

***TITLE OF PAPER: INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCES AFTER
SEPTEMBER 11:***

Baha Adnan Yahya Taher Alsabbari

Professor at the Faculty of Law and Political Science of the University of Kufa

Introduction

Different alliances between countries within the according type of relationship between these countries and the degree of rationality and understanding and the size of the risk and the common interests between them, and as the international environment with a competitive nature a permanent change and increasingly in terms of the risk so there is no alliances permanent but constantly changing according to the environment variables international and this leads to Search always looking for partners or allies to confront and especially with regard to gaining new allies, that alliances based on facing dangers or achieve common goals and identical, and that this is one of the pillars of international relations and theories balance of power, but what distinguished mechanism alliances after September 11, 2001 is It alliances based on interest, regardless of the ideological foundations and faith that brings the parties allied to the fact that the threat has become common.

First U.S. alliances: -

The security of the United States and the security of its allies is indivisible and that any threat to one is directed to all Alliances are for solidarity and unity and confront the environment variables strategy and to save the collective security as well, and therefore arise in order to achieve these goals so should there be a division of roles and responsibilities as it is divided benefits arising from the same coalition

The strategy the U.S. after September 11, 2001 became aware that the alliances that are institutionalized and structured legal and institutional is a burden now imposed the idea of the Cold War forming such alliances Now, it has changed what is important that these alliances flexible and smoother and are subject to change according to the data Environment International (1).

Second, the nature of alliances: -

Valbar tense security in the world is based on which will be formed alliances and necessities and security requirements that have driven approach to a new format of the coalition rather than patterns of traditional (2), which are no longer fit with the nature of the situation where necessary to recast the roles, and in comparison between the former and current roles, establish the following comparison:

Table (1)

The nature of the change in alliances before the events of 11 September 2001 and beyond

Traditional alliances alliances required

1 - alliance with the countries that have the skills to power 1 - alliance with all those who wish to focus on fragile states in order not happen under the control of terrorism

2 - Focusing on global alliances 2 - focus on regional alliances

3 - institutional and legal nature 3 - non-compliance with the institutions (coalition of the willing).

4 - alliances for a clear threat and agreed on the concept and level. 4 - alliances unstable due to lack of agreement on the concept and level of threat.

5 - ideological values and ideology more influential coalition formation 5 - more influential interests.

6 - a coalition means the balance of power 6 - a means of alliances against unknown threats.

Table prepared by the researcher

The rapid changes in the international environment, especially on the security side claiming to threaten the interests of countries and because these interests different from one country to another, as well as differences in the nature of threats tide against these interests and it becomes difficult to find reconcile these interests Hence it becomes difficult to create alliances multilateral While bilateral alliances is a strategic objective of the United States (3), especially since the idea of America to create a coalition is not to respond to the enemy with elements of military force or economic challenges it is because of the difficulty face multiple threats such as terrorism rampant in the world and in order to gain support and international support, which you see at the same time opening up to win new allies is essential for her, especially after the events of September 11, 2001.

Has provided bilateral alliances of the United States considerable resources on political, economic, military and breadth of flexibility to move as well as the unstable security environment that prompted some countries to focus its alliance with the United States is not against the backdrop of the political side only, but with a view to strengthen the

mechanism for the coalition in order to ensure this arms networking of alliances to deter or respond to threats of asymmetric and then pay these bilateral alliances to cooperation between countries with each other and which meets or meet its alliance with the United States to develop its cooperation is other (4), this mechanism the United States seeks them to strengthen and consolidate idea bilateral alliances first and Regional Alliances II being way more effective in the future in order to ensure flexibility and movement, as well as that of international terrorism transit border form a challenge to states on how to confront and respond in light of open societies and technological development used by terrorist groups and this is raising the level of security from national to international affairs and become the responsibility of the international stabilization force collective responsibility is addressed through alliances (5). These alliances United States is seeking them to be different from alliances of the Cold War, it sees that alliances offensive more fragile and less cohesive than alliances defensive nature Launching attack is problematic need of coalition members willingness to sacrifice for challenges or threats may not be equal for all members or These challenges or threats are not necessarily directed against all allied and then, according to a strategy of preventive war, which was based upon U.S. strategy after September 11, 2001, the aggressive style to tackle terrorism, especially through military operations in Afghanistan, for example, the form of a shift in the mechanism coalition, especially since many of the Member States in NATO was not prepared to fight outside the territory before it (6).

