Countering Terrorism: Hezbollah's Appeal
Fariborz Mokhtari

Introduction

The name Hezbollah (Hezb-Allah -party of God) did not originate with Shiite groups in Lebanon, now commonly associated with the term. Hezb-Allah first appeared in its modern political context during the Iranian Revolution of 1978 as a pro-Khomaini slogan that rhymed with the ayatollah's first name which means spirit of God: "Hezb faqat Hezbollah, Rahbar faqat Rohollah –Party, only God's party – leader, only God's spirit."[1] The general meaning associated with the name at the time was that of adherence to Islamic rule under Ayatollah Khomaini's guidance as chief theologian & Islamic jurist. The founding of a political movement in Lebanon by that name was not realized until 1982, partly as a reaction to Israel's invasion of Lebanon. The movement has been known as Islamic Jihad, Revolutionary Justice Organization, Organization of the Oppressed on Earth, and Islamic Jihad for the Liberation of Palestine. Liberating Lebanon, Palestine and Arab lands have been stated goals of the movement. The movement's centre for policymaking is a consultative council - Majlis al-Shura, headed by a cleric, Shaykh Hassan Nasr-Allah. Hezb-Allah has a long and violent history, but it has since 1992 appeared to be re-forming itself, to participate in Lebanon's parliamentary elections, and to resemble a political party with a military arm while maintaining a network of charitable institutions. Despite this evolution, the movement retains a militia force of 20,000[2] and has not repudiated violence, past or present.

Hezb-Allah has been charged with the suicide bombings of the US Embassy in April 1983, the US Marine Barracks in October 1983, and US Embassy Annex in September 1984 in Beirut. Three Hezb-Allah members are among FBI's most wanted terrorists for hijacking a TWA plane in 1985 and killing a US Navy diver onboard. Hezb-Allah has been linked to several kidnappings and detentions (of US, Israeli and Western hostages), an attack on Israel's embassy in Argentina in 1992, bombing of Israel's cultural centre in Buenos Aires in 1994, and capture of three Israeli soldiers in the autumn of 2000. The evidence of a Hezb-Allah-sponsored, pro-Syrian demonstration in Beirut on 8 March (after an anti-Syrian rally precipitated by former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri's assassination on 14 February 2005) suggests an influence that can mobilize hundreds of thousands at short notice.[3] Hezb-Allah has received substantial financial, military, political, and organizational assistance from Iran and diplomatic, political, and logistical support from Syria.[4] Evidence suggests, however, that the movement may be in the midst of a transition.

A Defining Moment

The attacks of September 11, 2001, changed the United States and altered international relations forever. For the United States the greatest impact was perhaps psychological: a sudden realization of US vulnerability. The United States had for two hundred years – certainly prior to the Cold War - relied on its geographical advantage as a country protected by two oceans and two benign neighbours to keep hostilities far away from its borders. While military forces of most countries were designed and deployed to secure national boundaries, US forces were prepared by the second half of the twentieth century to project power and face foes around the globe. The US attitude towards the use of force, one may argue, had to a large extent been based on the success of this strategy and the territorial invulnerability it implied, despite the emergence of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The events of September 11, 2001, however, illustrated a new type of vulnerability that the United States' overwhelming forces could not deter. The country's unmatched security forces had failed to stop a series of attacks on US soil. A few civilians armed with nothing more lethal than box-cutters had exploited advanced Western technology and access to global communication systems to attack the United States within its borders. By doing so, they transformed the comfortable feeling of security into an angry sense of urgent vulnerability. September 11 was a defining moment in the United States, as significant as defining moments in other nations' histories. To face the threat, the United States has reexamined evolving assumptions regarding ethical limitations of the use of force – a matter of much continuous consideration, never settled. The United States accepted voluntary limitations on its own unilateral use of power following WWII in order to create a system of multilateral alliances. The system was to foster collective defence and a stable international environment. But the combination of voluntary restraint, alliance-building, and military deterrence proved inadequate against extremist organizations that emerged after the Cold War. The centres of terror were suddenly separated from states and could easily move from place to place and strike anywhere at any time. Furthermore, they had few fixed assets and held millennial goals making them oblivious to deterrence as previously perceived. The emergence of this threat therefore forced the United States to reevaluate ethical and political assumptions underlying the international order it had itself sponsored. The results of this reevaluation appeared in the US National Security Strategy published by the Bush Administration in September 2002.

The use of terror as a means of exercising political power is perhaps as old as the human species. The cult of the Assassins (hashashin –smokers of hashish), founded by Hassan Sabbah – the Old Man of the Mountain - that terrorized the Middle East and parts of Africa and Central Asia from the eleventh to the end of the thirteenth century is one of the best known. The cult's public doctrine with references to religion and an Islamic sect (the Ismailis), differed from that of its leaders, who upon achieving the heights of "enlightenment" were freed from religious and moral obligations. The leaders, one may presume, could thus justify political assassinations without the pangs of moral or religious consciousness. Other terrorist groups include Jewish Zealots of the first century in Palestine; The Thugee of the seventh century in India (the cult of Kali); Narodnaya Volya (People's

Will) of the nineteenth century Russia; extremists in Serbia who triggered WWI by assassinating Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria in 1914; and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine with its first hijacking of a commercial airliner on 22 July 1968, among others.[5] To study terrorism, and to construct long-term strategies to counter it, considering terrorist organizations (e.g. Hezb-Allah) in a larger context is necessary.

Law, Ethics, & Extremism

The concerns related to the Global War on Terrorism, which may be more accurately called a "campaign against global extremism", reflect a kaleidoscope of perceived ethical implications. The philosophical and the intellectual aspects of warfare are inevitably linked to the legal and the operational ones (e.g., rules of engagement). The concepts of *jus ad bellum* (justice of war) and j*us in bello* (justice in war) address justification for going to war, versus justification for the manner in which the war is carried out, but the distinction is too often not made. Attempts at ethical streamlining often bear unsatisfactory outcomes and oversimplification may result in bureaucratic incidences of injustice against vulnerable individuals or minorities.[6] Defining terrorism as illegal, for example, does not point to a solution, for it addresses a symptom. The desired focus ought to shift to a search for a cure, or, better yet, prevention. What makes one a terrorist? What determines the attacks terrorists consider? What is the essence of terrorism? To know terrorists, one has to view them through their own eyes. Is terrorism in its essence a legal or a political problem? Does "the war on terror" mean different things to different people? To respond to terrorism, one must comprehend the grounds for action. Is any action justified? Are international laws adequate? Are ethical concerns relevant?

One may question whether a terrorist leader's mind allows any limits to the infliction of harm. If in a terrorist leader's mind all perceived enemies are "infidels", the potential targets of terrorism are guilty by definition. Furthermore, an argument with a terrorist would be of little utility, for a common moral basis necessary for a meaningful discussion would be lacking. The solution may be found in addressing terrorist leaders' potential audiences, likely supporters, and possible recruits. The absolutist stand of terrorists should not precipitate absolutist policies by the governments that resolve to confront them. There is more than a grain of truth in the saying that "terrorism is theater," for it is fundamentally designed to coerce public opinion. One may indeed question whether terrorism as we know it could exist without the modern media. Thus, a level-headed approach should lower society's anxiety and avoid the feeling of a social emergency.

