



---

**RESEARCH PAPER**

**The 9/11 Legacy: A New Framework for Conceptualizing Terrorism**

Dr. Ahmad Raza Khan

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Government College University Lahore,  
Punjab, Pakistan

---

**PAPER INFO      ABSTRACT**

**Received:**  
July 29, 2020

**Accepted:**  
September 05, 2020

**Online:**  
September 30, 2020

**Keywords:**  
9/11 Impact,  
Conceptualizing  
Terrorism,  
Extremism,  
Redefining Terror,  
Transformative  
Effects

**Corresponding  
Author**  
ahmadraza@gcu.ed  
u.pk

The present study examines the profound impact of the tragic events of September 11, 2001, on the conceptualization of terrorism. This research delves into the implications of 9/11 in redefining the understanding and perception of terror in contemporary society. Through an in-depth analysis of various sources, including scholarly literature, governmental reports, and media discourse, this study sheds light on the transformative effects that the 9/11 attacks had on the conceptual framework of terrorism. The findings highlight the shift in focus from conventional notions of terrorism towards a more comprehensive and multifaceted understanding that encompasses new dimensions and actors. This study contributes to the ongoing discourse on counterterrorism strategies, policy formulation, and international cooperation by examining the evolving nature of terrorism in the post-9/11 era and recommends that an all-comprehensive empirical approach is required to conceptualize the universal phenomenon like terrorism.

---

**Introduction**

An urge to learn and acquire knowledge has been primal attribute of human nature. At the bedrock of this acquisition of knowledge, keenness and curiosity accentuates progression and development in various fields by the human beings. In this respect, they understand and comprehend natural as well as artificial sources of knowledge regarding things, structures, events and ideas around them. These characteristics of human being enable them to produce and preserve ideas. In this quest, they also ensure the validity and authenticity of the facts gathered to ascertain quality and reliability in future times. Hence, plethora of knowledge is coined and analyzed for prospective departments. In this respect, the social sciences occupy a significant position on the basis of observations of academicians and researchers. The lived experiences of researchers and deductions from various research works contribute to the existing knowledge for future generations.

The post 9/11 era has been characterized by the phenomenon of terrorism and extremism. This catastrophic incident culminated paradigm shifts amongst the fundamental edifice and intellectual cognition at global level. However, the concepts of terrorism and extremism have been contested in the realm of intellectuals, but there is a variety of interpretations in this respect. The research work at hand would enquire in to the concept of terrorism since it has sufficient research gap to ponder upon its dynamics and comprehensions. Extremism would be underpinned in exhaustive manner in other studies. It is one of the striking features of social sciences to have different interpretations and meanings ascribed to certain concepts and terminologies. It not only invites various analysis from all quarters, but also integrates them as perspectives for further studies and research works.

### **Material and Methods**

This study, therefore, employs a combine techniques of qualitative content analysis and systematic literature review to examine the impact of the 9/11 attacks on the conceptualization of terrorism. Qualitative content analysis is utilized to analyze and interpret textual data from a variety of sources such as academic articles, reports, media coverage, and policy documents. Through a systematic process of coding and categorization, this approach aims to identify key themes, patterns, and shifts in the conceptualization of terrorism following 9/11. The analysis focuses on identifying changes in language, definitions, and perspectives, as well as exploring the emergence of new concepts and discourses. (Bryman 2012; Flick 2018).

Additionally, a systematic literature review is conducted to identify and critically evaluate existing scholarly works related to the impact of 9/11 on the conceptualization of terrorism. The review follows a rigorous and transparent methodology, including systematic search strategies, predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria, and thorough data extraction and synthesis. This approach allows for the comprehensive analysis of published research, providing insights into the evolving understanding of terrorism after the 9/11 attacks (Petticrew and Roberts 2006; Pickering and Byrne 2014).

The research methodology of qualitative content analysis and systematic literature review enables a thorough exploration of the impact of the 9/11 attacks on the conceptualization of terrorism, contributing to the existing body of knowledge and informing future research, policy, and counterterrorism efforts.

