Faculty and Researchers | Faculty and Researchers Collection

Crafting a better US grand strategy in the post-September 11 world: lessons from the early years of the Cold War

Gregg, Heather S.

International Studies Association

Crafting a Better US Grand Strategy in the Post-September 11 World: Lessons from the Early Years of the Cold War

Heather S. Gregg

Naval Postgraduate School

This article compares the instruments of statecraft used to construct grand strategies in the early years of the Cold War—the Truman and Eisenhower administrations—with the Bush administration's grand strategy and the Global War on Terror (GWOT). It argues that the Bush strategy relied heavily on the military instrument of statecraft in attempts of defeating Al-Qaeda and did not develop robust and concerted diplomatic, psychological and economic tools to undermine Al-Qaeda's ideology and influence. The early days of the Cold War hold valuable lessons for crafting an integrated grand strategy that can fight both the Al-Qaeda network and its ideology.

Americans are asking: How will we fight and win this war? We will direct every resource at our command—every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war—to the disruption and to the defeat of the global terror network.

—President George Bush, Speech to the Nation,

September 20, 2001

The current US challenge to craft a grand strategy for fighting the organizations and ideology fueling the global terrorist threat against the United States is not new; the Cold War demanded a similar strategy that challenged the Soviet Union and the spread of communist ideology. This article compares the early years of the Cold War—the Truman and Eisenhower administrations—with the Bush administration's grand strategy and the Global War on Terror (GWOT). Specifically, it investigates the tools of statecraft developed in the early stages of the Cold War—such as economic development, information campaigns, psychological operations (PSYOP), and negotiations—and how the US government knit together these different tools to form a grand strategy aimed at challenging Soviet power and the spread of communist ideology. It then describes actions of the Bush administration to fight Al-Qaeda and its ideology of militant Islam.

The article argues that, when comparing the early years of the Cold War to the first years of the GWOT, the Bush administration's grand strategy relied heavily on the military instrument of statecraft in attempts of defeating Al-Qaeda and did not develop robust and concerted diplomatic, psychological and economic tools to undermine Al-Qaeda's ideology and influence. The early days of the Cold War hold valuable lessons for crafting an integrated grand strategy that can fight both the Al-Qaeda network and its ideology.

The article is divided into four parts. The first section defines grand strategy and outlines the tools of statecraft used to realize a county's grand strategy. The second section describes the grand strategies developed in the early years of the Cold War, under Truman and Eisenhower, arguing that these administrations brought to bear a variety of tools of statecraft to contain both the Soviet Union and communist ideology, particularly the psychological tool, and developed programs that were used throughout the 45 years struggle against communism. The third section investigates the grand strategy employed during the Bush administration, noting its reliance on the military and its underemployment of the diplomatic and psychological tools of statecraft. And the fourth section suggests steps that could result in a better US grand strategy in the post-September 11th world.

Grand Strategy, Tools of Statecraft and the Early Years of the Cold War

The current US challenge in crafting a grand strategy aimed at neutralizing militant Islam bears some similarities to US efforts in creating a grand strategy aimed at countering communist ideology following the end of World War II. The United States fought the early years of the Cold War with a blend of the instruments of statecraft and specific tools aimed at containing the Soviet Union and fighting communist ideology; this approach offers some direction on crafting a grand strategy to fight the United States' current foe. The section begins by offering a definition of grand strategy. It then outlines the four broad instruments of statecraft—diplomatic, psychological, economic, and military—their purpose, and examples of actions in each type.

Grand strategy is the means through which a state insures its security. Colonel R.W. Van de Velde describes statecraft as ''the process through which a nation attempts to minimize its weaknesses and limitations, and to maximize its strengths and capabilities in a current international situation'' (1962:1–6). Political scientist Barry Posen defines grand strategy as ''a state's theory about how it can best 'cause' security for itself…A grand strategy must identify likely threats to the state's security and it must devise political, economic, military and other remedies for those threats'' (1984:13). In its broadest sense, constructing an integrated grand strategy, therefore, requires an understanding of the adversary and the threats it poses, and the means by which to confront those threats.

Devising a viable, robust grand strategy requires engaging and coordinating a state's resources, which are its instruments of statecraft. Van de Velde (1962) outlines four broad instruments: diplomacy, economics, military, and the psychological tool of statecraft. He notes that the psychological tool is somewhat controversial and not universally accepted. This observation is echoed by strategic communications expert Carnes Lord (1989:22–23), who contends that the psychological tool of statecraft is controversial because it implies lying and manipulation, which are unpalatable to Americans. As will be described, however, the psychological tool of statecraft primarily uses truth and facts in its operations. Subsequent summaries of the instruments of statecraft have changed the psychological tool to the information tool, creating the abbreviation DIME. However, Van de Velde's description of this tool as psychological is more apt. The goal is to shape perceptions; information is a means, not an end, to this objective.

The psychological tool of statecraft deserves particular attention because of its importance in Cold War grand strategies and its potential for US grand strategy today. The psychological tool aims to influence perceptions of populations and leaders with the ultimate goal of affecting other states' actions. Within the psychological tool of statecraft, perhaps the most important operation is public diplomacy. Public diplomacy is not traditional diplomacy. Whereas traditional diplomacy involves negotiations between heads of state behind closed doors, a government uses public diplomacy primarily to influence another country's

population; as such it is an open and visible process (Holt and Van de Velde 1960:15; Tuch 1990:3–4). Public diplomacy can include actions such as public addresses by heads of state or official visits, exchange programs like the Fullbright scholarship, military-to-military exercises, and military educational programs with the purpose of fostering relationships across officer corps, mitigating misperceptions, and increasing transparency (Lord 1989).

Information is another key use of the psychological tool of statecraft. The Unites States operates various media outlets, including the radio broadcast Voice of America, television programs, print media and, more recently, web sites. Increasingly, however, the information aspect of the psychological tool is affected by nongovernmental, globally broadcasted media sources, such as CNN, Fox News, and even the entertainment industry, which portrays US culture abroad. The ''CNN effect'' has presented challenges to the United States government and its ability to manage information for its desired effect (Lord 1989:23–26; Hoffman 2002:83–95).

The military also uses the psychological tool of statecraft. Beginning in the 1950s, the US Army stood up what would later become PSYOP, which focuses primarily on tactical and operational level information campaigns aimed at shaping perceptions (Lord 1989:15–18). PSYOP actions include leaflets, radio broadcasts, print media, and television programs.

Coercive diplomacy is another action that yields a psychological effect (Lord 1989:18–19). For example, the use or threat of the use of force has a psychological impact on populations. A credible conventional and nuclear deterrent during the Cold War reassured allies of the United States resolve for protection and dissuaded direct Soviet attack against the United States and its interests. The US government also made use of covert operations with the aim of impacting enemies and allies psychologically. Although many of these actions still remain classified, the following discussion will touch on some operations in the early days of the Cold War, such as the efforts made to sway Italy's 1948 elections away from the communists, and the psychological impact they had on US enemies and allies.

Unlike the psychological tool of statecraft, the diplomatic tool differs in its means of persuasion and its audience. In its traditional form, the diplomatic tool is used primarily by heads of state in a government and involves dialog and negotiations, usually behind closed doors and sheltered from the public. More recently, states have engaged in ''track-two diplomacy,'' which involves elites that are not state officials. Israeli and Palestinian negotiations between intellectuals, which eventually opened the way to the 1994 Oslo accords, are an example of track-two diplomacy.

