

## Challenges in the Post-9/11 World

Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs  
Remarks at Conference on the War on Terrorism  
French Senate, Paris, France  
September 11, 2002

I am honored to represent the United States at this important conference. The first anniversary of the terror hijackings that caused such grievous harm in New York and Washington, as well as the airplane that crashed in Pennsylvania, gives us all the opportunity to pause and consider the historical moment in which we are living. We look back before last September 11 and remember the world in which vibrant new forces of globalization enabled by information technology were creating prosperity and tapping human potential in virtually every part of the world. We want to reclaim that promising outlook for the new millennium.

And yet, we think about the past year of crisis and recognize that the adjustments we all have made in our international security perspectives are neither minor nor transitory. In the United States, we Americans do not doubt that we are living in a changed world. For if we are to reclaim our freedom to go about our lives without being paralyzed by fear or immobilized by restrictive security measures, we have to deal with the threat posed by terrorist groups with global reach. Indeed, if we are to be consistent with the approach the U.S. and its European allies have always taken regarding military threats, we must achieve and maintain superiority against this threat, as we have against every adversary to date. Nothing less will suffice.

And so it is most appropriate that we gather here to ask how we will approach the challenge of securing the peace in the 21st century against the nihilistic, stateless, and asymmetric threat of terrorism.

Whether we like it or not, we are obliged to recognize that September 11, 2001, imposed some new realities on the international security equation:

- An extremely violent adversary with no political agenda or demands has compelled us to take extraordinary physical and legal measures to reduce the vulnerability of our societies.
- The penetration of our borders and the attacks on our territory have put our longstanding concern about proliferation of WMD [weapons of mass destruction] in a wholly new light, one characterized by urgency.
- The fact that Al Qaeda terrorists claim 40 nationalities, have no return address and are prepared to die in order to attack us, leaves no basis for a traditional policy of deterrence -- what would we hold at risk?

In these ways, and others, we are all confronted by the dilemmas posed by a sophisticated non-state adversary abusing the open nature of our modern society to threaten us.

And we are driven to take the necessary, sensible, and even obvious measures that may protect us against the next major terrorist operation.

As President Bush has said, should we discover credible information that terrorists plan to attack, we are justified in taking pre-emptive action in self-defense. This is nothing more than the application of the traditional, settled principle of self-defense to the new terror threat. After all, how could any responsible leader not try to stop acts of terrorism before they occur?

President Bush has also put a spotlight on Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) as a concern above all others. When the threat of terrorism is extended to the very real possibility of terrorists possessing weapons of mass destruction, the logic of pre-emptive action by our governments to stop such attacks is indisputable.

So what are the new elements in our own thinking and our own collective response to this 21st century threat? It should be clear that the security doctrines, structures and tools that kept the peace among nations in the 20th century must be reconsidered to

some extent. That is why our Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, remains dedicated to the concept of "transformation" within the U.S. military -- even while we are conducting wide-ranging military operations on several continents.

Europe and the United States are blessed with many advantages as we contemplate security against global terrorism.

- We have highly effective defense cooperation and alliance structures, and many superior operational capabilities.
- We have international organizations, legal instruments and norms of acceptable behavior that support our collective interest in isolating and incapacitating the global terrorist actors such as Al Qaeda.
- And perhaps above all, we have the natural habit of democratic governance, which reflects the legitimate mandate and the collective wisdom of millions of citizens.

Now it falls to us to adapt these strengths to the task at hand.