### **Literature Review:**

History is cognizant of the use of power for certain vested interests by human beings in various capacities. The rulers, invaders and warriors have applied brutal and ruthless power to achieve their objectives against their opponents. Ironically, the writers have been reluctant to use the term terrorism for such applications of power. However, for such acts, the terms of brutality, cruelty and barbarianism have been enshrined in the political literature. For the first time, the connotation of terrorism was

used for the French ruler, Louis XIV. His era was labeled as "Reign of terror." Afterwards, the French revolution was also entitled as "Reign of Terror."

As regards the frequent use of the term of terrorism, its traces could be discerned from the presence of certain extremist groups which were skeptical of US activities in Persian Gulf. These groups had serious reservations pertaining to the US activities and operations in this area. These groups were grouped as terrorist segments by the US led coalition in post 9/11 scenario.

The debacle of 9/11 inflicted several trends at global level under which US launched a campaign against those groups that were accused and held accountable for breaching the invincible US defense system. Bush administration declared 9/11 attacks as a challenge to "the American way of life". Resultantly, global war on terror was initiated against all those factors across the globe. It was a border less war and all those who were, unilaterally, declared responsible were to be hunted down. Americans concluded it in binary terminologies as you are with us or against us. A discrete fragmentation was drawn by the US administration. All the States had to choose between alliance with the US or enmity with it "Western Civilized World" (Bush 2001). In this scenario, bulk of literature was produced which disapproved the activities of the groups that were fighting against their local administrations. The foremost objective of such literature was to highlight the suspicious acts of the groups that apparently had adherence to the US grand global strategy.

Terrorism has been a peculiar concept which enjoys universal application, but lacks clarity and consensus. Thus far, no institute or academic platform has succeeded to reach harmonious point to define the contours and facets of concept of terrorism. Writers have been resorting to interpretations and comprehensions to draw inferences in this realm.

The 'Convention of League of Nations' propounded a definition of terrorism in following words: "All criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons or a group of persons or the general public" (UN 2012).

On 17 December, 1996, the United Nations passed a resolution, 51/210 to set forth the broad aspects of terrorism. According to that document any act committed by any person or group, having criminal tinge to achieve vested interests which creates violence and threat would fall under the ambit of terrorism. It may be political, religious, philosophical, ethnic and sectarian provocation by any person or group in society. All such acts would be termed as terrorism. (UN General Assembly 1996).

In the aftermath of terrorist attacks in 2001, the United Nations Security Council passed a resolution on September 28, 2001 regarding terrorism. The resolution 1373 condemned the terrorist attacks, but did not provide any compact framework or definition for future usage. (Security Council 2001)

A resolution named, "The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy" was passed and adopted on 8 September 2006 by UN general assembly. Once again, the content of the resolution shed light on the condemnation of the attacks, but it did not formulate or coin any precept for the definition of the concept.

Inability or inadequacy on part of the global institutes to define the term of terrorism left vacuum for its misuse in future. Ideally speaking, these forums must have clarified the intellectual boundaries of this global phenomenon. Its discrete clarity was the dire need of contemporary times to avoid any exploitation by any enforcement agency or member of the coalition; while working 'to curb this menace'.

In this respect, a resolution was drafted and passed by the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC), according to which, terrorism means: "Terrorism means any act of violence or threat thereof notwithstanding its motives or intentions perpetrated to carry out an individual or collective criminal plan with the aim of terrorizing people or threatening to harm them or imperiling their lives, honor, freedoms, security or rights or exposing the environment or any facility or public or private property to hazards or occupying or seizing them, or endangering a national resource, or international facilities, or threatening the stability, territorial integrity, political unity or sovereignty of independent States". (OIC Convention 1999)

### **Pre and Post 9/11 Discourse of Terrorism**

As dilated above, terrorism lacks universally accepted definition to be applied to any act of violence or brutality. Most of the writers and intellectuals have used their own lens and circumstantial factors while defining terrorism as per their cognition of the concept. Here is a brief account of some of the definitions before extending any universal prism to conceptualize this concept.