So the United States works after September 11, 2001 to convert political NATO defense doctrine that there was a period of the Cold War to the doctrine offensive required by the security environment in the war on terror and the idea shift in the form of alliances of alliances defensive alliances offensive associated strategy of America through Two points: -

First: the shift towards alliances least number or bilateral.

Second: not to resort to unilateral action as a way to achieve the goal.

I found some states that the work done by the United States in the race is the work of a single, but the American vision differs is focused on the mechanism of alliances are few in number under her leadership, such as Britain and the countries participating in the Iraq war in 2003, while some influential countries in the European Union such as France and Germany feel that the United States is working unilaterally when it comes to interest American and this is what interprets these forces as a kind of American hegemony and marginalization have which justifies the tensions between the United States and among some of its allies in Europe, especially after America's insistence on going to war in 2003.

The administration of U.S. President George W. Bush was working on the defense of American interests, regardless of what you see France or Germany and that the sheer number of countries allied against terrorism has strengthened the strategic vision of America based on the support of each country and the alliance with him, even with the most vulnerable, the U.S. to support these countries and their governments in order not to fall under the influence of terrorist groups (7).

Despite the protests and objections made by countries such as France and Germany against management style global coalition against terrorism and setting mechanism future goals of this alliance, especially before and after the 2003 Iraq war, it however I realized participated in coalitions of the willing and regardless of the nature of perception of these countries or NATO The problem about determining the common interests between the United States and NATO, the United States believes that it managed after the events of September 11, 2001 changed the style and mechanism existing alliances of image traditional to the new image which she feels able to include alongside a wide range of countries, regardless of the nature of the assistance and contribution provided to support this war, but the most important thing is the international consensus and cooperation for the eradication of terrorism and the other thing is to find new allies what could be a future add or substitute for NATO if she Member States of NATO action to block the strategic security of America, especially since the nature of future threats do not need to huge numbers and equipment of weapons are asymmetric threats require an extensive network of cooperation and alliance to address them.

References:

- (1) d. Fred Najjar, strategic alliances from competition to cooperation, options of the twenty-first century, i 1, Enzak for publication and distribution, Cairo, 1999, pp. 14-26.
- (2) Daniel. Byman, Remaking Alliances for the war on terrorism, The Journal of strategic studies, VO (29), NO (5), Center for Peace and Security Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, 2006, pp 770-771.
- (3) Hendrickson, Ryan. NATO After September 11: Explaining the Alliance's Persistence. Paper presentation at the international studies association, Chicago, United States, 2007. p1.

- (4) Paolo Pasicolan and Balbina Hwang, The Vital Role of Alliances in the Global War on Terrorism Backgrounder, NO (1607), The Heritage Foundation, Leadership for America, Washington, October, 2002, pp 3 - 5.
- (5) Nicolae I. Ciuca, Roles of Alliances and coalitions in the war of Terrorism, Strategy Research Project, US Army War College, Pennsylvania. United States, 2006, p2.
- (6) Thomas Donnelly, The Big Four Alliance: The New Bush Strategy, National Security Outlook, The American Enterprise Institute for public policy research, Washington, 2005, pp 2-5.
- (7) Ibid, p 4.

C.V

Full name and title / Baha Adnan Yahya Taher Alsabbari

Born / Najaf 08/29/1977

Professor at the Faculty of Law and Political Science of the University of Kufa

Educational attainment / PhD in Political Science

Specialization / Strategy.

Faculty of Political Science / Nahrain University. Iraq

- 1. Decision of the Department of Political Science / Islamic University in 2006.
- 2. Researcher at the Center for Strategic and Development Studies at the Islamic University, 2006.
- 3. Head of the political science department at the Islamic University / AGENCY 2007.
- 4. Professor in the Department of Political Science / College of Law and Political Science / University of Kufa.
- 5. Head of the political science department / Faculty of Law and Political Science / University of Kufa 2012.