The economic tool of statecraft can be used through incentives and coercive policies with the goal of aligning other states toward US interests. Incentives include, most notably, financial and material aid. Incentives can also include trade agreements, such as Most Favored Nation (MFN) status, which the US gave to China in the 1990s. Coercive economic actions include sanctions, tariffs, and trade embargos. Although these actions are primarily tools of the government, private sector business also wields influence, particularly since the dawn of powerful Multinational Corporations (MNCs), which have become increasingly important actors that affect dynamics between states (United Nations 1973). In times of war, the military also has assets that affect the economic instrument of statecraft. The Army Corps of Engineers, for example, has unique capabilities that can develop infrastructure in a country, positively impacting its economy. Troops in Iraq and Afghanistan have also been tasked with jumpstarting local economies through employment programs and small grants (Murphy 2004).

The military tool of statecraft is best defined as the threat or use of force. The military is the most obvious institution that uses force, but force is not the

exclusive domain of the military. The intelligence community also has capabilities that allow it to project force with the aim of killing or capturing high value targets. As will be discussed, covert actions by the intelligence community has played a key role in US foreign policy, both in the Cold War and today. More recently, even the private sector has had a hand in the use of force. Specifically, the US government has hired private security companies as force providers in certain situations. A recent example is the private US security firm Black Water, which protected US diplomats in Iraq. The presence of private security companies, as with MNCs and private worldwide news agencies, has altered the US government's control over these tools of statecraft.

Finally, Van de Velde (1962:2) argues that the four tools of statecraft can be divided into two subsets: those that are physical and have measurable effects (military and economic); and those that are intellectual and harder to measure (diplomatic and psychological). With the latter subset, people's perceptions are the target: ''The moment we accept people as the actors and reactors in international affairs, we must accept the fact that these people are guided by their hearts and minds or by their emotions, or by a combination of both'' (Van de Velde 1962:2). The goal of the diplomatic and psychological tools, therefore, is to influence and shape perceptions of leaders and their populations.

Despite this distinction, Van de Velde contends that the intellectual instruments of statecraft permeate and shape the effects of physical tools, and that the physical tools can be employed to have an intellectual effect. He notes as an example, the 1947 Marshall European recovery plan, which engaged the economic tool of statecraft but also involved diplomacy and had a psychological impact on the United States, its allies and adversaries. Likewise, the Berlin Airlift of 1948–1949 built on diplomatic tools to use military and economic means that delivered a psychological effect (Van de Velde 1962:3).

Table 1 summarizes the tools of statecraft and examples of actions.

As the following discussion will show, the US government developed robust programs, through trial and error, and used the different tools of statecraft in the early years of the Cold War to contain the Soviet Union and counter the spread of communism. By comparison, in the first 8 years of the GWOT the US government relied heavily on force as its primary tool of statecraft and did not develop and employed other instruments, particularly instruments aimed at shaping perceptions.

Grand Strategy in the Early Years of the Cold War

This section focuses specifically on the grand strategies developed under the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, analyzing their mix of the tools of statecraft to fight the Cold War. It suggests that these administrations used a mixture of all four instruments with the aim of not only containing Soviet military capabilities, but also undermining the spread of communist ideology. The early years of the Cold War demonstrate, in particular, that the Truman and Eisenhower

TABLE 1. Tools of Statecraft

	Diplomatic	Psychological	Economic	Force
Acts	• Heads of state negotiation • Track-two diplomacy	• Public diplomacy • Information programs • Cultural, intellectual exchange programs • Military PSYOP • Coercive diplomacy	• Trade • Aid • Sanctions • Military stabilization • Reconstruction	• Military action • Covert operations

administrations made efforts to understand their adversary and developed an array of programs aimed at influencing not only leaders but also their populations, and allies as well as adversaries.

In the aftermath of World War II, the United States faced a weakened but hostile Soviet Union that held ideologically driven expansionist aims. To counter this threat, US diplomat George Kennan argued that the United States should focus on containing the Soviet Union's capabilities and concentrate on keeping specific industrial centers—particularly Europe and Japan—from falling into Soviet hands. The Truman administration ascertained that the United States could not prosper in a global economic system dominated by the Soviet Union but—at the same time—that it should avoid direct military confrontation with the Soviet Union, which could spark another major war. The Truman administration's goal, therefore, was to bound Soviet expansionist aims by ''measures short of war''; this objective inspired the Truman Doctrine of Containment (Gaddis 1982:25–53; Mitrovich 2000:1).

To fight the Soviet Union without direct military confrontation, the Truman administration crafted a grand strategy that used an array of tools aimed at undermining Soviet influence that targeted both Soviet leadership and populations in Central and Eastern Europe. The US government fought the early years of the Cold War, therefore, with a mixture of tools employed both defensively and offensively.

A critical component of Truman's grand strategy was the Marshall plan, which aimed to facilitate economic reconstruction of war-torn Europe, particularly Germany, and to deter the spread of communist ideology in Western Europe (Leffler 1992:147–164). The Truman administration surmised that reinvigorating Europe's economy would serve the United States' security interests in two interrelated ways: it would demonstrate US benevolence and values to the world and, in doing so, it would provide an economic and ideological bulwark against Soviet expansionist aims into Europe. The Truman administration deemed the Marshall plan a success in preventing the spread of communism into Central Europe and future generations have heralded the plan as one of the most successful economic stabilization programs undertaken in modern history (De Long and Eichengreen 1991; Kuntz 1997; Dobbins, McGinn, Crane, Jones, Lal, Rathmell, Swanger, and Timilsina 2003).

Alongside economic development, the Truman administration focused on shaping perceptions of the United States and of its foes through the psychological instrument of statecraft. In 1949, Truman founded the Fulbright Scholarship program, which funded cross-cultural education experiences and better understanding between scholars in America and the rest of the world. The Truman administration also launched programs aimed at better understanding the power dynamics within the Communist Party more broadly, and the Kremlin in particular, with the hopes of exploiting weaknesses in Soviet leadership (Mitrovich 2000).

Truman's administration also built on information-based PSYOP undertaken during World War II, particularly the Office of War Information the Office of Strategic Services, which were set up to counter German and Italian propaganda during the war (Tuch 1990:15–16; Cull 2008). The Department of State established the Office of International Cultural Affairs in 1946 and continued to broadcast US news and information through the Voice of America. Simultaneously, the CIA broadcasted Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty to undermine the Soviet message. In addition to radio broadcasts, the CIA also dropped leaflets into Central and Eastern Europe to spread their messages and counter Soviet propaganda (Mitrovich 2000:181–182).

In 1947, Secretary of State Marshall named George Kennan the director of the newly created Policy Planning Staff (PPS), which sought to develop long-term

programs aimed at assessing US political and security needs and realizing foreign policy objectives (Gaddis 1982:25; Mitrovich 2000:23). As head of the PPS, Kennan developed four goals aimed at reducing the Soviet Union's power and influence; two of those goals sought to prevent the Soviet Union from solidifying control of satellite countries in Europe; the other two goals targeted Soviet leadership and aimed to weaken the Kremlin from within (Mitrovich 2000:29). Under Kennan's guidance, the US government developed an array of covert capabilities, ranging from ''psychological warfare'' tools to émigré covert insurgency forces with the aim of creating ''a vigorous and effective ideological program'' aimed at fighting communist ideology (Lucas 1999:58). The goal of these covert tools was to confront and counter Soviet expansionist aims while maintaining a degree of ''plausible deniability'' that would allow the US government to deny direct involvement in these operations (Mitrovich 2000:21; Kennedy and Lucas 2005:313).