Britannica Concise Encyclopedia defines terrorism as the use of systematic use of violence to achieve any political objective. According to this definition, the organized form of violence creates a feeling of general fear among the masses which involves achievement of vested interest by any person or group for that matter (Britannica).

As per the tenets of Oxford Dictionary of the US Military, terrorism connotes to the application of violence or threat of violence to extract certain political, religious or ideological objectives. In the process of these interests, the violent group threatens the government and society by accentuating environment of fear for the vested objectives (Oxford Dictionary of US Military).

Comparatively, this definition seems much comprehensive and plausible owing to its facets. There are three dimensions to explicate it for the discussion. Firstly, according to the definition, the use of the violence or threat must be estimated or calculated, which implies limited application of power. Secondly, there must be a factor of fear as a consequence of such activity by the terrorist. Thirdly, there must be an objective in form of political, religious or ideological. These factors induce an

inference that terrorism has been perceived as a means not an end. Lastly, an apprehension arises from the above points that if the activity lacks any objective, it kills or destroys the public, what would be the connotation of such activity in purview of this definition.

While, Oxford Dictionary of Politics elucidates terrorism as, 'a concept which has no unanimous or consensus oriented meaning or understanding'. Yet it is used rigorously by the governmental departments and agencies. However, its use has explicated its connotation to disapprove all acts of violence which has politically motivated interests on part of a person or group to disrupt the general peaceful coexistence. (Oxford Political Dictionary)

Furthermore, Webster's University Dictionary defines terrorism as the systematic or organized use of violence, terror and intimidation to achieve an end. As per three-fold definition of Oxford English Dictionary terrorism means, "(a) Policy projected to assault with terror those against whom it is opted; (b) the application of strategy of intimidation; (c) the reality of terrorizing or environment of being terrorized".

Likewise, the American Heritage Dictionary explains terrorism as the use of unlawful use of force, power, violence or threatening means, which intimidates the governments and societies to achieve any political or ideological ends. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, declares terrorism as the unlawful use of force and power. It also includes the threat for the civilian population in its definition. Along with it, the socially motivated objectives of the terrorist are grouped with political or ideological objectives.

US Department of Defense defines terrorism as the use of unlawful force or power against any individual, group, population, property, government and society having political, religious, ideological and ethnic interests. During application of force, the group intimidates or threatens the governments and societies.

U.S. Army Manual definition terrorism is the; "Calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear. It is intended to coerce or intimidate governments or societies ... [to attain] political, religious, or ideological goals." (US Army Field, 2001). According to Article 22 Chapter 38 of the US Code, "Terrorism is the employment of violence or force by sub-national and clandestine groups against the population and government for certain objectives. These acts are preplanned and politically motivated" (US Code Collection).

However, Wilkinson discussed this Phenomenon in a different context. He said, "Terrorism is a peculiar or distinct use of violence causing injury or murder to the opponent by the terrorist. It not only has the use of aggression cum violence, but involves the state in which one succumbs before the terrorizing entity" (Thackrah 1987). Walter Laqueur is a renowned professor in the realm of terrorism studies has

given a different perspective on this concept. According to him, it is the use of violence by the government against its own people (Laqueur 1997).

Martha Crenshaw, professor of global issues at the Wesleyan University Connecticut, According to this scholar, terrorism aims to inflict desired changes in political will of the State. Along with coercive power, the group causing such action intends to change the political behavior as per their vested goals and objectives. At the same time, they use symbolic activities to pronounce their impact at the highest level (Crenshaw 1990).

### **Findings and Analysis:**

With reference to the definitions entailed above, the analysis reveals that terrorism has no unanimous definition or framework under which one can aptly explain or identify its academic parameters. These definitions could not differentiate between the acts of violence and terrorism. There seems an overlapping on large scale. However, micro level analysis has helped to construe certain components, elements and prerequisites of the phenomenon of terrorism for simplicity of study. The following is a detailed table of Prerequisites, elements, strategies, components, audience and objectives of terrorism.

