Policy in Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines.Südostasienaktuell , 5:42-70.

Droba, D. D. (1931). Effect of various factors on militarism-pacifism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology , 26, 141-53.

Dufour, J. (2007). The Worldwide Network of US Military Bases.Global Research.

Dunne, T., & Schmidt, B. C. (2008).Realism. In J. Baylis, S. Smith, & P. Owens, The Globalization of World Politics. An introduction to international relations (p. 91). New York: Oxford University Press.

Durbin, E., &Bowlby, J. (1939).Personal aggressiveness and war. London: Kegan Paul.

Einstein, A., & Freud, S. (1932). Why war? Paris: International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation.http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-worldwide-network-of-us-military-bases/5564

Eland, I. (1999). Does U.S. Intervention Overseas Breed Terrorism? The Historical Record. Foreign Policy Briefing , 50: 1-24.

Fry, M. G., Goldstein, E., & Langhorne, R. (2002).*Guide to International Relations and Diplomacy* (p. 9). London: Continuum.

Freedman, L. (2008). A Choice of Enemies: America Confronts the Middle East. New York: Public Affairs.

Gelvin, J. L. (2005). *The Modern Middle East: A History* (pp. 247-248, 260, 214-215). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

George, A. L., & George, J. (1956). Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: A personality study. New York: John Day.

Gholz, E., & Press, D. G. (2007). Energy Alarmism: The Myths That Make Americans Worry about Oil. Cato Institute Policy Analysis , 589.

Hadar, L. (2005). Sandstorm: American Blindness in the Middle East. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hoffman, B. (2006). Inside terrorism (2nd ed.).;. Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Hoge, J. F., & Rose, G. (2001). How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War. New York: Public Affairs.

Holsti, O. R. (1989). Models of International Relations and Foreign Policy. Diplomatic History , 13, 1:15-43.

Ivan E., "*Does U.S. Intervention Overseas Breed Terrorism*?: The Historical Record," Cato Institute

Jonathan Stevens, Counter-Terrorism, IISS, Oxford University Press, New York, 2004 *Deterrence still matters* p 98-p113

Jones, A. M. (1973). *U.S. Foreign Policy in a Changing World* (p. 184). New York, NY: David McKay Company, Inc.

Kroenig, M., &Pavel, B. (2012).*How to Deter Terrorism*. The Washington Quarterly , 35 (2): 21-36.

Langer, W. C. (1972). *The Mind of Adolf Hitler: The Secret Wartime Report*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Leites, N. (1951). The operational code of the Politburo. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Levy, J. S. (2013).Psychology and Foreign Policy Decision-Making. Rutgers: Rutgers University.

Lenczowski, G. (1980). *The Middle East in World Affairs* (4th ed., p. 792). New York, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lenczowski, G. (1984). *U.S. Policy in the Middle East: Problems and Prospects*. In D. L. Bark (Ed.), *To Promote Peace: U.S. Foreign Policy in the Mid-1980s* (pp. 163-165). Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Little, D. (2002).*American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East since 1945* (pp. 119-120). Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Lum, C., Kennedy, L. W., &Sherley, A. J. (2006). The Effectiveness of Counter Terrorism Strategies: A Campbell Systematic Review. Washington DC: Rutgers University, School of Criminal Justice and Center for the Study of Public Security.

Mallow, B. P. (1997). Terror vs. Terror: Effects of Military Retaliation on Terrorism. Washington D.C.: National Defense University.

May, M. (1943).A social psychology of war and peace. New Haven: Yale University Press.

McDermott, R. (2004). Political psychology in international relations. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

McDermott, R. (2008). Presidential leadership, illness and decision making. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, A. D. (2008). The Much Too Promised Land: America's Elusive Search for Arab-Israeli Peace. New York: Bantam.

Moravcsik, A. (1997). Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics. International Organization , 51(4): 513-553.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1973). Politics among Nations; The Struggle for Power and Peace, 5th ed. . New York .

Mulhall, CSP, J. W. (1995). *America and the Founding of Israel: An Investigation of the Morality of America's Role* (pp. 64-65). Los Angeles, CA: Deshon Press.

Nevin, J. A. (2003). Retaliating Against Terrorists Behavior and Social. Behaviorists for Social Responsibility , 12: 109-128.