The Truman administration initiated a series of covert operations aimed at rolling back Soviets influences through ''political warfare''; operations that were controversial and mixed in their success. The administration undertook a massive effort to sway the 1948 elections in Italy away from a communist party victory (Lucas 1999:43; Osgood 2006:38–40). The PPC, together with the CIA and the Office for Policy Coordination, spread stories of abuse at the hands of the communist party behind the Iron Curtain through radio broadcasts and newspaper articles. The PPC also initiated a letter-writing campaign from Italian émigrés in the United States to family members in Italy, encouraging them not to vote for the communist party. Historian Scott Lucas argues that these efforts hinged on the conclusion that ''no campaign could rest on economic incentives or political pressure alone; elections had to be persuaded through propaganda, that Communism was ideologically inferior to a 'democratic' system'' (1999:44). Alongside these efforts, the PPC launched a ''disinformation program'' that fabricated communist party pamphlets and documents (Mitrovich 2000:17–18; Kennedy and Lucas 2005:313). The Italian Christian Democrat party won the elections by 48.5% of the vote, and the administration deemed the political warfare operation a success (Mitrovich 2000:18).

As another means of influencing perceptions in Europe, the Truman administration established a ''State-private'' network, which sought, first, to sell the Marshall plan to Europeans and more broadly to fight the Cold War on the intellectual front. Several philosophers, including John Dewey and Karl Jaspers, helped form the Congress for Cultural Freedom, which aimed to promote liberal ideas and check Soviet efforts to spread communism in Europe (Lucas 1999:97–99). Artists and intellectuals were also sent to the Soviet Union as a means of positively influencing the population with American art (Kennedy and Lucas 2005:314).

Not all of the Truman administration's programs were a success. The administration attempted to use US trained, covert émigré paramilitary forces to overthrow weakened communist regimes in Europe. In 1947, the United States and Britain trained and deployed Albanian émigrés into Albania with the objective of violently overthrowing the government. The operation failed, due in part to a mole within the force, and the United States was implicated in the operations (Lucas 1999:66; Mitrovich 2000:43–45.

The Truman administration also overtly weighed in on conflicts in areas of national security interest to the United States. The United States stepped in to provide economic and military aid to the Greek monarchy to defeat communist forces attempting to overthrow the government. Similar aid was extended to Turkey with the rationale that it was in the United States' security interest to keep these countries from falling to communism (Leffler 1992:73–81). Iran also became a concern to the United States, and the Truman administration began

to court the Shah's government with the aim of keeping Soviet influence from taking hold, particularly following the advance of Soviet forces to the Iranian border in 1946 (Leffler 1992:110). Tito's break with Stalin in 1948 inspired further efforts to drive a wedge between Communist leaders within the Soviet Union and those in Satellite countries and China (Gaddis 1982:42–44; Mitrovich 2000:30–42).

The Truman administration also used the diplomatic tool of statecraft to realize its security goals. Western Europe and the United States established NATO in 1949, with the goal of creating a security umbrella against Soviet expansionism. NATO fostered alliances between free Europe and the United States through joint military training programs and exercises, weapons sales, and basing privileges, where United States forces could deploy closer to the Soviet Union and show resolve for defending Europe (Gaddis 1982:72–76).

Under the Truman administration, nuclear weapons had yet to fully develop into a robust deterrent, and debates loomed over their proper use in statecraft. The Soviet Union's successful detonation of a nuclear device on August 12, 1949 altered the United States' perception of nuclear war, raising questions about the Soviet's ability to strike the United States and the United States' ability to strike back with a preponderance of force. This new dynamic gave added impetus to undermining the Soviet Union through measures ''short of war'' (Gaddis 1982:79–83; Mitrovich 2000:186–188).

Conventional military force also played a role in Truman's grand strategy, specifically through the deployment of forces in Europe and Japan and ultimately through the Korean War. In the immediate years following World War II, the US government drew down its conventional forces to a fraction of its wartime strength. The outbreak of war in Korea reinvigorated the need for conventional military power and further underscored the perils of direct military confrontation in a nuclear age (Gaddis 1982:168).

The Truman Doctrine, which sought to focus on containing the Soviet Union's capabilities and rolling back communism's appeal in key areas of vital security interest to the United States, crafted a grand strategy that developed and blended diplomatic, psychological, economic, and military tools. Hindsight shows that this was a period of experimentation, where multiple programs were developed with the aim of checking the security threat posed by both Soviet power and communist ideology. Not all of the programs worked, but these early efforts established a foundation of tools upon which future administrations could draw to formulate new strategies for fighting the Cold War, including the Eisenhower administration.

The escalation of Soviet nuclear capabilities, the emergence of Communist China, the stalemate of the Korean War and a new administration in 1953 prompted a shift in US grand strategy toward a more force-driven posture than Kennan's original argument of containment. Eisenhower's ''New Look''—enshrined in NSC-68—defined communist ideology as a threat wherever it arose and propelled the United States into checking communist movements beyond Kennan's critical centers of industrial power.

Eisenhower aimed to get at what he called the ''Great Equation'' for US grand strategy: ''Spiritual force, multiplied by economic force, multiplied by military force, is roughly equal to security'' (Osgood 2006:54). On its face, Eisenhower's grand strategy relied heavily on the threat of nuclear confrontation. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles (1954) announced in a speech to the Council on Foreign Relations that the new administration promised ''massive retaliation'' for any Soviet use of nuclear weapons against the United States and its interests:

> The way to deter aggression is for the free community to be willing and able to respond vigorously at places and with means of its own choosing. So long as our

> basic policy concepts were unclear, our military leaders could not be selective in
> building our military power. If an enemy could pick his time and place and
> method of warfare—and if our policy was to remain the traditional one of meet-
> ing aggression by direct and local opposition—then we needed to be ready to
> fight in the Arctic and in the Tropics; in Asia, the Near East, and in Europe; by
> sea, by land, and by air; with old weapons and with new weapons…. (1954)

Despite its more aggressive posture, Eisenhower also made psychological and dip-
lomatic tools a cornerstone of his grand strategy. Cold War historian Kenneth
Osgood argues that, building on his experiences with psychological warfare in
World War II, Eisenhower argued that:

> …the battle for hearts and minds would be a long-term enterprise, involving a
> wide range of activities to enhance U.S. influence and spread American ideals of
> democracy and free enterprise. [Eisenhower:] ''It is not merely the beaming out
> of facts. I would encourage the exchange of students, of scientists, of doctors, of
> instructors, of even theologians; anything you could think of that would tend to
> carry back into these various countries an understanding of what we are doing
> and just how we live…I believe it should go into the fields of art, science, and
> everything.'' (2006:51)

To this end, the administration consolidated information-based assets under the
United States Information Agency (USIA) in 1953, which aimed to ''tell Amer-
ica's story to the world,'' and interdict the spread of communist ideology by
informing other countries of US culture and policy through public diplomacy.
In addition to governing the Fulbright Scholarship program and Voice of Amer-
ica, USIA developed programs in education, arts, music, literature, television,
movies, and other efforts aimed at promoting the United States' image abroad.
The administration also launched a commercial advertising-crafted campaign
that sabotaged the Communist message (Gaddis 1982:154–155; Osgood 2006:46–
103; Cull 2008:90–91).[1]

Building on the programs established under Truman, the Eisenhower adminis-
trations further developed covert psychological tools aimed at undermining com-
munist leadership. Eisenhower launched a series of operations following the
death of Stalin in 1953 that attempted to sow seeds of mistrust and discontent
within the Politburo, including Operation Overload, Delay and Cancellation.
The US government also initiated Operation Engross, which encouraged high-
level members of the Communist party to defect and weaken the resolve of the
leadership (Mitrovich 2000:184).