**Table 01**  
**Components of Terrorism**

| <b>S No</b> | <b>Components</b> | <b>Activities</b>   |
|-------------|-------------------|---|
| 1           | Pre-requisites    | Sequential, cyclic and systematic activities by a group.              |
| 2           | Elements          | Fear of random victimization "it could have been me".                 |
| 3           | Strategies        | Indiscriminate and massive killing of innocent, non-combatant masses. |
| 4           | Audience          | The majority that does not agree with them.                           |
| 5           | Objectives        | Political power/disorder or restructuring of behaviour or systems.    |

In purview of the definitions enunciated above, following explanation has been construed and coined as an operational definition for the given study. Terrorism connotes to the Philosophy behind certain acts of persons, groups, institutes, performed with violent instruments to cause harm, casualty, to inflict traumatic situation, and to achieve the set objectives. "The philosophy that deals with acts performed by an individual, group or institutions with the help of instruments which would kill, injure or create panic to achieve already specified objectives" (Sheikh 2006).

Generally, it has been observed, the Western countries did not give much weight to the religion as a significant factor in political affairs. It has remained a negligible component of political apparatus. Though Western countries have departments for religious studies, yet it could not gain much primacy at broader spectrum. These departments did not consider the inter-intra religious conflicts as a debating point. However, a transformation was observed with the rise of Soviet Union as a major power in 1949. United States of America, in pursuit of containment policy,

employed religious factor to curtail the space for Soviet Union. Further, at the time of disintegration of USSR, the religious factor gained much importance through the writings of renowned writers. A famous professor of Harvard University, Samuel P. Huntington (1993) presented a unique idea of, "Clash of Civilizations"; He put immense emphasis on religion and religious conflicts along with geographical facets in international politics. He went further to remark; religion has more potential to accentuate changes in political affairs as compared to geographical components.

In order to generate healthy academic discussion on terrorism, the analysis of terrain of Afghanistan is indispensable. This country has been blamed for the mushroom growth of terrorists. Along with it, Afghanistan has been accused for harboring the terrorist elements owing to its mountainous belts. It becomes inevitable to analyze the historical role of this country during various phases such as, before the Soviet invasion, during its rule and in post Soviet disintegration. This prelude to the study would help to analyze the harboring of Osama Bin Laden and operations of Taliban from this territory.

### **Politics of Terrorism: Multiple Faces**

After the Second World War, the international politics revolved around the cold war between USSR and USA. In order to dismantle rise of communist power, US launched a rigorous strategy to declare communism as an evil force for the mankind. US designed its grand policy through ideological cum political spectrums to downplay its opponent. In the meanwhile, US enforced USSR to indulge in Afghanistan to cause its downfall (Schweizer 1994). While pursuing its grand policy, US administration did not bother regarding loss of valuable lives of human beings. At the same time, it also undermined the catastrophic impact for the country.

Cold war was an inter-play between the USA and USSR to establish hegemony in the World. Under the penumbra of hegemonic designs, US employed various ideological, religious and political propaganda factors to dismantle and disintegrate USSR. For such objectives, it took the support of ISI, the Pakistan's premier intelligence agency to weaken the USSR forces in Afghanistan. US administration exploited religious elements in Pakistan against Communist USSR. The ISI set-up several Madrassas on the border area between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Certain institutes were formulated under the umbrella of Madrassas to train the personnel to fight against USSR in Afghanistan. ISI provided financial support to the anti-USSR forces in Pakistan on US commitment. Nexus of CIA and ISI played a vital role to provoke certain political and religious leaders in Pakistan to raise their voice against USSR operating in Afghanistan.

In the aftermath of US agony and humiliation in Vietnam, it resorted to a strategy to provoke USSR to have foot on Afghan territory. Since Afghanistan has been a grave yard of empires, US anticipated similar results of its communist counterpart. In this pursuit, US had started to extend support for Afghan Anti-government groups even before the invasion (Brzezinski 1998). As the USSR invaded Afghanistan in 1979,

US propelled all its forces and elements against USSR. It began lobbying, using religion as a catalyst to disrupt USSR in Afghanistan. CIA played an instrumental role to derive support from other agencies in the region to have strong front against their cold war opponent. In this process, US chanced its arm in all financial, ideological and political realms. US obtained the support of Muslim rulers against USSR and supervised all the covert operations in this respect. US went all guns blazing, it trained Mujahideen with latest arsenal and weapons (Coll 1992). The US administration utilized all of its allies and forces against USSR to weaken its increasing influence at international level. With the support of US support, Mujahideen used even the suicide belts to carry the bombs and other weapons in mountainous areas. It was observed that US intended to destroy the 'Termez' bridge, which was the only link between Afghanistan and USSR, However, all efforts were in vain (Coll 1992).