Countering one absolutist stand with another will escalate social apprehension which in itself is damaging to the government on which the population depends for its peace of mind. John B Judis has argued that US leaders have consistently described "the nation's role in the world in religious terms". When a nation's policy is defined as good versus evil, there is no room left for resolution short of one side's annihilation. He argues that US presidents' positions, e.g. President Franklin Roosevelt's "there never has been - there never can be - successful compromise between good and evil,"[7] illustrates the point. US leaders have consistently referred to the United States as "God's chosen nation – from Abraham Lincoln's "the last, best hope on earth" to former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright's indispensable nation." They have asserted that the United States has a mission or a calling to

transform the world. From Senator Albert Beveridge on the annexation of the Philippines: "God marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the redemption of the world," to presidential candidate Richard Nixon: "America came into the world 180 years ago not just to have freedom for ourselves, but to carry it to the whole world," to President George W Bush in April 2004 "as the greatest power on the face of the earth, we have an obligation to help the spread of freedom..." They have insisted that in implementing the above mission the United States has, and is, "representing the forces of good over evil".[8] The formulation of the above ideas, Judis argues, creates a "framework that is defined in religious terms," with a tendency to "gravitate toward absolute dichotomies... and an immediate resolution of conflict. A realistic, yet flexible approach, avoiding Armageddon-like events," he suggests, would be more likely to achieve the society's objectives.[9] Judis's argument merits consideration, but it may not be as universally valid as suggested. That President George W Bush has frequently invoked God in his statements may not appeal to an ardently secular audience, but if well articulated, may in fact resonate with the people of faith, regardless of religion, nationality and culture. If terrorism is a tactic, it follows that it remains useful for only as long as it is effective. A tactic no longer of use, is readily (and quite logically) abandoned unceremoniously.

Individual Responsibility

Aristotle stated that laws are not made for the good as the virtuous do not desire to do anything less than good. The aim ought to be the elevation of virtue in society in general, through education of moral standards. Aristotle believed that proper behaviour depended on character rather than laws and regulations.[10] The poignant point to emphasize here is the individual's sense of responsibility which may have been eroded as legality rather than ethics has become the standard of good citizenship. Ultimately however, it is likely that ethical arguments and policies, as well as their implementation, are our most effective instruments in combating terrorism.

Although moral arguments are not likely to convert the Osamas of the world, they are essential for they affect the populations that the likes of Osama bin Laden try to influence; and they form the basis for justifying actions against the likes of bin Laden in our own backyard as well as his. In presenting arguments against terrorists, sensitivity to the language used is important. The use of correct terms (misguided revolutionary rather than Islamist, terrorist rather than jihadist) and cultural symbols (campaign rather than crusade) are crucial; and serious attention to religious convictions and anti-colonial sentiments are important. While ben Laden's actions are reprehensible, he manipulates cultural icons effectively and he speaks in an idiom understood locally. Those who viewed al-Qaeda as simply against the American principles of freedom and justice may have misunderstood the basic appeal of al-Qaeda, which is presented as protecting the holy lands of Islam and the *umma* - the Moslem community of believers. Al-Qaeda presented, for instance, the presence of non-Moslems, personified by the US military presence in the Hijaz region of Saudi Arabia, as an attack upon the liberty of Moslem believers. Al-Qaeda thus claimed it attacked the United States and its allies to liberate the holy lands of Islam. Al-Qaeda's aim seen from its own perspective may be congruent with principles of freedom and justice. Arguments against Al-Qaeda directed at Al-Qaeda's potential supporters that overlook linguistic and cultural subtleties will inevitably fall flat and eventually prove ineffective.

Interpretations of the words of God through second or third-rate clerics with political ambition is demonstrably suspect. "The devil can always quote scripture to his use, and there is never a shortage in any faith of texts justifying the use of force."[11] Rather than allowing terrorists to adjust religious doctrine to rationalize their goals we should subject their arguments to "the genuine interrogation of the true faith".[12] We must consider the Divine Command argument going all the way back to Abraham[13] (because the people we wish to reach do), but illustrate that inflicting harm through third or fourth parties has no place in that Command. If our campaign against terrorism appears immoral or illegitimate, the task of confronting terrorism is undermined. Conversely, if our approach is accepted as moral and legitimate, it will in time, be effective in influencing potential terrorists.

Consequently, the United States must justify its behaviour and criticize its opponents with equal vigor. It is imperative to articulate ethical grounds for actions, for US citizens demand it. Factual issues could be clarified and legal matters persuasively explained. Issues concerning national self-interest, however, require further analysis. A country might have the moral right to do something but choose not to do so – for instance if the cost is perceived to be exorbitant. It is important to clarify honestly that in the realm of realistic foreign policy there is no moral *obligation* to do good at any cost. There *is* of course a moral obligation to do no harm, but to do good – as the 2005 tsunami in Asia illustrated, is *voluntary*. That is to say, the United States, as well as all countries ought to formulate foreign policies that are designed to be good for all. International expectations, however, must be realistic for no nation would approve of its government treating its national resources as a global charitable institution. The global nature of the threat posed by extremism must be shown with clarity and consistency if it is to gain universal acceptance.

Four distinct audiences are to be targets of our well-calibrated message: the domestic audience, the Western Allies, the Islamic world, and the non-Muslim, non-Western world. That is not to prescribe four different messages, for doing so would be hypocritical, and very likely to be found out as such. It is to say, however, that the message, in order to be clearly comprehended by different audiences, may require different forms of expression. We must articulate the right message, but what is correct in our way of thinking may not resonate in other societies. An official US State Department interpreter who had accompanied his boss to a meeting with an Arab President told the author a story that illustrates the point. The Arab president had his own interpreters with him at the meeting. The US secretary of state, in a show of sincerity, seasoned his private conversation with common baseball expressions that baffled the president and caused his interpreters to give up in despair and embarrassment. We must find common values that transcend our differences.

One such approach may be found in Natural Law, to afford us a meaningful common basis for discourse. Considering that battles between terrorists and governments are fundamentally over public opinion, we should steer away from extreme measures of arbitrary arrest, preventive detention, torture under any name, and deportation…, for they clearly play into the hands of the enemy.[14] The French Army's tactics in Algeria, we may recall, were condemned by the French as the anti-terror violence there proved to be a two-edged sword. The French won the battles but lost the war despite having wiped out the National Liberation Front (FLN) antagonists. A calm, collected, level-headed government policy with the

appearance of "business as usual", in responding to a terrorist crisis may appear counter-intuitive, but it denies the terrorists the attention they so badly seek.