Eisenhower also oversaw programs to fostered covert and overt actions that
attempted to foment uprisings in Poland and Hungary, eventually culminating
with the failed revolution in Hungary in 1956 (Gati 2006). The Eisenhower
administration used ''unconventional warfare''—covert operations aimed at
deposing or maintaining desired leaders with a country as a means of checking
the spread of communism. This included aiding a coup d'état in Iran in 1953,
and a coup in Guatemala in 1954. The Eisenhower administration also inter-
vened to influence the Suez Canal Crisis of 1956, and to keep the administra-
tion in Lebanon pro-United States in 1958 (Gaddis 1982:177; Osgood
2006:138–150).

Alongside these efforts to undermine communism internationally, Eisenhower
engaged the diplomatic tool of statecraft through dialog with the Soviet Union,

---

[1] Subsequent administrations developed additional psychological tools to complement these assets, including
Kennedy's implementation of the Peace Corps shortly after taking office in 1961, which aimed to share US exper-
tise to the developing world.

beginning in 1953, which helped pave the way for further diplomatic exchanges between the two powers (Gaddis 1982:159: Osgood 2006:60). Cold War historian Gregory Mitrovich (2000:188) argues that dramatic changes in the geo-strategic environment between the United States and the Soviet Union—particularly the Soviet Union's development of thermonuclear weapons—compelled the Eisenhower administration to begin dialog with the Soviet Union as a necessary means of deescalating tensions and preventing nuclear war.

Revisiting US grand strategies during the early years of the Cold War reveals important lessons for crafting US foreign policy in the post-September 11 world. First, the US grand strategies during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations always drew on a mixture of statecraft's tools, including actions such as conventional military power, covert operations, reconstruction and development, public diplomacy and informational programs, and diplomatic negotiations. Subsequent administrations further blended the tools of statecraft to create grand strategies aimed at defending the United States' security and prosperity in the face of the threat caused by the Soviet Union and communist expansion around the globe.

Arguably, the Truman administration developed the bulk of the programs used throughout the duration of the Cold War. These assets included the ambitious reconstruction and economic development initiatives of the Marshall Plan, public diplomacy and information programs embedded in the State Department, and sincere efforts to understand the United State's real and potential adversaries through the cross-cultural academic exchange envisioned in the Fulbright Scholarship program. Simultaneously, the Truman administration used the military tool, including both conventional and nuclear deterrence, military confrontation in Korea, and covert operations in Europe, Latin American, and the Middle East (employing both the psychological tool and force). The United States, in other words, fought the Cold War with more than the military tool of statecraft and the threat of nuclear war; it brought to bear a wide array of resources that contained Soviet expansion and undermine the spread of communist ideologies, particularly into Western Europe.

Second, US grand strategy was not fixed during the Cold War; rather, different administrations blended the tools of statecraft according to developments in the geo-strategic environment, technological advances, and their understandings of the adversary. The Truman Doctrine amassed economic, psychological and conventional military power, and an emerging nuclear deterrent with the goal of containing the Soviet Union and, specifically, denying its expansion into the industrially developed centers of Europe, Japan, and Korea. The Eisenhower administration adopted a more aggressive grand strategy, promising to check communist movements, wherever they arose and building a nuclear deterrent based on massive retaliation.

The programs developed under Truman and Eisenhower provided the foundation for future administrations during the Cold War. For example, Kennedy responded to the rise in communist-inspired insurgent activities with a US counterinsurgency capability and retooled the US nuclear deterrent following several close calls that challenged the efficacy of massive attack. The Johnson administration relied most heavily on conventional forces to fight the Cold War, specifically through the war in Vietnam. In response, the Nixon, Ford and Carter administrations swung back toward a less-military dominant foreign policy, and crafted their grand strategies around negotiations and Detente. The Reagan administration adopted perhaps the most overtly offensive grand strategy, promising to ''roll back'' communism and ultimately defeat it.

Ultimately, both the Soviet Union and communist ideology were defeat through a mixture of the tools of statecraft, not through military means alone. It took roughly 45 years to win the war.

US Grand Strategy Post-September 11

Following the September 11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, DC, President Bush announced that the United States would execute a GWOT with the aim of routing out terrorist entities wherever they existed and, specifically, dismantling Al-Qaeda: ''Our war on terror begins with Al-Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated'' (2001). To this end, the Bush administration has targeted Al-Qaeda's leadership and executed two wars—Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) in Iraq—with the aim of denying assets to global-minded terrorists. The United States continues to grapple with the threat posed by militant Islam and how to devise a grand strategy for ensuring US security and prosperity. The early years of the Cold War offer useful insights for fighting this new threat posed by Al-Qaeda and its ideology. In particular, the psychological programs developed to counter communist ideology and explain the United States and its intentions are necessary tools for fighting this new global threat. Successfully deploying these tools requires better understanding the adversary and the nature of the threat.

The Cold War and the GWOT have important differences and similarities that may affect the applicability of employing the former war's strategies to the present global threat. Perhaps the most important difference between wars is that the Cold War was more state-centric focused than the GWOT. The Soviet Union, China, Cuba, and other communist powers resided within state structures. The tools of statecraft could therefore be employed to deter, coerce and compel these states' leaders and assets. The GWOT, while including some state actors, operates primarily on the sub-state and trans-state levels; this requires new strategies of coercion and compellence. Alongside this difference, nuclear deterrence—one of the pillars that shaped Cold War strategic thinking and interaction—is no longer applicable as it was in the Cold War; nuclear confrontation is unlikely to deter nonstate actors. Finally, transnational terrorism does not appear to be a threat to major industrial powers as the Soviet Union and China were during the Cold War. Perhaps the greatest industrial threat posed by Al-Qaeda and like-minded Islamic insurgents is the disruption of oil from the Middle East. While important, this does not appear to be as great a threat as Soviet and Chinese expansion was in the 1950s.