At the juncture of USSR withdrawal from Afghanistan, US did not comprehend the consequential circumstances arising in Afghanistan. The trained groups of Mujahideen, who were united under US supervision, now had no unifying force. In the aftermath of USSR withdrawal, all the foreign and local groups of Mujahideen got indulged in to power game to grab more and more territory. All the war lords established their own areas of influence all over Afghanistan. President Rabbani got confined to Kabul. In the meanwhile, some of the elements of local Mujahideen got united under the leadership of Mullah Umer, who entitled his group as 'Taliban' meaning students of Islam (Rashid 2000). This new ethnic group had strong footings due to similarities in religious beliefs and studies from closely connected Madrassas. Since public was fed up from the ongoing conflicts, they started owing allegiance to this new group. Pakistan also shifted its policy and supported this new group of Taliban. It betrayed the group of Gulbadin Hikmatyer and others, whom it had supported previously during the Afghan war. Pakistan's strategic interest was to establish a strong route to central Asian republics (Rashid 2000). Initially, Pakistan accepted the contacts with Taliban by declaring them as, "our boys" but denied afterwards any link with them (Rashid 2000). Taliban strengthened its roots in different areas of the country once it had established firm footings in Kandahar. Many of the people who were irritated with their leaders extended support to the Taliban force. They were presumed as liberators of people and staunch followers of Islamic principles, "Sharia". Taliban adhered to certain fundamentals of Islam; the one they had acquired in Deobandi Madrassas, mostly run and organized by Jamiat Ulema Islam JUI, Darul Uloom Haqania (Akora Khatak) and analogous. The Taliban opened trade routes to Central Asia and ensured safety of the travelers against a safe passage tax (Rashid 2000).

The US administration did not show any reluctance on the cementing of Taliban in Afghanistan (Gasper 2001). The withdrawal of USSR from Afghanistan could not ensure tranquility cum stability and hold of the local forces in Afghanistan. US pursued its policy to support the Taliban implicitly, while, Pakistan openly stood by the new authorities in Afghanistan. In addition, Saudi Arabia also extended support for Taliban. All these countries had their respective interests. Pakistan had the interest to construct transnational oil pipeline from Central Asian republics to its



seashores. In 1998, According to John J. Maresca, Vice President, International Relations UNOCAL Corporation, the reserves of Caspian Sea have huge treasure for future needs for European countries. Further, he testified before "House Committee in International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific that "Proven natural gas reserves within Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan equal more than 236 trillion cubic feet. These reserves have the capacity to exceed even 60 billion of barrels, which may fulfill the needs of the region for next 11 years. However, some of the experts give an estimate of around 200 billion of barrels." The project seems insufficient and incomplete without floating a route for the supply lines of these reserves. He suggested the construction of a new silk road, which had serious threats and concerns. Along with the high security risks, the rewards are exemplary too (Gasper 2001).

It is a veracious fact; the international powers pursue their vested interests. This narration depicts the interests of Western States in this region. They had shown least concern for the welfare of the local people. The chaotic situation, which has persisted for long, had no positive blink in prospective times.

This perpetual volatile situation was further aggravated by the devastating incident of 9/11. The US got the license to kill their preempted enemies in any quarter of the World. Afghanistan became under the pump from all segments having relevance at global level (Woodward 2002).

President Bush announced all-out war against the groups operating in Afghanistan. Especially, Taliban and Osama Bin Laden were the prime targets of the US. Pakistan also faced serious music due to its allegiance to the Taliban Regime. US administration held the view that terrorists want to exterminate all Americans, Jews and Christians. They want to eliminate American way of life.