A Global Campaign

Countering extremism is not an exclusively American fight. UN Security Council Resolution 1368, passed the day after the September 11 attack, declared any act of terrorism a threat to international peace and security. A follow-up Resolution 1377 stated that acts of terrorism endanger "innocent lives and the dignity and security of human beings everywhere, threaten the social and economic development of all states and undermine global stability and prosperity".[15] Thus the moral and legal basis to define terrorism and terrorists as common enemies of humankind exist. Establishing a potent universal jurisdiction for legal action against the common enemy, therefore, should not be too far away. Fighting terror, if understood to be everybody's fight, persuades all nations to join in the effort. The persuasion, however, will not be effective if it champions only the American defining moment, indifferent to those of others. Historic similitude and cultural symbolisms could help shape a sympathetic global attitude. It is worthy of note that a hand may be overplayed and that even insurgents are not immune from doing so. The Tamil Tigers of Sri Lanka, despite their brutality and persistence, finally realized that terrorism may have worked as a tactic but failed as a strategy.[16]

It may be useful to view terrorism as a social ailment that may affect the strong as well as the weak, just as an Olympic weight-lifter is as susceptible to certain virus infections as is a child. The most effective cures could not overlook the role of the body's own immune agents. We must be willing to accept the unpleasant truth that our effectiveness against terrorist organizations too, requires at the very least cooperation of the countries in which the groups are to be found. The prerequisites for the cooperation however, are the willingness of that nation and its government to be helpful. The governments may be enticed but the peoples must arrive at a consensus to hold all acts of terrorism devoid of legitimacy "in the same light as slavery, piracy and genocide".[17]

A strategy to counter terrorism must include education. War, after all, must be a thin slice of a greater strategy. We may never manage to eradicate terrorism absolutely, but education – properly understood and broadly defined - is the most important long-term prescription to build character in the Aristotelian sense, to marginalize terrorists, and to contain terrorist tendencies. Undiluted liberal arts education is particularly important in reinforcing ethical values. Let us not forget that many terrorist leaders have advanced degrees, but their education has often been of the black-and-white type of learning. With a long-term approach, liberal arts education – educating well-rounded generalists - does matter. The statement, "education is an ornament in prosperity and a refuge in adversity," is worthy of contemplation.[18] Our recent penchant for specialization and "professional studies", may have been the starting point of the flourishing industry that seeks, promotes and utilizes legal loopholes that are strictly speaking not necessarily right, yet legal. The counsellors who advise students to select college majors that promise high income should contemplate the counsel of Confucius that "the superior man thinks of virtue; the inferior man thinks of comfort. The superior man thinks of what is right; the inferior man of what will pay."

The evidence that Aristotle was right is all around us. Our modern democratic emphasis on rules, bureaucracies, regulations, laws, rights and litigation under the premise of equality in pursuit of liberty, has diminished in our society both virtue and liberty. The importance of character has depreciated further by specialization and division of labour for the sake of efficiency. The cost of that efficiency has been the fragmentation of responsibility. Millions of individuals labour every day to perform tasks so minute the ethical implications of them are impossible to determine. The thousands of bureaucrats involved in investigating, branding, arresting, imprisoning, torturing, fining, executing, expropriating, building weapons of mass destruction, and other questionable tasks are oblivious to the implications of their work precisely because their duties are minute fragments with which they do not identify. The armies of minor functionaries who collect and file people's personal information every day are undiscerning to the consequences of a deportation order to be issued to a refugee whose application for political asylum may be pending. Fragmentation of tasks, whether through commissions or political assembly-lines lessens if not removes individual responsibility for acts of inhumanity. Such industrial organization with information-age technology, coupled with an expansionist political bureaucracy, may – as history has shown - create nightmares of frightening proportions.[19]

The proponents of swift and efficient governance should not overlook the possibility of swift an efficient injustice meted out on massive scales. Most unfortunate is the emphasis on *Positive Law* to the exclusion of *Natural Law*. Proponents of Natural Law hold that its concepts are known to all human beings as they emphasize the distinction between right and wrong. In contrast, Positive Law –that is to say man-made law, requires the services of multitudes of legal experts to interpret, argue and bargain before a final resolution is reached.

Richard Weaver argued "[t]here is ground for declaring that modern man has become a moral idiot... For four centuries every man has been not only his own priest but his own professor of ethics, and the consequence is an anarchy which threatens even that minimum consensus of value necessary to the political state".[20] Weaver's view regarding the "superiority of an ideal",[21] is compelling, for it suggests the germ of understanding our modern, seemingly educated terrorist's alienation. The nihilistic motives of terrorists in search of a moment of powerful glory, "a moment of violence that will transform a penniless nonentity into an avenging angel," must be understood.[22] That psychological need for an instant of power and glory is a matter to be addressed urgently. Urgency however, is not an excuse for rashness. Isiah Berlin, a philosopher who had tasted turmoil in his own lifetime, warned that

> ... the ultimate ends of life are many, and even within one culture and generation; that some of those come into conflict, and lead to clashes between societies, parties, individuals, and not least within individuals' themselves... And if we understand how conflicts between ends equally ultimate and sacred, but irreconcilable within the breast of even a single human being... can lead to tragic and unavoidable collision, we shall not distort the moral facts by artificially ordering them in terms of some absolute criterion; recognizing that not all good things are necessarily compatible with one another.[23]

Michael Oakeshott recognized two types of knowledge – technical knowledge consisting entirely of formulated rules or principles, and practical or traditional knowledge that cannot be formulated in rules. Paul Franco referring to Berlin and

Oakeshott argues that "The essence of rationalism is that it denies the epistemic value of practical knowledge. Rationalism consists in the belief in the sovereignty of technique, which is not the same thing as the sovereignty of reason per se."[24] Claes G Ryn further argues that genuine statesmen are flexible and compromising with a willingness to put themselves in the other fellow's shoes, "rather than considering doing so deplorable and the only worthwhile task to cleanse the fellow through decontamination" of the bad old ways of traditional societies.[25] The arguments thus imply a greater need for generalists with the intellectual facility to think broadly, rather than specialists with a fashionable emphasis on technology with what is called nowadays "professional training". Admiral James B. Stockdale, a US Navy aviator shot down over Vietnam in 1965 and imprisoned in Hanoi for seven and a half years wrote in 1978,

> Most of us prisoners found that the so-called practical academic experiences in how to do things, which I am told are proliferating were useless. I'm not saying that we should base education on training people to be in prison, but I am saying that in stress situations the fundamentals, the hard-core classical subjects, are what serve best.[26]

If a legitimate state of war with al-Qaeda exists, we need a morally admissible standard for "unconventional warfare", and the hard core classics could be valuable. It is ethically appropriate to pursue a campaign against terror. Credibility demands however that the United States as well as other countries respond to terror without ambiguity. Doing so may require a new body of law to address unconventional war, covert operations, and espionage. Such a formulation will involve international legal and philosophical expertise, cultural awareness, and political courage. It will also take time. Nevertheless, an international convention to formulate legal guidelines to be ratified by all countries may be a valuable first step towards a global agreement.

