

# Good essay on war on terror

[Society](#), [Terrorism](#)



\n[[toc title="Table of Contents"](#)]\n

\n \t

1. [America on the War on Terror](#) \n \t
2. [Illegal Nature of the War on Terror](#) \n \t
3. [Conclusion](#) \n \t
4. [Works Cited](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

## **America on the War on Terror**

America and its supporters indicate that the War on Terror is justifiable under international law and the fact it intended for the paralysis of the United States, if not its total elimination. According to Yoo and Ho (2003), the attacks designed to eliminate the current military and civilian leadership status of the country with one hit and disrupt the entire country's functions with the attack. Al Qaeda, who had claimed responsibility for the attacks, wanted to influence America into changing its Middle Eastern policy through the attack. President George W. Bush then stressed in one of his speeches that the 9/11 attacks ended up bringing the country at the state of armed conflict and declared the War on Terror . In order to legalize their attack, the United States cited Article 51 of the United Nations Charter as a legal basis of their attacks. According to Wu (2014), Article 51 permits states to exercise collective or individual self-defense should an attack occur on their territories. With the UN Charter permitting state action for self-defense, the US President has the authority under the Constitution to call the country into war should the country finds itself threatened by any type of threat .

## **Illegal Nature of the War on Terror**

On the other hand, opponents to the War on Terror stressed that the War on Terror is illegal and should be reconsidered. Mazhar and Goraya (2011) argued that the sovereignty is violated by the War on Terror as seen in Article 2 (4) and Article 51 of the UN Charter. Under both provisions, countries are not permitted to intervene in another's political affairs without their consent as it disrespects the aspect of states being autonomous from one another. Article 51 even gave a reason as to why American action is illegal as the provision prohibits unsanctioned attacks from agencies not accredited by the UN . Bradley and Goldsmith (2005) added that there is a slight question with regards to the sentiment on what the “ war” all about is and who the actual target is. The Congress have been aware that the target are non-traditional actors and stressed that the US is fighting against the “ Armed attack” rather than a “ war” . Finally, Graff (2013) added that America is not even clear with the goals it has for the War on Terror. As a result of its inconsistent policies, many civilians are caught in the middle of the conflict and increase the growth of terrorism because of resentment to the United States. Many of the attack's survivors would feel such resentment for targeting their communities, or if they have lost a loved one in the sieges .

## **Conclusion**

Currently, the threat of terrorism remains at the forefront of world affairs, and the international community is on high alert to stop it from growing further. On the one hand, America has a point with its stance on the War on Terror because they have been threatened by these terrorists in their own territory. As a result, America will need to retaliate to defend themselves

from future attacks. Their interpretation is also apparent as the UN Charter indeed stressed a clause that permits countries to engage in war for the sake of self-defense. On the other hand; however, America's War on Terror is not legal primarily because of the UN Charter and the fact America's terrorist strategy is becoming more than just eliminating the risk. There is also the concern that the attacks done in the name of the war is done without considering the sovereignty of the affected country. While the argument remains unsolved, it is crucial that the international community agrees on the rules of engagement when dealing with these threats.

## **Works Cited**

- Bradley, Curtis and Jack Goldsmith. " Congressional Authorization and the War on Terrorism." Harvard Law Review 118. 7 (2005): 2047-2133. Print.
- Graff, Garrett. The threat of terrorism is ebbing, but US counterterrorism policies are not: A Critical look at US Counterterrorism efforts amid the NSA scandal. Washington, D. C.: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Perspectives, 2013. Print.
- Mazhar, Muhammad Saleem and Naheed Goraya. " Drone war against Pakistan: An analytical study." Journal of Political Studies 18. 2 (2011): 187-206. Print.
- Wu, Edieth. " Drones in the Fight against Terrorism - Should the global community stringently regulate their use?" International Journal of Arts and Commerce 3. 4 (2014): 19-34. Print.
- Yoo, John and James Ho. International law and the War on Terrorism. Report. Berkeley: University of California , 2003. Print.