Subsequently, all the allies and supporters of US and their way of life started criticizing Pakistan and its structure of Madrassa, which was a nursery for the training of Mujahideen to serve US interests during 1980's. All the media houses; print or electronic having support for Islamic education in Madrassa were banned or cut to size.

### **Re-defining Terrorism: The US Perspective**

As a consequence of global war on terror in 2001, the terms, "Extremism and fundamentalism" became the catching words for Western powers. The slogan for the reformation in Madrassa education became eye catching phenomenon for States. It was debatable whether these buzzwords are merely used as a scapegoat or it had any substance. The prevailing caveats or problems of the Madrassa system initiated new research gap for scholars and intellectuals. However, reforms in Madrassa system became a political rhetoric (Sajjad 2011)

Terrorist attacks of 9/11 accentuated dramatic and paradigm transformations in US policy in particular and global trends in general. US administration declared Osama Bin Laden and Taliban responsible for the attacks. When Taliban refuse to handover Osama Bin Laden to the US forces, Afghanistan was toppled within no time by the US led forces. Taliban could not comprehend the gravity of the situation. In the meanwhile, all the Muslim rulers had to cooperate with US since there was no option left. US announced that any forces in support of Taliban would be considered as forces of evil or enemies of US.

According to the policies of President Bush, World was divided in to two groups, those who allies of US and those who are enemies of US and the west. A binary constellation was enshrined by the Bush administration. Further he said that we will chase the terrorists in every corner of the World. Any nation, supporting or financing the terrorists would be considered our enemy (Bush 2001a).

American invasion of Afghanistan reflected their grand designs to inflict novel global missions. It was the lust for power under which they started a full scale battle against the terrorist. The scope of the war was such as to target everywhere, with all modes of battle as per their intentions. He also stated that we will come after the terrorists irrespective their resorts in the World. President Bush further remarked that it is the beginning of our mission in Afghanistan, and Afghanistan is the beginning of our designs in the World. These statements divulged their inherent aspirations to introduce new World order led by their political ideals. Despite dissenting voices by the scholars and intellectuals, the US administration successfully launched its campaign and convinced the public regarding the global war on terror. It put the entire responsibility of the war on Osama Bin Laden and justified its aggression by putting the onus on all the preempted terrorist elements. The US administration announced that we have already accused Osama for the attacks, any State or group, which supports, sponsors, harbors, aids or finances these terrorist elements, would be at our target (Bush 2001b).

President Bush was not alone in perpetrating war. General Colin Powell said in a statement, "We have to make it clear to Pakistan and Afghanistan, this is show time" (Woodward 2002).

President Bush echoed his egoistic stance while addressing State of the Union Address, "The American flag flies again over our embassy in Kabul. Terrorists who once occupied Afghanistan now occupy cells at Guantanamo Bay" (Bush 2002). He legitimized his invasion of Afghanistan by stating, "What we have found in Afghanistan confirms that, far from ending there, our war against terror is only beginning. Most of the 19 men who hijacked planes on September the 11th were trained in Afghanistan's camps, and so were tens of thousands of others. Thousands of dangerous killers, schooled in the methods of murder, often supported by outlaw regimes, are now spread throughout the world like ticking time bombs, set to go off without warning" (Bush 2002).

While declaring the objectives of the global war against terror, President Bush said, "Our first priority must always be the security of our nation.... My budget supports three great goals for America: We will win this war; we'll protect our homeland; and we will revive our economy" (Bush 2002).

There is a wide spread realization among the scholars and intellectuals regarding new global strategies of US to have strong hold in different countries. Under the cover of war against terrorism, US has ascertained stranglehold in several countries of the World. US has been besieged by consistent Israel Pressure over the last many years (Mearsheimer 2008). Myriad intellectuals have surfaced evidence of US financial and technical assistance to Israel; in its cruelty against the Palestinians. Invariably, these brutal acts have not been declared as terrorist acts. On the contrary, Most of the US adventures have resulted in multiplying its problems. According to the analysts, this chain of mistakes has been recurring phenomenon due to US defiance to accept the commission of wrong doings. As said by J.F. Kennedy, "An error does not become a mistake unless you refuse to correct it".