However, there are important similarities between the Cold War and the current global terrorist threat that give the foreign policy tools developed during the Cold War relevance today. Perhaps most importantly, both wars contain ideologies that are antithetical and hostile toward the United States and require strategies aimed at de-legitimating their message. The Cold War ended not only with the defeat of the Soviet Union, but also the defeat of communist ideology and the wide-scale rejection of its tenets by populations around the globe. The fight against Al-Qaeda demands a similar debunking of militant Islamist ideology to neutralize the threat it poses to the United States. Second, the adversaries in the Cold War and the GWOT both have global reach. Communist ideologies were a global threat, spanning from Europe to East Asia, Africa to Latin America. Similarly, militant Islamist ideologies and their organizations are popping up in virtually every corner of the globe. Third, communism and militant Islam are both long-term adversaries. The Cold War lasted almost 50 years—nearly two generations—likewise, it is prudent to assume that militant Islam will take at least a generation or two to discredit. Finally, the Cold War was not won through military power alone. As previously described, the United States brought to bear all the tools of statecraft to defeat the Soviet Union and undermine communist ideologies. Similarly, neither can this global war be won through military power alone.

Shortly after the beginning of the GWOT, the Bush administration issued the 2002 National Security Strategy, which outlined the administration's vision for ensuring US security. The executive summary of the strategy names defeating terrorism as the nation's priority: ''To defeat this threat we must make use of every tool in our arsenal—military power, better homeland defense, law enforcement, intelligence, and vigorous efforts to cut off terrorist financing'' (White House 2002, i). Critically, the NSS does not name the psychological or diplomatic tools as key instruments for fighting the threat posed by terrorism.

The Bush administration relied heavily on the military instrument of statecraft to realize this National Security Strategy. The GWOT began with a military campaign against the Taliban regime in Afghanistan that aimed to destroy its authority and the sanctuary it had provided the leadership of Al-Qaeda. In the near term, OEF accomplished both these pursuits, toppling the Taliban in a matter of weeks and scattering Al-Qaeda's leadership. However, more recent analysis of Al-Qaeda's organizational structure suggests that, while OEF denied the organization a safe haven in Afghanistan, key leaders have continued to hold some operational control over the organization in neighboring Pakistan, particularly in the lawless Northwest Frontier Province. Similarly, the Taliban has regrouped and is now reasserting itself both politically and militarily in Afghanistan. It appears, therefore, that OEF achieved its goals in the near term, but has since lost the initiative.

The Bush administration also used the military instrument of statecraft to target Iraq. As early as September 12, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld fingered Saddam Hussein as an accomplice in the terrorist attacks and began calling for his removal. These assertions culminated with a 2003 ground invasion against Saddam Hussein based, in part, on a believed connection between the dictator and the terrorist threat posed by the Al-Qaeda network (CBSNews Online 2002).

Operation Iraqi Freedom was a counterproductive move in the GWOT for three broad reasons. First, the international community largely rejected the United States' reasons for initiating OIF—to stamp out Iraq's purported Weapons of Mass Destruction capabilities and connections to Al-Qaeda—which opened the way for conspiracy theories on the ''real causes'' of the US offensive, ranging from oil to Bush family vendettas against Saddam Hussein (Farrell 2006). The war also strained US relations with its allies. Second, OIF helped fulfill the prophecies of Al-Qaeda's ideology, which claims that the United States is out to destroy Islam, through its support of apostate regimes, its ''occupation'' of Saudi Arabia, and now its invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq (bin Laden 1996). Third, Iraq became a magnet and training ground for the Al-Qaeda network; prior to the Anbar Awakening and the Surge, the instability in Iraq allowed for Al-Qaeda to set up a presence in the country, ironically making it the safe haven that the US government aimed to destroy.

In addition to the military campaigns of OEF and OIF, the GWOT also targeted the core leadership of Al-Qaeda. The FBI named bin Laden as its most wanted man in addition to identifying around 20 of his associates as targets of the GWOT (Federal Bureau of Investigation 2007). Within the first 2 years of September 11, the United States killed or captured nearly 20 core members, including the believed number three in command Muhammad Atef (killed in Afghanistan as part of OEF in 2001), his replacement Abu Zubaydah (captured in Pakistan in 2002), his replacement and believed architect of the September 11 attacks Khaled Sheikh Muhammad (captured in Pakistan in 2003), al-Nashiri, the operations chief and believed designer of the 1998 US Embassy bombings in Africa and the 2000 attack on the USS COLE (captured in the Arabian peninsula in 2002), and the capture of abd al-Haidi al-Iraqi, the operations chief of Al-Qaeda, who was apprehended trying to enter Iraq in April 2007 (Global

Security.org 2010). Killing or capturing Al-Qaeda leadership continues to be a key strategy in the war against militant Islam.

The US government employed other instruments of statecraft in the GWOT, but these tools were few in comparison to its use of force. Within weeks of September 11, the US government targeted bin Laden and Al-Qaeda's financial assets as a means of disrupting their terrorist capabilities. The Patriot Act, which President Bush signed into law on October 26, 2002, aims to—among other things—arrest patterns of terrorist financing. The Bush administration has claimed some success in freezing around $138 billion in terrorist financial assets; however, lack of international regulations and compliance coupled with unofficial means of transmitting money, such as the *hawallah* system, have hindered efforts to thoroughly block terrorist financing (Farah 2003).

Perhaps the single greatest difference between the grand strategies at the beginning of the Cold War and grand strategy under the Bush administration was the lack of a public diplomacy campaign. In the months following the attacks in Washington, DC and New York, the Bush administration attempted an information campaign aimed at promoting the United States' image abroad. The Bush administration hired Charlotte Beers, a New York-based advertisement executive, to work on promoting a better image of the United States to the Muslim world. Under Beers' direction, the State Department produced documentaries on Muslims in America to be distributed abroad, and launched Radio Sawa, an Arabic-language radio station broadcasted throughout the Middle East. Beers resigned in March 2003 after her campaign was criticized for not understanding its target audience and achieving little to no visible results (Starr 2001; De Young 2002; CNN.com 2003).

The State department also created the Office of Global Communications, headed by former US ambassador to Morocco, Margaret Tutwiler, with the aim of better explaining US foreign policies to the Muslim world and countering anti-US propaganda from Al-Qaeda and others. In the fall of 2005, her successor, Undersecretary of State Karen Hughes, traveled to the Arabian Peninsula in an effort to meet with various populations and promote the United States' image in the region. Her tour received a mixed reception, prompting some women in Saudi Arabia to argue that they did not need an American woman telling them how to live their lives (Marquis 2004; Weisman 2005).

These efforts show that the United States' use of the psychological tool of statecraft was thin in the GWOT. The initial public diplomacy programs suggest that the US government has not taken time to understand its audience. In the early years of the Cold War, the Truman and Eisenhower administrations began with programs that aimed to better understand citizens in the Soviet Union and its satellite countries, and Soviet leadership. This knowledge allowed these administrations to tailor its message to these audiences more effectively.

The United States government's weak public diplomacy campaign, coupled with a military dominant grand strategy, had disastrous consequences for the US image abroad. In particular, the Bush administration did not succeed in explaining or justifying US actions in the GWOT to the Muslim world. Post-September 11 polling data is particularly illustrative of this problem. Surveys conducted by Pew and Gallup have found a pervasive overall attitude of "anti-American sentiment" throughout the Muslim world and in the Middle East in particular. The region's ill feelings toward the United States are more pronounced in response to its foreign policy than its culture and values. In 2002, Gallup polled nine countries in "the Islamic world," including Lebanon, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, Morocco and Indonesia, to measure attitudes toward the United States and its foreign policy actions. It found that "In every nation in which this question was asked, including Turkey, a majority of those interviewed expressed the view that the American military action [in Afghanistan] is either

largely or completely unjustifiable'' (Gallup 2002). A 2002 Pew global survey concludes: ''In general, antipathy toward the United States is shaped more by what it *does* in the international arena than by what it *stands for* politically and economically'' (2002:69).