Expectations

The man in the global street expects the United States to state its position clearly, act accordingly, justify its conduct, and remain consistent. The United States, with its large and diverse nation, however, cannot speak with a single voice easily. The media as well as interest groups actively seek and reflect different views and interpretation,s making a singular consistent picture on behalf of the United States impossible. Commentators often misuse terms in their public statements which may be picked up instantaneously and spread worldwide. A fine lawyer with little knowledge of military justice for instance, may overlook distinctions between terrorists and uniformed soldiers, or laws of war and battlefield rules of engagement.[27] Yet law does not have to be confusing. Natural law in particular is generally understandable to all whether military or civilian, Christian, Jew, Muslim, or Buddhist, for it is based on human reason.

Claiming our common Judeo-Christian-Islamic heritage to emphasize our philosophical points of convergence will be helpful. Mainstream Islamic jurists – as well as some revolutionaries - have rejected the interpretation of the Koran[28] and the concept of jihad (which stands for exertion, primarily against the shortcomings of the self) put forth by terrorists in every Moslem country. At the Islamic Conference in Spain on 11 March 2005, for instance, a large number of Moslem theologians issued a strict religious opinion (Fatwa), identifying Osama bin Laden as an apostate (kafir).[29] But extremists have dismissed the theologians as lackeys

of the ruling elites who themselves are accused of having sold out to Western imperialists. A sound and consistent argument skilfully delivered will eventually prevail, for to deny that is to ignore the human capacity for learning.[30] John Stuart Mill, on the "Liberty of Thought and Discussion" suggested that in not articulating a case "If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error".[31] We should neither refrain nor be weary of articulating our message in the best way possible. For a nation that has mastered the art of successful marketing the most frivolous of merchandise, marketing reason ought not to be so daunting a task.[32]

It is worth noting that Musa (Moses) and Isa (Jesus) are common names among devout Moslem families. An interested party is far more likely to find bridges connecting us through Islam than barriers keeping us apart. Consider Islam's basic obligations: 1) Belief in one God. 2) Prayer. 3) Charity - giving alms. 4) Fasting – at certain times of the year and giving the food not consumed to the needy. 5) Pilgrimage. None of the "Five Pillars of Islam" are alien to the Western religious convictions. Abu-Nasr Mohammad Farabi (circa 870-950), the famed Islamic philosopher known as *the second teacher* (after Aristotle) considered "war as an end in itself [to be] the supreme vice that can have no place in the regime whose end is the supreme virtue". There may also be numerous virtuous nations with different religions, Farabi taught. "By presenting divine laws, jurisprudence, and theology as parts of political science, he [Farabi] pointed to the possibility of a neutral discussion of all religions or sects and of the features common to them all."[33] Renewed interest in the classics of Eastern as well as Western philosophy may reawaken new generations of all nationalities to appreciate the existing wealth of accumulated knowledge at their disposal. Familiarity with Farabi's teachings, for instance, is as important for us in the West as it is crucial for the societies in which terrorist masterminds recruit.

Judgments in regard to when and how one should go to war are to be within the boundaries of prudence. Reasonable preemption is not inconsistent with prudence, and prudence and the importance of ends are not divorced from the tradition of just war. Confusion results when the distinction between *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* are not made. Awareness of the just approach is an ethical consciousness involving legal, social, economic, and political considerations. Following a just approach is not only right but also prudent for it facilitates reconciliation after, and fair treatment of combatants during, the conflict. Prudence, as Michael Ignatieff argues, holds that in public policy what works may not be always right and what is right might not always work. If rights are to bow to security "there had better be good reasons, and there had better be clear limitations to rights abridgement".[34]

Terrorism may be described as a form of urban insurgency for the similarities (of terrorism and insurgency) are significant. Terrorism and insurgency are political acts that seek objectives through violence. War differs from terrorism and insurgency in that it is a legal remedy of last resort. Since antiquity, civilized peoples the world over have recognized the necessity of using force in the name of justice, and have delineated concise rules and limits on how and when force may be legitimately used.[35] Every civilized society has recognized some restrictions on the use of force. That recognition collectively underlines the principles that constitute what is often called the Just War Tradition. That tradition directly and indirectly influences current international law on the conduct of war. The Just War Tradition holds that war can be declared only by a lawful government; that it must

be declared publicly to give the other side a chance to meet demands in order to avoid violence; that there must be a just cause for going to war that could not be resolved any other way; and that the means employed must be proportional to the cause. If war becomes inevitable, the Just War Tradition calls for attacking only military targets.

Terrorism rejects the entire legal framework of war. Terrorist acts are mostly premeditated political acts aimed at civilians, for maximum psychological impact, and are carried out by organized yet elusive groups. Terrorists don't conform to the Just War Tradition principally because they don't limit themselves to legitimate targets. Terrorists may be viewed in several categories: *Nationalist, Religious, State-Sponsored, Radical* (leftist extremist), *Reactionary* (rightist extremist), and *Anarchist.* Religious terrorists resort to violence in pursuit of divine commands as they define them, in search of sweeping changes. Nearly half of the terrorist groups identified in recent years have been religious and not all related to Islam. Aum Shinrikyo of Japan, the Jewish group affiliated with the late Rabbi Meir Kahane, and some white supremacist groups in the US, are examples. State-sponsored-terrorists are foreign policy tools of certain states wishing to wage war on adversaries through surrogates. The current regimes in Iran, Cuba, Libya, North Korea, Sudan and Syria and the former regime in Iraq are recognized examples, having supported Hezb-Allah, the Abu Nidal Organization, and the Japanese Red Army. Radical terrorists wish to destroy capitalism to establish a socialist society. The German Baader-Meinhoff Group, the Japanese Red Army, the US Weathermen, and Italy's Red Brigade fit in that category. Reactionary terrorists seek to abolish liberalism and liberal democratic governance. Neo-Nazis & neo-Fascists appear to defy reason and celebrate instinct and racial supremacy. Anarchist terrorists, most active in 1870-1920, but reappearing in movements denouncing globalization, consider any external (involuntary) regulation of human conduct contrary to liberty, and wish to abolish all governmental institutions to replace them with free, unrestricted volunteer associations. In 1901, a Hungarian anarchist assassinated President William McKinley of the United States. Thus viewing Moslems as suspects and relating terrorism to Islam are demonstrably wrong.

Terrorists murder innocent people intentionally and seek safety in places impossible to attack without endangering other innocent lives. Terrorists thus shield themselves with the assurance that government forces wishing to fight back will have to violate the same moral principles for which they fight the terrorists in the first place. The Just War Tradition, it is argued, recognizes this dilemma, as discussed by Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics* and later by Thomas Aquinas in *Summa Theologica.* The basis for solving the dilemma is the acknowledgement that an act may have two consequences: an intended good effect and an unintended bad one (the Doctrine of Double Effect). Thus an action may have both a good and a bad effect and still comply with the Just War Tradition, provided certain conditions are satisfied. First, the bad effect must be unintended; second, it must be proportional to the good effect; and third, those performing the action must try to minimize the bad effect *even if it means increased risk to their own combatants.*[36] Given the two choices, not to strike back, or strike while adhering to the tenets of the Just War Tradition, the US has generally chosen the path of avoiding harm to innocent noncombatants. Could a liberal society steel its will to accept that what appears neat in theory may not turn out so in practice? Sir William Blackstone, the noted English jurist, argued that since a pirate renounces all benefits of society and government and reduces "himself afresh to the savage state of nature, by declaring war against all mankind, all mankind must declare war against him".[37] The

argument is sound, except that it may lead to a doctrine of equivalence, opening the door to authorized state retaliation against terrorist groups.