President Bush could not comprehend the far-reaching consequences of the war against terrorism at global level. Like his predecessors, he continued in his own vain projecting the manifest destiny which has been a historical cum egotistical slogan of Americans. The invasion of Afghanistan proved a piece of cake on the face of it. However, its implications accentuated troublesome repercussions for the US administration. The religious factors, which were already anti-America due to US posture in Middle East, united and turned against US aggrandizement. Previously called Jahidi elements, who were close to the hearts of Americans during Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, now gathered their strength against the US administration. They formed coalitions with other anti-American elements in the World. Ayman Al-Zawahiri said that Afghan war served as an, "Incubator" and the young warriors got, "practical experiences in combat, politics and organization" (Gerges 2005).

It was analyzed pertaining to the US policies that Bush Administration could not comprehend the future consequences of the full throttle war against terrorism. The US had its vested interests at first priority. It ignored or undermined the ramifications for rest of the World. Bush administration as well as the subsequent Presidents urged and forced the rulers of the Muslim World to take aggressive actions against those elements those were assumed to be their opponents. These Muslim allies of US took the brutal actions against such factors. These coercive measures turned those elements in to strong opponents of the US. The international forces could not change their minds otherwise. The persuasion through negotiations and dialogue had negligible room amongst such policies.

## **Conclusion**

The above encapsulation of the definition of terrorism and subsequent US policies to combat this menace, have begun a new debate in the realm of research. There is dire need to study this concept in much detail so as to differentiate between

the freedom fighters and terrorists. An ironical nexus has been observed, the groups which were blue eyed and freedom fighters at particular juncture, now became the terrorists for certain States. There must be an indiscriminate criterion to ascertain this difference and clarity to analyze the phenomena in an apt manner. During the Afghan invasion by USSR, the US governments supported all the hard liners in Pakistan's former Tribal belt to disrupt the cold war counterpart. US ensured the support through various means to train the Mujahideen. CIA collaborated with ISI to accomplish its mission to become the gigantic superpower of the World. In the aftermath of disintegration of USSR, US did not pay much attention to those trained elements. In post 9/11 scenario, the Bush administration declared freedom fighters of the past as terrorist of that time. The persistent inconsistency on part of the countries gave birth to new conflicts and caveats at international level.

In post 9/11 scenario, United Nations has passed resolutions to counter the evil of terrorism. It has given comprehensive accounts of the phenomenon, yet could not provide an exhaustive and acceptable definition to put things straight and on flawless parameters. Consensus exists on the actions which cause injury or death to any person in this respect, but much clarity is required to draw lines between the actions of freedom fighters and terrorists. Along with UN, various writers and think tanks have propounded myriad definitions, but lacked clarity and discreteness. This academic void in the ambit of terrorism has been prone to inconsistent policies on part of the States.

In this respect, the role of the academicians becomes indispensable and of centennial value. They can extend comprehensive analysis through research to provide certain boundaries and parameters regarding violent acts. Along with it, the scholars must delimit its intellectual realm on the grounds of its sensitivity and intricate nature. Everyone should not be allowed to express his or her views on this topic. Besides this, the States must legislate according to control this menace. The legislation must be based on the global principles and parameters set forth by the major States of the world.

It is the responsibility of the States to identify the real causes of the disintegration of any group from the main stream politics. Every group do not resort to terrorist activities abruptly, the causes such as economic, ethnic and political must be addressed to reform the thought process of certain groups who feel deprived and aloof from the main stream political realm. Economic backwardness occupies a significant position to provoke a certain group against the government.

US administration could not construe the after effects of the full throttle war on Afghanistan. It had direct spillover ramifications for tribal belt of Pakistan. The cross border movement on Pak-Afghan border created immense problems for Pakistan's government. The complete analysis of the aftermath is utmost and equally important before undertaking any adventure at large scale by the States.