Negative sentiment over US foreign policy was particularly acute in regard to US military operations in Iraq. Prior to the war, in 2002, Pew surveyed countries throughout the world regarding support for armed conflict against Saddam Hussein and found that the overwhelming majority of countries surveyed did not support military action against Iraq (2002; Center for Strategic Studies (Jordan) (2005); Telhami 2005). Pew also polled Turks on their attitudes toward a war in Iraq and, specifically, the prospects of the US military using its bases in Turkey to conduct the war. It found that ''Fully 83% of Turks oppose allowing US forces to use their country, a NATO ally, to wage war on Iraq. Further, a 53% majority of Turkish respondents believe the United States wants to get rid of Saddam Hussein as part of a war against unfriendly Muslim countries, rather than because the Iraqi leader is a threat to peace''(Pew 2002).

In April 2003, Pew surveyed countries on perceptions of OIF and found that favorable ratings for the United States to be ''far below levels measured in 2002 and 2000;'' ratings in Turkey, Jordan and Palestine fell to the teens (Pew 2003). A 2004 survey found that ''While populations of predominately Muslim countries are not averse to democracy, they are skeptical of the [Bush] administration's goal of promoting democracy in the Middle East. The war in Iraq has only intensified these doubts; in March 2004, majorities in Turkey, Jordan, Morocco, and Pakistan said the war made them less confident that the United States wants to promote democracy'' (Pew 2005c:119). More broadly, Pew surveys have found that in several countries—including Pakistan, Jordan, Lebanon, Kuwait, and Turkey—a majority of citizens perceive the US military as threatening and fear US military actions against their own state (Pew 2005a; Pew Foundation 2005c). A 2007 Pew survey found that: ''the overall US image remains abysmal in predominately Muslim countries. Notably, solid majorities in every largely Muslim country surveyed—as well as in the Palestinian territories—also say they are very or somewhat worried that the US could be a military threat''(Pew 2007:55).

These polling data suggest that the Bush administration's use of the military instrument of statecraft and its desires to positively shape perceptions in the Muslim world were at cross purposes. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, in particular, generated fear and suspicion over US intentions toward Muslims. These fears support the United States' adversaries, who claim that the United States is out to destroy the Muslim world and, therefore, must be fought to defend the faith.

In 2006, the Bush administration issued a second National Security Strategy. While the 2006 strategy contains an almost identical table of contents to the 2002 document, the new executive summary specifies two pillars for security: ''promoting freedom, justice, and human dignity—working to end tyranny, to promote effective democracies, and to extend prosperity through free and fair trade and wise development policies''; and, ''confronting the challenges of our time by leading a growing community of democracies'' (White House 2006: p. ii). The 2006 National Security Strategy, in other words, made democratization the cornerstone to transforming the global security environment and insuring US security. This strategy, while still stressing the importance of defeating the global terrorist threat to the United States, named economic development and human rights as the best means of defeating terrorism in the long run.

Following the 2006 National Security Strategy, in June 2007—nearly 6 years after September 11—the Strategic Communication and Public Diplomacy Policy Coordinating Center (PCC) of the State Department issued the US National

Strategy for Public Diplomacy and Strategic Communication, which aimed to set the agenda for an information campaign in the GWOT. The document stresses the importance of emphasizing the United States' values to the world through promoting: ''democratization... amplifying mainstream Muslim voices...isolating and discrediting terrorist leaders...deligitimizing terror...[and] demonstrating that the West is open to all religions and is not in conflict with any faith'' (U.S. Department of State 2007a,b:3). The document is valuable for envisioning the kind of message the United States should be promoting; the report, however, is unclear as to which government agencies will spread this message and by what means or how this message will compliment or compete with information spread by the media and private enterprises such as the entertainment industry. Without these details in place, implementing the strategic vision remains suspect.

What is Needed to Craft a Better Grand Strategy for the GWOT

Following the September 11 attacks, several international relations scholars weighed in on how to construct a grand strategy aimed at insuring US security in the face of this new adversary. Political scientist Robert Art argues that grand strategy, by its very nature, is built around the tool of military power and that the other instruments of statecraft fall in the realm of foreign policy (2003:1–2). Stephen Biddle (2005) argues that the United States has two broad policy options for fighting militant Islam in the post-September 11 world—rollback or containment. Rollback requires aggressive policies of nation-building, great power competition and great commitment in the near term with the potential for defeating the terrorist threat in the long run. Containment demands fewer aggressive policies up front and could reduce near-term confrontations with great powers and WMD use by terrorists, but could allow for the root causes of Islamic militancy to go untreated.

Historian John Lewis Gaddis contends that US grand strategy under the Bush administration focused heavily on the military tool of statecraft. In particular, the Bush administration used the Cold War definition of pre-emptive war, which includes preventive war—military action taken to reduce the possible development of hostile action—to declare war on Iraq:

> To wait for terrorist threats to become clear and present was to leave the nation vulnerable to surprise attacks. Instead, the United States would go after states that had harbored, or that might be harboring, terrorist gangs. It would at first seek to contain or deter such regimes—the familiar means by which the Cold War had been fought—but if those methods failed, it reserved the right to pre-empt perceived dangers by starting a preventive war (2005:3).

Gaddis argues that, while military action in Afghanistan and Iraq demonstrate that the United States will not retreat from the region, other instruments of statecraft are needed to reduce the threat of transnational terrorism to the United States. Gaddis notes, in particular, that ''Grand strategy is as much about psychology as it is facts on the ground'' and that more effort is required in the realm of diplomacy and reestablishing international legitimacy (2005:6).

The persistence of Al-Qaeda directed and inspired operations coupled with the limited-at-best success of denying Al-Qaeda sanctuary in Afghanistan and Pakistan suggest that military power alone will not counter this post-Cold War security threat. The Bush administration's strategy neither eradicated terrorist organizations nor did it undermine the ideology that inspired these groups to act. In fact, evidence suggests that the military dominant strategy may actually have fueled Al-Qaeda's ideology, fulfilling its prophecies instead of undermining them.

If the United States' grand strategy—including the military strategy of denying Al-Qaeda safe haven and taking out its leadership, coupled with the absence of a thorough public diplomacy plan—was as ineffective as polling data suggest, what drove this disjointed approach toward the war against Al-Qaeda?

Lessons from the Cold War suggest several possible answers. First, various administrations' perception of the enemy and how best to defeat that enemy played a significant role in shaping grand strategy postures; post-September 11 grand strategy is no exception. The Bush administration appears to have believed that Al-Qaeda could be defeated through force and, more broadly, that the Muslim world would be deterred by overwhelming military might. In the months following September 11, the Bush administration reached out to several well-known scholars of the Middle East, particularly the British-born and trained historian Bernard Lewis. Lewis argues that Arabs are in a state of crisis and unwilling to look within their own ranks for the causes of this crisis, pointing instead to the legacy of colonialism and current US hegemony as the source of their suffering. This argument, coined the ''Lewis Doctrine,'' contends that a victim mentality has caused Arab and Muslim society to stagnate; a strong, forceful response from the United States will propel the Muslim world into modernity, including the transition for autocratic to democratic societies. The Lewis Doctrine goes on to assert that, in order for the United States to counter the threat of militant Islam, it needs to stand firm, show force and—above all—not appease Arab discontent. Under this perception of the problem, conventional military force is a natural policy choice; Lewis supported the war in Iraq as a necessary step of standing firm against militant Islam, and imposing progress on a stagnated region of the world (Waldman 2004).