Paul K. Davis & Brian Michael Jenkins, *Deterrence and Influence in Counter-Terrorism, Rand:* National Defense Research Institute, 2002.

Peter Bergen, Holy War, Inc.: *Inside the Secret World of Osama bin Laden* (New York: The Free Press, 2001), p. 222. Emphasis in original.

Peretz, D. (1968). The Middle East Selected Readings (pp. 1-14). New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Perl, R. F. (2001). Terrorism, the Future, and U.S. Foreign Policy. Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service.

Ploch, L. (2010). Countering Terrorism in East Africa: The U.S. Response. Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service.

Polling data reported in Karen DeYoung, "*Poll Finds Arabs Dislike U.S. Based on Policies It Pursues: American Freedoms, Values Viewed Favorably, Survey Says,"* Washington Post, October 7, 2002, p. A13.

Putnam, R. D. (1988). Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games . International Organization , 42, 3: 427- 460.

Pratt, J. W. (1972). *A History of United States Foreign Policy* (3rd ed., p. 516). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Rashid, A. (2001). Taliban: Militant Islam, Oil and Fundamentalism in Central Asia (pp. 13-18). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Richard Betts, "*The New Threat of Mass Destruction*," Foreign Affairs 77, no. 1 (January-February 1998), p. 28.

Rosen, S. (2005).War and human nature. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rush, G. E. (2002).*The Dictionary of Criminal Justice (5th ed.). Guildford*, CT: McGraw-Hill.

Stagner, R. (1942). *Some factors related to attitude toward war,* 1938. Journal of Social Psychology , 16, 131-42.

Surratt, R. (2000). *The Middle East* (9th ed., p. 4). Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

William C. Banks, *Combating Terrorism, Strategies and Approaches*, CQ Press, 2008, p99-135

Sylvan, D., &Majeski, S. (2003). *An Agent-Based Model of the Acquisition of U.S. Client States* (pp. 1-5). Portland, OR: Paper Prepared for Presentation at the 44th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association.

U.N. Security Council.(2007). Report of the Monitoring Group on Somalia Pursuant to Security Council Resolution. New York: United Nations.

U.S. Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001* (Washington, D.C.: Department of State, 2002), pp. 171, 176.

Weisglas, F. W., & de Boer, G. (2007). Parliamentary Diplomacy . The Hague Journal of Diplomacy , 93-99.

White, J. R. (2011). Terrorism & Homeland Security (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Wright, R. (2008). Dreams and Shadows: The Future of the Middle East. New York: Penguin.

https://www.thoughtco.com/search?q=obama+on+the+middle+east

2015 *Index of U.S. Military Strength*.(n.d.). Retrieved from

http://index.heritage.org/militarystrength/chapter/op-environment/middle-east/

Documents Consulted

National Strategy for Combating Terrorism. (2003). Retrieved from

http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/60172.pdf

Foreign Policy Briefing no. 50, December 17, 1998.

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

My name is Tom Ayora, a Master of Arts in Diplomacy and International studies, University of Nairobi. I am carrying out a research on 'Retaliatory Terrorism on US Foreign Policy in the Middle East.' This is part of my Master's Degree in Diplomacy. I kindly request your assistance in conducting the research by completing the attached questionnaire. The responses and information provided will be kept confidential and solely used for the study and won't be shared for any other purpose.

Thank you for taking your time to complete the questionnaire.

Question 1

I.   What is your career/profession?

- Security/ counter-terrorism expert   ☐

- US Embassy Official   ☐

- International NGO Official   ☐

- Security Agent/ KDF   ☐

II. How many years have you held your current position?

- 0-5 years   ☐

- 5-10 years   ☐

- Over 10 years   ☐

III.   Are you well versed with US Foreign Policy in the Middle East?

  - Yes   ☐

  - No   ☐

IV.   What is your view on terrorism?

V.   The following are some of the factors to retaliatory terrorism on the United States. In a scale of 5-1 (Strongest- weakest) how would you rate them?

  - USA support to Israel   ☐

  - Presence of US Military in the Middle East   ☐

  - Dislike of Westernization   ☐

  - Religious Motivation   ☐

  - Sanction against Middle East Countries   ☐

  - Provocation of USA into war   ☐

VI.   What can you say about the USA Global War on terror and its effects on Retaliatory Terrorism?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VII.   In your own opinion what should the USA do to prevent further terrorist attacks on it and her allies?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your participation.