### **Recommendations**

- No state policy or strategy can be productive unless conceptually explained and established on strong philosophical foundations.
- The phenomenon, loosely explained, and adopted as basis of any strategy, cause more confusion and attract criticism.
- It is the responsibility of the academia to explain the dimensions, parameters and directions of every phenomenon before it is adopted as a fundamental basis of any major strategy or policy; both by any government or the international community.
- Concepts like terrorism still lack unanimous definition despite comprehensive, yet divergent, explanations regarding the phenomenon.

## References

- Abrahms, M. (2008). What terrorists really want: Terrorist motives and counterterrorism strategy. *International Security*, 32(4), 78-105.
- Al-Zawahiri, A. (2001). *Knights Under The Prophet's Banner* (serialized by Asharq al-Awsat, 3 December 2001) cited in Gerges, F. A. (2005). *The Far Enemy: Why jihad Went Global*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 85
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Brzezinski, Z. (2012, November 11). *The CIA's Intervention in Afghanistan*.
- Bueno de Mesquita, E. (2005). The quality of terror. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(3), 515-530.
- Bush, G. W. (2001, September 24). *The White House*.
- Bush, G. W. (2001a, September 20). *Address to joint session of Congress*.
- Bush, G. W. (2001b, September 20). *Transcript of President Bush's address*.
- Bush, G. W. (2002, January 29). President Delivers State of the Union Address. *The White House*.
- Coll, Steve. (1992, July 19). Anatomy of a Victory: CIA's Covert Afghan War. *Washington Post*.
- Crenshaw, M. (1990). Cited In. Kegley, C. W. (Ed.), *International Terrorism Characteristics, Causes and Control*, Hampshire: Macmillan Company. 53
- Crenshaw, M. (2007). The debate over "new" vs. "old" terrorism. In A. P. Schmid (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of terrorism research* (pp. 99-112). Routledge.
- Flick, U. (2018). *An introduction to qualitative research* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Forest, J. J. F. (Ed.). (2006). *The making of a terrorist: Recruitment, training, and root causes*. Praeger Security International.
- Gasper, Phil. (2001, November-December). Afghanistan, the CIA, bin Laden, and the Taliban. *International Socialist Review*.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations. *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22-49.
- Kydd, A. H., & Walter, B. F. (2006). The strategies of terrorism. *International Security*, 31(1), 49-80.31.1.49
- Laqueur, W. (1997). *The Age of the Terror*. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson. 27

- Mearsheimer, J. J., & Walt, S. M. (2008). *The Israel Lobby*.
- OIC Convention to Combat Terrorism. (1999).
- Oxford Dictionary of US Military. (2010).
- Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Piazza, J. A. (2008). Incubators of terror: Do failed and failing states promote transnational terrorism? *International Studies Quarterly*, 52(3), 469-488.
- Pickering, M. J., & Byrne, J. (2014). The benefits of publishing systematic quantitative literature reviews for PhD candidates and other early-career researchers. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(3), 534-548.
- Rashid, A. (2000). *Taliban: Islam, Oil and the New Great Game in Central Asia*. London: I B Tauris. 17-30
- Sajjad, M. W. (2014). Madrasas in Pakistan: thinking beyond terrorism-based reforms. *Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad*. 10-28
- Schweizer, P. (1994). *Victory: The Reagan Administration's Secret Strategy that Hastened the Collapse of the Soviet Union*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press. 23-82
- Terrorism (2002), *UN Office of Drugs and Crime*,
- Thackrah, J. R. (1987). *Encyclopedia of Terrorism and Political Violence*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 27
- U.S. Army Field Manual. (2001, June 2001). No. FM 3-0, Chapter 9. 37
- U.S. Code Collection. (2012, November 11). Title 22 Chapters 38, 2656f. Annual country reports on terrorism.
- Understanding Terrorism. (2012, November 11). *World Conflict Quarterly*.
- United Nations General Assembly. (1996). Resolution 51/210, Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism.
- United Nations. (2001). Press Release SC/7158.
- United Nations. (2012, November 11). *United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy*.
- US Code Collection, *Title 22 Chapters 38, 2656f. Annual country reports on terrorism at*

US Israel Genocide. (2012, November 11).

Woodward, B. (2002). *Bush at War*. New York: Simon and Schuster. 15-32