Critics of the Lewis doctrine point out that the war in Iraq had the opposite effect on Muslim society; rather than cow the region into submission and spark political and social progress, the war fueled insurgency, unrest, and fed the ideology of Islamic extremists, who ague that the United States is out to destroy their faith (Hirsh 2004). Moreover, one of the most free and fair elections in the Middle East brought the militant Islamic group Hamas to power in Palestine in 2006; elections did not usher in the tolerance and modernity predicted by Lewis (''Protecting Free Elections for Palestinians 2006''). Thus, the Bush administration's perception of its adversary and how to defeat it—enshrined in the Lewis doctrine—was misguided.

Second, building on the lessons of the Cold War, the Bush administration should have been developing programs that use the other tools of statecraft with the aim of fighting not only the Al-Qaeda network, but also its ideology and appeal to Muslims around the globe. It is important to note that the Truman and Eisenhower administrations developed the bulk of the diplomatic and psychological tools of statecraft used during the Cold War; in other words, they developed these capabilities in the early stages of the conflict, recognizing that the military tool alone would not defeat the Soviet Union and communist ideology. Moreover, the Truman administration did not develop its diplomatic and psychological capabilities from scratch; it built on existing institutions developed to fight Fascist ideology during World War II, such as Voice of America.

The Obama administration should use the lessons learned fighting the United State's previous global threat and adapt diplomatic and psychological tools developed during the Cold War to fight Al-Qaeda and its ideology. First and perhaps foremost, the US government needs to devote more time and resources to understanding the nature of the threat. Post-September 11, the enemy appeared to be a radical, militant interpretation of Sunni Islam, often referred to as *Wahabbism* or *Salafism* (Wictorowicz 2006). Seven years on, however, Shia Islamic movements, particularly in Lebanon and Iraq, are also a threat to the United States and its interests. What are the connections between Wahhabism and Shia

Islam? What unites these movements, what divides them? Clearly the United States government is still struggling to get its arms around the nature of the threat and on which groups in the Muslim world the United States should focus and why.

More recent scholarship suggests that the Muslim world is going through a revival or reformation, not unlike the Christian Reformation that shook the foundations of Europe and resulted in nearly 200 years of intra-Christian bloodshed over the origins and nature of religious and political authority (Maghraoui 2006). If true, militant Islamists like Al-Qaeda may represent one end of the spectrum, calling for a radical ''return'' to the early days of the faith when one leader spoke for the entire Muslim community; and with reformists at the other end of the spectrum, who are attempting to reconcile Islam with modernity and democracy. In the middle are the majority of Muslims around the globe, who practice their faith and are attempting to live their lives in dignity, unsure which ideology will best allow them to do this.

Presenting the current battle for Islam in these terms suggests several important implications for US grand strategy. First and foremost, it is important to better understand support for bin Laden and Al-Qaeda's message. Who is buying it? Why? How does the United States interdict the ideology of militant Islam? Polling data reveals some important hints to these questions. A 2003 Pew survey showed that 55% of Jordanians and 45% of Pakistanis gave bin Laden a favorable rating, while only 15% of Turks concurred with this view (Pew 2005b:29). In 2004, 65% in Pakistan rated Osama bin Laden favorably, and 55% in Jordan concurred with this; only 11% of respondents in Turkey gave bin Laden a favorable rating, however (Pew 2004:21). Polling in 2005 revealed that support for bin Laden had fallen overall, alongside waning support for acts of terrorism in Iraq and Palestine, but favorable ratings toward bin Laden had rose to 60% in Jordan, while declining to 51% in Pakistan and 7% in Turkey (Pew 2005b:29). Clearly bin Laden's actions were positively resonating with a portion of the Muslim world. The question remains: Why? What part of bin Laden's message was earning him favorable ratings with these populations. How can the United States craft its foreign policy to change these numbers and de-legitimatize bin Laden's message and actions?

Second, crafting a successful grand strategy requires clearly understanding the threat and engaging the tools of statecraft—diplomatic, psychological, and economic as well as military—to counter the threat and insure US security and prosperity. The 2006 National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism states: ''In the GWOT, violent extremism—in its various forms—is the primary threat to the United States, its allies, and interests'' (Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff 2006:3). The Plan further states: ''The national strategic aims are to defeat violent extremism as a threat to our way of life as a free and open society; and create a global environment inhospitable to violent extremists and all who support them'' (Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff 2006:5). The plan goes on to stress the need for interagency support in waging the GWOT, and the importance of fighting the enemy not only through military means but also through humanitarian assistance, alliances formation, and military-to-military contacts (Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff 2006:7).

The National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism, while naming the threat and the means for countering it, does not identify exactly who the terrorists are, or their goals. The United States government cannot answer this question without better understanding its enemy and the nature of the threat. The Truman administration spent considerable energy investing in better understanding its adversary in the early years of the Cold War, including research on the nature of the communist party and Soviet leadership, and

vulnerable populations in central Europe. The GWOT requires this attention to the enemy to craft a better grand strategy.

Finally, the United States needs to target militants without alienating the silent Muslim majority or its non-Muslim allies, and support reformists without de-legitimating their cause. Using primarily the military tool of statecraft will not achieve this end. In fact, force alone appears to be undermining these goals. The US government needs to better utilize the other tools of statecraft to achieve these ends.

A necessary first step in developing better diplomatic and psychological tools is the National Strategy for Public Diplomacy and Strategic Communication statement. Along side this effort, the government needs to develop more intellectual tools that can implement this vision. To do this, the United States needs to allocate more money to developing these tools, something that the 2007 budget reflected with a significant increase in funds to public diplomacy programs (Epstein 2006). It also needs to better understand the exact nature of the problem and develop metrics that can show changes in perceptions (Government Accountability Office 2003). This is neither an impossible or unprecedented task; the Cold War offers valuable lessons that can help pave the way.

Finally, it is important to note that developing tools other than force for fighting the GWOT is not a bid for isolationism; the United States needs to remain active in the new security environment and the threat posed by militant interpretations of Islam. Evidence from the Cold War suggests that it can do this through a better utilization of the tools of statecraft.

References

ART, ROBERT J. (2003) *A Grand Strategy for America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

BIDDLE, STEPHEN D. (April 2005) American Grand Strategy after 9/11: An Assessment. Carlisle: US Army War College Strategic Studies Institute. Available at http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute. army.mil/Pubs/display.cfm?pubID=603. (Accessed December 5, 2008).

bin LADEN, OSAMA. (1996) Bin Laden Declares Jihad on Americans. (FBIS Translation): 1–12.

BUSH, GEORGE H.W. (September 20, 2001) Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People. White House. Available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8. html. (Accessed June 26, 2007).

CBSNEWSONLINE. (September 4, 2002) Plans for Iraq Attack Began on 9/11. Available at http:// www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/09/04/september11/main520830.shtml. (Accessed June 26, 2007).