We cherish principles of democracy and human rights -- but in order to stop Al Qaeda, we must cooperate with all willing governments, whether or not they fully share these principles. The alternative would be to allow safe-havens and financial havens for the people who destroyed the World Trade Center. We must adjust our thinking on post-Cold War security approaches. Since September 11 one year ago, Presidents Bush and Putin have moved beyond the old Cold War agenda. Offensive nuclear arms and missile defense policies have adapted to U.S.-Russian partnership, and Cold War arms control processes have had to catch up with more cooperative and friendly political relations. Indeed, the focus of proliferation concern has increasingly shifted to the developing world, since the bipolar East-West dynamic of the U.S.-Soviet arms control era is now a thing of the past. The transatlantic alliance itself is evolving with the times:

- NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson is pressing European allies to increase defense spending.
- The Afghanistan crisis has answered his appeal to some extent, as many allies have deployed forces to conduct combat, peacekeeping or humanitarian relief operations, and this has stimulated political support for defense spending.
- Let me add that France has contributed substantially to the coalition military effort, with naval operations near the Horn of Africa, air operations based in Central Asia, and training for the Afghan Army, as well as medical assistance within Afghanistan. On behalf of the American people, I join Ambassador Leach in saluting France for these very substantial commitments and sacrifices.

And so we find European military institutions less focused on the threat of war in Europe, and more focused on a new kind of role, further from home and more expeditionary in nature.

We could call this concept "projecting security," since the key to reducing the threat of terror attacks on our homeland is to suppress the sources of the threat in the places far from home where terrorists plan and train.

In the U.S. we find our neatly organized regional military command organizations -- CENTCOM, EUCOM, PACOM -- waging a counter-terrorism campaign that does not respect regional geography. We need to learn to operate effectively with forces from Denmark, Jordan, Australia, and elsewhere, side by side, all at once. This is a particular challenge for my bureau at the State Department.

I believe that NATO's emphasis on greater interoperability, via the Defense Capabilities Initiative, is important, and I will support defense export licensing reforms that better enable the U.S. and Europe to field superior technologies for their mutual use.

The war on terrorism, of course, is about much more than the use of military force.

It requires far greater levels of intelligence, law enforcement, and financial cooperation to detect, impede and apprehend these people than we have ever had before. Cooperation among governments everywhere must be continuous and wide-ranging.

The U.S. military has adapted to this situation by placing representatives of civilian agencies at several combatant command headquarters. It is an experimental arrangement to promote effective coordination of all aspects of this anti-terrorism effort.

But every aspect that I have mentioned this morning involves entities and experts professionally concerned with national security. I believe another dimension of security against terrorists is to bear in mind who they are, and who we are, and to carry a vision of a world in which our citizens are conscious of all the basic principles that we share as free people and allies.

We need to communicate to the masses of young Arab and Islamic youth that we care about them and want to build our future together, to help them fulfill their hopes and human potential.

In the political realm, even as our governments carry on the normal pattern of agreeing or disagreeing on trade, economic, and policy matters, we need to ensure that all of us reflect a core sense of political solidarity, backed by deep, tangible commitments of

resources and effort on the major new strategic dimensions of this war on terrorism.

I will not open discussion on the topic of American power in the international arena, but I do want to conclude with a message: President Bush, Secretary Powell and the American people are profoundly conscious of the need for broad international support and participation in the global war on terrorism. The opinion of our friends and allies matters. At a basic level, Americans need to know that we are united with Europe, and with other peoples around the world.

We often hear the term "unilateral" used to describe America's approach to foreign affairs. Yet the campaign against terrorism as I have just described it is anything but unilateral. It is wide-ranging, inclusive, multi-disciplinary, and painfully dependent on the willingness of many societies, parliaments and political leaders to commit resources and to cooperate.

If there is one insight that emerges above all from this conference -- a year after September 11, 2001 -- I hope it is recognition that there are major strategic questions at issue: the very shape and promise of our future together. Whatever our policy differences of perspective and preference, we must remain fundamentally united in our resolve to contain, manage, and defeat the threat of global terrorism.

Our primary goal must be to shape a 21st century international environment that is congenial to our shared values and hospitable to innocent peoples everywhere pursuing their fullest human potential, free from the threat of random, horrific, and wholly unjustified terror attacks.

Thank you and good luck with your deliberations.

[End]

---

This site is managed by the Bureau of Public Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

External links to other Internet sites should not be construed as an endorsement of the views contained therein.

[Copyright Information](#) | [Disclaimers](#)