Consider the hypothetical extreme case of a terrorist gang taking hostages to trade for their imprisoned terrorist comrades and killing the hostages one at a time to hasten the government's capitulation. Would society support the government's retaliation by killing the incarcerated terrorists in a similar manner to stop the murder of the hostages? Would doing so serve the higher interests of a liberal society? Considering that terrorist acts are mere tactics and most terrorists manipulated instruments, one may anticipate the possibility of gradual transformation through acquired wisdom and maturity.

Hezb-Allah: Terrorist or Political Party?

Although closely linked to Iran, it is not accurate or realistic to assume that all Hezb-Allah activities are ordered or approved by Iran's clerical rulers. Those who assert that Hezb-Allah's every movement is orchestrated by the rulers in Tehran should recall that it was Hezb-Allah that blew the cover off what became known as "Iran-Contra Affair" in 1986. Former national security advisor Robert McFarlane had already travelled to Tehran and US weapons had been shipped to Iran. At the same time, Hezb-Allah had maintained a freeze on abductions of Americans and released three hostages. Hezb-Allah leaders, however, wanted to put an end to their patron's direct dealings with the United States. A little known magazine published in Baalbek – a Hezb-Allah controlled part of Lebanon - reported the top-secret arms-for-hostages deal on November 3rd, unravelling the initiative.[38]

More recently, there is reason to suggest that Iran's assistance to Hezb-Allah has been dwindling, which may explain at least in part Hezb-Allah's increasing eagerness to participate in electoral politics and considering the possibility of disarmament. Iran's role in Lebanon may also be on the wane. Iran reportedly deployed 2,000 Revolutionary Guards to protect Lebanon's Shiite population after Israel invaded Lebanon in 1982, but began a gradual withdrawal five years ago and reportedly left Lebanon almost entirely (15-20 personnel may have remained) by April 2005.[39] Iran's president Mohammad Khatami after meeting with French President Jacques Chirac in Paris on 6 April 2005 stated that "Hezbollah constitutes a real force in Lebanon and this party symbolizes resistance in the face of foreign aggression. The good relations that we have are of a nature to help resolve the problems in Lebanon."[40] The relationship between Iran's current regime and the Hezb-Allah is a two-way street. Still, Iran's support has been crucial for Hezb-Allah's financial, political, and military survival. Hezb-Allah's presence on Israel's border on the other hand, has offered Iran a forward deterrence capability against potential Israeli air attacks.

Whatever its origins, Hezb-Allah is more than a terrorist organization today. It is an effective political party with parliamentary representation (the parliamentary elections of June 2005 resulted in 72 seats for Hariri-Jumbalat alliance, 35 seats for Hezb-Allah & Amal Shia alliance, and 21 seats for General Aoun and his allies);[41] and a social movement with scores of charities, medical facilities, schools, a seminary (Najaf College), and a popular television broadcasting station. It controls 60 per cent of Lebanon's Shiite municipalities and may accept ministerial posts in the country's next government.[42] Indications generally suggest that Hezb-Allah is trying to enter Lebanon's mainstream politics. "It was Lebanese flags, rather than

the banners of their party, that they brought to the mass rally in Beirut on 8 March. There was a moment of silence at that rally for Hariri, and a message to the opposition that Hezbollah wants a share of the country's power... The Lebanese opposition to Syria is at peace with Hezbollah's political role."[43]

Hezb-Allah's popularity and prestige, particularly among Lebanon's poor Shiites - politically disenfranchised for decades before the country's civil war, ought not to be overlooked. Hezb-Allah filled a vacuum by providing public services as well as a powerful political voice for a population whose government had failed them. The June 2005 elections clearly showed Hezb-Allah's popularity among Lebanon's voters. On Sunday 5 June, Hezb-Allah supported candidates outpolled their nearest challengers by 10 to one, and the turnout was greater than in the 2000 elections. Every seat contested in the Sunday 5 June election – the national elections are conducted over four Sundays - was won by either Hezb-Allah or Amal (a Shiite based party allied to Hezb-Allah) candidates.[44]

The movement, however, faces a period of transition. Although open resistance to Israel's occupation of Lebanon gained the movement both respect and legitimacy in the region and Hezb-Allah's leaders and supporters assumed credit for having driven Israel out of Lebanon, Israel's withdrawal has removed much of Hezb-Allah's reason for maintaining its militia and its militancy. The question of whether keeping Hezb-Allah's armed militia is justified, for example, arose nearly two years before Hariri's assassination. The issue culminated for the US in the Syrian Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003, which gave President George W Bush authority to impose sanctions against Syria, with implications for Hezb-Allah's armed wing. President Bush in his State of the Union Address of 2 February 2005 asked Syria to leave Lebanon. On 15 March 2005, he stated, "I would hope that Hezbollah would prove that [it is] not [a terrorist organization] by laying down arms and not threatening peace".[45]

General Michel Aoun, a Lebanese Christian who left his country in 1991 for exile in France until May 2005, declared on 14 May that Hezb-Allah could be convinced to disarm in accordance with a UN resolution and the desire of the United States. Shaikh Hassan Nasrallah stated in an interview with the French Newspaper *Le Monde* published on the same day that his group was "quite ready to discuss all subjects with Lebanese parties, including the arms of the Islamic Resistance."[46] In addition, Israeli sources have confirmed a noticeable drop in Hezb-Allah's profile and its encouragement of Palestinian groups to conduct terror attacks. While Israel's intelligence community earlier had publicly accused both Iran and Hezb-Allah of inciting violence and obstructing this summer's planned disengagement, a member of the Israeli General Staff revealed to Israel's *Haaretz* on 6 April 2005 that the predictions had proven inaccurate,[47] although isolated incidents have occurred.[48]

Haaretz reported on 4 April 2005 that a number of meetings between a Western unofficial delegation and senior members of Islamic organizations in the Middle East and East Asia had taken place in Beirut in late March. The Western delegation included the former EU envoy to Palestine and veteran MI6 agent Alistair Crooke; RAND consultant Graham Fuller, Fred Hof, associated with the Mitchell Report; Geoffrey Aronson of the Foundation for Middle East Peace; Mark Perry of Jefferson Waterman International - a former advisor to Yasser Arafat; and a retired senior CIA official. Moussa Abu Marzouq, deputy to Hamas leader Khaled Meshal, two members of the organization's diplomatic bureau, Sami Khater and Osama

Hamdan, represented Hamas. Nawaf Musawi, head of the Hezb-Allah's foreign relations department spoke for that organization. Abu Marzouq and his colleagues reportedly stated that in late 2003 they offered to halt attacks on civilian Israelis (excluding settlers in territories). Then deputy director of the CIA George Tenet, according to the report, travelled to Cairo for talks about the offer, but Israel rejected the deal. Despite the rejection, no Israeli was harmed for three months, until Ismail Abu Shnab was "assassinated". Musawi asserted "there is nothing in Hezbollah's ideology that makes an enemy of the Jews and it will respect any agreement that is reached between the Palestinians and Israel. Our enemy is the occupation, especially the occupation of Muslim holy cites in Jerusalem." According to Haaretz, he compared Hezb Allah to the Irgun and the Stern Gang at the founding of Israel. "After Israel leaves the Shaba Farms on the Golan, Hezbollah will proclaim an end to Israeli occupation of Lebanon and becomes part of Lebanon's regular army..." The report concluded that Middle East scholar and former special advisor to heads of Shin Beth Security Service Mati Steinberg "agreed that an Israeli withdrawal from Shaba would enable Hezbollah to move from being a problem to being a solution".[49]

The Lebanese polled in April 2005 on the subject of disarming Hezb-Allah expressed mixed views:[50]

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Hezb-Allah should be disarmed.

	All	Maronite	Sunni	Shiite
Agree	6%	18%	3%	---
Agree, if peace exists	18%	17%	28%	14%
Only if Hezbollah Agrees	31%	51%	28%	6%
Disagree	41%	8%	31%	79%

Do you support or oppose the US pressuring Syria to disarm Hezbollah?

Support	26%	53%	14%	9%
Oppose	61%	29%	70%	82%

The Lebanese June 2005 elections confirm that Hezb-Allah's political support is significant. More importantly, the United States has support among the Lebanese that could be enhanced or may be squandered. Recognizing and respecting Lebanon's political dynamics of change is crucial in forcing Hezb-Allah to either return to its terrorist tactics, or seizing the opportunity to purge itself and its inglorious past policies. The possibility that the United States may have to deal with Hezb-Allah as a political party, and that the political party may in fact be in a position to help the United States, is not entirely farfetched. If so, a deliberate but determined policy will serve the US strategic interest better than a testy, absolutist approach.

What Is To Be Done Now

Faced with terrorism, a government must act. The best solution, as is often the case with most problems, is prevention which requires allocation of considerable resources at times that terrorism may not appear to be a national concern. To focus on preventing terrorism when terrorism does not appear threatening requires heroic efforts by the national leadership, always facing fierce competition for limited resources. Preventing terrorism, much as preventive maintenance, is likely to be

postponed in favour of addressing more pressing issues of the moment. Unfortunately, when terrorism bursts on the scene, the nation is often unprepared, surprised, angry, and inclined to blame the government. Sudden allocation of resources after a terrorist act, to invest in preventive measures, however, will not address the crisis in its entirety. What is then a government to do when faced with a terrorist crisis?

First, it must recognize that a terrorist recruit is likely to have experienced a personal crisis, with a deep sense of frustration. Such personalities are particularly vulnerable to indoctrination, which they often receive in prison systems. Recent research findings reveal that a high percentage of terrorists had been incarcerated for petty crimes at some point. Prisons are often schools of terrorism, recruiting new inmates who may know little about the religion or the ideology in the name of which they commit terrorist acts when freed from incarceration. The recruiters are experienced, influential characters who are familiar with the prison system, and are in touch with the outside through cell phones and computers.[51] Governments must, therefore, take a hard look at their prison systems to prevent their institutions of rehabilitation from functioning as universities for terrorism.

Second, a government must not over-react for doing so plays into the hands of the terrorists. Calm but effective anti-terror policies judiciously applied with the appearance of business as usual – as opposed to an emergency, would be best.

Third, it should recognize that time is of the essence and personal, partisan, and departmental rivalries should be sacrificed – at least for a time, for the greater national interest. Any division among the ruling elite will be cleverly exploited by crafty manipulative terrorist or insurgent organizations.

Fourth, lessons learned from previous insurgencies must be reviewed and relearned. Repeating the mistakes of previous generations is asinine, costly, and contrary to the national interest.

Fifth, winning the allegiance of the population from whom the terrorists are recruited and among whom they hide, must be a priority. This is easier said than done of course, but essential. The success of this step in regard to the terrorist is as a fish thrown out of water.

Sixth, fighting terrorism requires specially educated, trained and equipped units for traditional armed forces would be as efficient in countering terrorists as conducting micro-surgery on an eye using butcher knives and axes. Such units require flexibility, mobility and mental preparedness to adjust to changing terrorist tactics with superior agility.

Seventh, counter the opponents' advantage of familiarity with its base of operation by physically separating them from the population that supports them, occupy the zones of their previous operations by visible overwhelming presence, and persuade the population to turn against the terrorists, to see them as tormentors rather than liberators.

Eighth, accept that human intelligence is irreplaceable, even with the fanciest of technological miracles. Gadgets and technological devices are in essence "things" that could never replace an intelligent human mind familiar with cultural nuances, languages and human sentiments.

Ninth, calm down the population's fears and anxieties by emphasizing normalcy and "business as usual". Declaration of emergency, emergency legislation, extralegal measures, fiery speeches and flooding public places with specially armed and uniformed personnel will add to the sense of social anxiety and may create a crisis mentality bordering on mass psychosis.

Tenth, take the war to the terrorist and avoid mistakes, for every little infraction, every mistaken arrest, every misdirected raid, and every mistargeted bombing will strengthen the terrorists who will turn them into propaganda boons.[52] The above steps will neutralize a terrorist or insurgent group but will not cure the social ailment. The cure requires education, preparation, commitment, constant vigilance and plenty of time. Combating terrorism after a terrorist threat has already exploded ought to constitute much more than military or police action.[53]

Conclusion

For better or worse, in the current campaign against terrorism the focus is on west Asia, commonly called the Middle East – a colonial term in its origin.[54] At a time that mutual understanding is essential, neither side sees the other as it seen by itself. The "Middle Easterners" would like to see the United States as a former exploited colony that has managed to liberate itself by a militia against a superior well-trained and well-equipped military force. They like to see the United States as a former agricultural developing country that has managed to industrialize and achieve great technological heights as well as wealth. In short, they like to see the United States as a model to emulate. By the same token, they expect the United States, because of its past colonial history, to be more sympathetic towards them that towards the former colonizers. The United States, however, does not commonly view itself as a former colony with reservations against former colonizers. The United States celebrates the Fourth of July and glorifies the War of Independence, but also holds the "British cousins" as the closest of allies rather than defeated former masters. To be perceived as replacing British or French colonial rulers in the region will not foster endearment. To be seen as a champion of fairness as in the Suez Crisis of 1956 – checking the British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt, will.

There is also a philosophical divide that separates the United States from the "Middle Easterners". As Robert Nozick has pointed out, one may observe the current distribution of resources broadly defined, through either a *time-slice view* (similar to a snap-shot of the present to be subjected to some preconceived pattern of just distribution), or a *historical view* (which considers everything present intimately linked to the past and thus affected by it).[55] The United States, satisfied with its great power and wealth, has reason to gravitate towards a "time-slice view" of things. The aggrieved, on the other hand, have a greater penchant for a "historical view", thus keeping the memories of their past alive. Addressing the many problems of the Middle East, therefore, requires a genuine consciousness of the two different perceptions of justice.

In the war on terrorism vigilance is required to safeguard societies against terrorists but even more vigilance is necessary to protect liberal democracies against corrosion from within. In our enthusiasm to find a quick solution to the social disease of terrorism, we may easily turn the prescribed cure into a more serious malady. We could, if not vigilant, win battles beyond our borders yet lose the war at

home by undermining liberal democracies within our own societies. That would indeed be a compound calamity.

Finally, we must recognize that terrorism is a tactic and as such a mere instrument to impose upon societies, irrespective of race, nationality or religious confession. To assume terrorism to be anything other than a method used in a struggle mires us in the endless debate confusing the tactic used versus the justice of the conflict. Terror may be used to impose an ideology upon a reluctant society, but it is not an ideology nor has it an ideology of its own. Some terrorist organizations are death cults with inverted values that hold love of life to be a manifestation of weakness. If a cult member's own life is to be sacrificed the lives of potential victims (in his mind) could not be any more valuable.[56] Such characters may be beyond the reach of reason, but we should not give up on the potential recruits desperately in search of meaningful lives. To seek an "ideology of terrorism" is to misconceive ideology. To study terrorism one must distinguish recruiters from recruits. The recruiters of terrorism devise and constantly fine tune schemes of predators lurching on a herd's fringes. The recruits are the prey, the weak and the lonely, fallen behind or edged away to the fringes, made vulnerable to sinister predators on the look out, waiting for opportune moments.[57]

Endnotes

[1] Rouhollah –rouh-Allah, means spirit of God, which happened to be ayatollah Khomaini's first name.

[2] The Economist, March 12th-18th, 2005, p. 47.

[3] The number of Hezb-Allah supporters turned out were conservatively estimated at 500,000. The Economist, March 12th-18th, p. 47, c.2.

[4] Russell D. Howard & Reid L. Sawyer, Terrorism And Counterterrorism: Understanding The New Security Environment (Guilford, Connecticut: Mc Graw-Hill/Dushkin, 2004), p. 510, 511.

[5] "Terrorism: Q/A," Council on Foreign Relations http://cfrterrorism.org/terrorism/introduction_print.html, p. 2 (Page 2 of 4).

[6] This is a particularly serious tendency in times of crisis. Consider for instance the typecasting of all Middlea Easterners after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, or the internment of US citizens of Japanese descent during WWII, facilitated by bureaucratically enabled mass production of injustice…

[7] John B. Judis, "The Chosen Nation: The Influence of Religion on US Foreign Policy" Policy Brief #37, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 2005, www.CarnegieEndowment.org.

[8] John B. Judis. P. 1-2.

[9] John B. Judis. P. 3, 5. Judis presents a chart, "The Framework of US Foreign Policy in which he records the following

Period	Mission	Adversary	Means
Pre-revolutionary Colonial America (1600-1776)	Millennium	Papal antichrist	Example as "city on the hill"
Revolutionary & expansion Founding era alliances (1776-1815)	Empire of Liberty	Old world tyranny "hellish fiends" (Native Americans)	Example, continental without entangling
Manifest Destiny (1815-1848)	Christian civilization	Savages or "children" (Native Americans)	Example, continental expansion w/o entangling
Imperial America (1898-1913)	Christian civilization	Barbarians & savages (Filipinos)	Overseas expansion w/o entangling alliances
Wilsonian Internationalism (1914-1919)	Global democracy	Autocracy & imperialism	International organization and alliances
Cold War, liberalism (1946-1989)	Free world	Communism	International organizations and alliances
Bush & neoconservatism	Spread of	International	Unilateral action with

| | (2001-) | freedom | terrorism, radical Islam | ad hoc alliances |

[10] Bradley C.S. Watson, "The Western Ethical Tradition and the Morality of the Warrior," <u>Armed Forces & Society</u>, Fall 1999, Volume 26, Number 1, p.55.

[11] Michael Ignatieff, <u>The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of terror</u> (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), p. 123.

[12] Michael Ignatieff, <u>The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror</u> (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), p. 123.

[13] F. Mokhtari, ed. <u>Ethics & Terror</u>, proceedings of a conference, 19 December 2002 sponsored by the Near East South Asia Center for Strategic Studies, National Defense University, Washington, DC. This paper and much of its contents are inspired by the presentations at the conference. The author is indebted to all participants.

[14] Michael Ignatieff, p. 18.

[15] Joseph McMillan, "Apocalyptic Terrorism: The Case for Preventive Action, "<u>Strategic Forum</u>, Institute for National Strategic Studues (INSS), National Defense University (NDU), Post 9/11 Critical Issues Series, No. 212, November 2004, p. 3.

[16] Michael Ignatieff, p. 68.

[17] Joseph McMillan, "Apocalyptic Terrorism," p. 2.

[18] James Bond Stockdale, Vice Admiral, USN, Ret., quoted in "The World of Epictetus: Reflections on Survival and Leadership," published in <u>The Atlantic Monthly</u>, April, 1978 and Malham M. Wakin, ed. <u>War, Morality, and the Military Profession</u> Second Edition (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), p. 21.

[19] Richard M. Weaver, <u>Ideas Have Consequences</u> , (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), p. 56, 64. Brinton states "The government of the Terror is a dictatorship by commission." Crane Brinton, <u>The Anatomy of Revolution</u>, New York: Vantage Books, 1965), p.171.

[20] Richard M. Weaver, <u>Ideas Have Consequences</u>, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), p. 1-2.

[21] Richard M. Weaver, p.2.

[22] Michael Ignatieff, p. 113.

[23] Issiah Berlin, "Historical Inevitability," in <u>The Proper Study of Mankind: An Anthology of Essays</u>, edited by Henry Hardy & Roger Hausheer, (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux), p. 176, quoted in Paul Franco, "Oakeshott, Berlin, And Liberalism," <u>Political Theory</u> (August 2003) v. 31, No. 4, p. 488.

[24] Paul Franco, "Oakeshott, Berlin, And Liberalism," <u>Political Theory</u> (August 2003) v. 31, No. 4, p. 491.

[25] Claes G. Ryn, "The Ideology of the American Empire," <u>Orbis</u>, (Summer 2003) v. 47, No. 3, p. 390.

[26] James B. Stockdale, p. 21.

[27] Such questions, one may recall, were raised regarding Afghan detainees after the fall of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan.

[28] Hezb-Allah's spiritual leader Shaikh Mohammed Fadlallah condemned the September 11 attacks "as incompatible with Islamic law and perversions of the true meaning of jihad." See "Terrorism: Q&A," Council on Foreign Relations, http://cfrterrorism.org/groups/hezbollah_print.html, Page 3 of 4.

[29] "Free Muslims Against Terrorism, Kamal Nawash, President, http://www.freemuslims.org/, Page 1 of 3, March 27, 2005.

[30] The 2005 tsunami and the international response for relief illustrated the point well.

[31] John Stuart Mill, "On Liberty," Richard T. gardner & Andrew Oldenquist eds., <u>Society and the Individual: Readings in Political and Social Philosophy</u> (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Inc, 1990), p. 301, c.2.

[32] A colleague critical of the Iranian clerics once stated in jest that the most effective marketing experts throughout history, have been the clergy. Perhaps our business schools can learn a thing or two from seminary schools.

[33] Leo Strauss & Joseph Cropsey, eds., <u>History of Political Philosophy</u> , Third Edition, (Chicago: The U of Chicago Press, 1987), p. 221, 224. Farabi was an Iranian who wrote in Persian as well as Arabic. His name has been erroneously recorded by some familiar only with his works in Arabic as Al-Farabi.

[34] Michael Ignatieff, p. 8, 9.

[35] The Chinese philosopher Laotse, in the *Book of Tao*, written in the 6th century BC, notes the following about the legitimate objectives of war:

> A good general effects his purpose and stops…
> Effects his purpose but does not take pride in it.
> Effects his purpose as a regrettable necessity.
> Effects his purpose but does not love violence.

The Hindu *Book of Manu*, written in the 4th century BC, states the following about who can legitimately be attacked in war: 'When the king fights with his foes in battle, . . .let him not strike one who joins the palms of his hands in supplication, nor one who flees, nor one who sits down, nor one who says "I am thine," nor one who sleeps, nor one who is disarmed, nor one who looks on without taking part in the fight, nor one who has been wounded, but in all cases let him remember the duty of honorable warriors.'

Plato, in his *Republic*, provides the following limitations on the use of violence when fighting in cities other than one's own: 'They will not ravage Greek territory nor burn habitations, and they will not admit that in any city all the population are enemies, men women and children, but will say that only a few at any time are their foes, namely, those who are to blame for the quarrel. And on all these considerations they will not be willing to lay waste to the countryside, since the majority of the inhabitants are their friends, nor to destroy the houses, but will carry the conflict only to the point of compelling the guilty to justice…'

One more quotation, taken from Marcus Tullius Cicero, a famous Roman politician and philosopher, writing about just causes for resorting to use of force during the first century BC: 'A war is never undertaken by an ideal state, except in defense of its honor or its safety…Those wars what are unjust are undertaken without provocation. For only a war waged for retaliation or defense can actually be just. No war is considered just unless it has been proclaimed openly and unless reparation has first been demanded.'

[36] Indeed, this is precisely what is happened in Afghanistan. Rather than massive air strikes against the population, the attacks were aimed narrowly at military targets. Rather than an extended air and artillery campaign designed to attack the will of the Afghans, the US and its allies limited their attacks and conducted ground operations to unseat the terrorist regime. There is substantially more risk to US soldiers in a ground operation compared to dropping bombs from 15,000 feet or firing cruise missiles from hundreds of miles away. Avoiding the risk by putting innocent noncombatants in harm's way, however, is certainly not legitimate. Did innocent Afghan civilians die as the result of our military actions? Certainly. But civilian casualties were unintended side effects of our actions aimed at legitimate military targets; the number always to be kept to a minimum by carefully attacking only military targets.

[37] Commentaries on the Laws of England, IV.5.iii, 72, quoted in Joseph McMillan, p. 2, c. 3.

[38] Timothy Naftali, Blind Spot: The Secret History of American Counterterrorism (New York: Basic Books, 2005), p. 188-189. Colonel Oliver North who oversaw both the Iran initiative and assistance to Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries (Contars), it was revealed, had overcharged the Iranians to fund the Contras.

[39] VOA News, 13 April 2005, based on a Washington Post report citing US and European officials. http://www.voanews.com/english/2005-04-14-voa12.cfm?renderforprint=1, page 1 of 1.

[40] Associated Press AP, Wednesday, April 06, 2005.

[41] Ya Libnan, Monday June 20, 2005, http://yalibnan.com/site/archives/2005/06/lebanon_electi_2.php.

[42] "The Influence of Shia Clergymen," The Economist, April 23-29, 2005, p.46.

[43] Fouad Ajami, "The Autumn of the Autocrats," Foreign Affairs, May/June 2005, p. 29, 31.

[44] Nora Boustany, "Hezbollah and Its Allies Celebrate Win in Regional Vote," The Washington Post, Tuesday June 7, 2005, p. A17, c.1.

[45] http://www.angusreid.com/polls/index.cfm?fuseaction=viewItem&itemID=6914. Fouad Ajami, "The Autumn of the Utocrats," Foreign Affairs, May/June 2005, p. 27, 28, 29. 31.

[46] Khaleej Times Online, http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2005/April/middle... p. 1 of 2.

[47] Haaretz http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/objects/PrintArticleEn.jhtml?itemNo=561482, Page 1 of 2.

[48] On Friday 14 May 2005 "IDF planes, gunships and tanks destroyed Hezbollah posts in Lebanon, in response to Hezbollah shelling of IDF positions." Haaretz, May 15, 2005, http://www.haarets.com/hasen/objects/pages/printArticleEn.jhtml?itemNo=575884, Page 1 of 2.

[49] Haaretz, "Hamas wants power, Hezbollah has already won," http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/objects/pages/PrintArticleEn.jhtml?itemNo=566574. p. 1-5.

[50] Zogby International/Information International/The Arab American Institute. Methodology: Interviews with 600 adults in Lebanon.

[51] Research conducted in Spain, Turkey and Israel, presented at the Istanbul International Conference on Democracy and Global Security, June 9-11, 2005. Some 60 percent of terrorists arrested in Turkey had been in prison before. Research findings by Ami Pedahzur and Arie Perliger of University of Haifa, Israel, "The Culture of Death:Terrorist Groups and Suicide Bombing," presented on 10 June 2005, panel 24; Alan Daniel, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, USA, "Terroriswt Recruitment in European Prisons,", panel 32; and Samih Taymur, Turkish National Police/University of North Texas, USA, "Terrorist Recruitment," were particularly compelling.

[52] See Robert R. Tomes, "Relearning Counterinsurgency Warfare," Parameters, Spring 2004, p.16-28.

[53] For an expanded discussion of the steps mentioned also see Fred T. Krawchuk, "Combating Terrorism: A Joint Interagency Approach," Landpower Essay, No. 05-1 (Washington, DC: An Institute of Land Warfare Publication, AUSA, January 2005), www.ausa.org.

[54] The term is so commonly used that it has lost its colonial significance. Few now a days stop to ask Middle East in reference to what? Only with Europe designated as the center, the near or middle or far east would have meaning.

[55] Robert Nozick, Anarchy, State and Utopia," in Richard T. Garner & Andrew Oldenquist eds. Society and the Individual: Readings in Political and Social Philosophy (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1990), p. 337-352, from Nozick's Anarchy, State and Utopia (1974).

[56] Michael Ignatieff, p.127.

[57] I am indebted to my colleague Dr. William Olson for the analogy of the herd, the predators and the prey. See Susan B. Glasser, "Martyrs in Iraq Mostly Saudis: Web Sites Track Suicide Bombings," The Washington Post, Sunday May 15, p. A1, c1-A25, c1.