CENTER FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES (JORDAN). (February 2005) Revisiting the Arab Street: Research From Within. Jordan: Center for Strategic Studies, University of Jordan. Available at http:// www.mafhoum.com/press7/revisit-exec.pdf. (Accessed January 29, 2010).

CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF. (February 1, 2006) National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism. Available at http://www.defense.gov/qdr/docs/2005-01-25-Strategic-Plan.pdf. (Accessed July 26, 2007).

CNN.COM. (March 4, 2003) Bush's Muslim Propaganda Chief Quits. Available at http:// www.cnn.com/2003/US/03/03/state.resignation. (Accessed June 27, 2007).

CULL, NICHOLAS J. (2008) *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945–1989*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

DE LONG, J. BRADFORD, AND BARRY EICHENGREEN. (1991) The Marshall Plan: History's Most Successful Structural Adjustment Program. Presented at the Center for Economic Performance and Landeszentralbank Hamburg Conference. Available at http://econ161.berkeley.edu/pdf_files/ Marshall_Large.pdf. (Accessed July 26, 2007).

DE YOUNG, KAREN. (July 30, 2002) Bush to Create Formal Office to Shape U.S. Image Abroad. *Washington Post*, A01.

DOBBINS, JAMES, JOHN G. MCGINN, KEITH CRANE, SETH G. JONES, ROLLIE LAL, ANDREW RATHMELL, RACHEL M. SWANGER, AND ANGA R. TIMILSINA. (2003) *America's Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq*. Santa Monica: RAND.

DULLES, JOHN F. (January 12, 1954) Speech of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles Before the Council on Foreign Relations. Available at http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1556858/posts. (Accessed December 6, 2008).

Epstein, Susan. (May 1, 2006) U.S. Public Diplomacy: Background and the 9/11 Commission Recommendations. *Congressional Research Services*, 1–21.

Farah, Douglas. (December 14, 2003) Al-Qaeda's Finances Ample, Say Probers. *Washington Post*, A01.

Farrell, Maureen. (February 6, 2006) Top Ten Conspiracy Theories About George Bush. Available at http://www.buzzflash.com/farrell/06/02/far06001.html. (Accessed June 26, 2007).

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2007) FBI's Most Wanted Fugitives. Available at http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/terrorists/fugitives.htm. (Accessed June 27, 2007).

Gaddis, John Lewis. (1982) *Strategies of Containment*. London and New York: Oxford University Press.

Gaddis, John Lewis. (2005) Grand Strategy in the Second Term. *Foreign Affairs*, 84 (1) January/February: 2–15.

Gallup. (2002) *The 2002 Gallup Poll of the Islamic World; Tuesday Briefing*. Princeton: Gallup.

Gati, Charles. (2006) *Failed Illusions: Moscow, Washington, Budapest and the 1956 Hungarian Revolt*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Global Security.org. (2010) Abdul Hadi al-Iraqi. Available at http://www.globalsecurity.org/security/profiles/abdul_hadi_al-iraqi.htm. (Accessed January 28, 2010).

Government Accountability Office. (September 2003) U.S. Public Diplomacy: State Department Expands Efforts but Still Faces Significant Challenges. Available at http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03951.pdf. (Accessed December 6, 2008).

Hirsh, Michael. (November 2004) Bernard Lewis Revisited. Washington Monthly. Available at http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2004/0411.hirsh.html. (Accessed June 28, 2007).

Hoffman, David. (2002) Beyond Public Diplomacy: Weapons of Mass Communication. *Foreign Affairs*, 81 (2) March/April: 83–95.

Holt, Robert T., and R. W. Van de Velde. (1960) *Strategic Psychological Operations and American Foreign Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kennedy, Liam, and Scott Lucas. (2005) Enduring Freedom: Public Diplomacy and U.S Foreign Policy. *American Quarterly*, 57 (2): 309–333.

Kuntz, Diane B (1997) The Marshall Plan Reconsidered: A Complex of Motives. *Foreign Affairs*, 76 (3), May/June, 162–170.

Leffler, Melvyn P. (1992) *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Lord, Carnes. (1989) The Psychological Dimension in National Strategy. In *Political Warfare and Psychological Operations: Rethinking the U.S. Approach*, edited by Frank R. Barnett, and Carnes Lord. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press.

Lucas, Scott. (1999) *Freedom's War: The American Crusade Against the Soviet Union*. New York: New York University Press.

Maghraoui, Abdeselam M (2006) American Foreign Policy and Islamic Renewal. USIP Special Report No.164. Available at http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr164.html. (Accessed July 26, 2007).

Marquis, Christopher (April 30, 2004) Promoter of U.S. Image Quits for Wall Street Job. *New York Times*, A9.

Mitrovich, Gregory. (2000) *Undermining the Kremlin: America's Strategy to Subvert the Soviet Bloc, 1947–1956*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Murphy, Dan. (January 29, 2004) The GI's Weapon of Choice in Iraq: Dollars. Christian Science Monitor. Available at http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0129/p01s04-woiq.html. (Accessed May 4, 2010).

Osgood, Kenneth. (2006) *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Pew Foundation. (December 4, 2002) What the World Thinks in 2002. The Pew Global Attitudes Project. Available at http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID=165. (Accessed January 29, 2010).

Pew Foundation. (June 2003) Views of a Changing World 2003: War With Iraq Further Divides Global Publics. The Pew Global Attitudes Project. Available at http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID=185. (Accessed January 29, 2010).

Pew Foundation. (March 16, 2004) A Year After the Iraq War: Mistrust of America in Europe Ever Higher, Muslim Anger Persists. The Pew Global Attitudes Project. Available at http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID=206. (Accessed January 29, 2010).

Pew Foundation. (June 23, 2005a) U.S. Image Up Slightly, But Still Negative: American Character Gets Mixed Reviews. The Pew Global Attitudes Project. Available at http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID=247. (Accessed January 29, 2010).

Pew Foundation. (July 14, 2005b) Islamic Extremism: Common Concern for Muslim and Western Publics: Support for Terror Wanes Among Muslim Publics. The Pew Global Attitudes Project. Available at http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID=248. (Accessed November 18, 2005).

Pew Foundation. (2005c) Chapter 7: Global Opinion: The Spread of Anti-Americanism. Trends 2005: The Pew Global Attitudes Project. Available at http://pewglobal.org/commentary/pdf/104.pdf. (Accessed November 18, 2005).

Pew Foundation. (July 24, 2007) A Rising Tide Lifts Mood in the Developing World. The Pew Global Attitudes Project. Available at http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID=257. (Accessed January 29, 2010).

Posen, Barry. (1984) *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain and Germany Between the World Wars.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Starr, Alexandra. (December 17, 2001) Charlotte Beers' Toughest Sell. Business Week Online. Available at http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/01_51/b3762098.htm. (Accessed February 5, 2010).

Telhami, Shibley (2005) 2005 Annual Arab Public Opinion Survey. Available at http://www.sadat.umd.edu/new%20surveys/surveys.htm. (Accessed February 5, 2010).

Tuch, Hans N (1990) *Communicating With the World: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

United Nations. (1973) *Multinational Corporations in World Development.* New York: United Nations Publications.

U.S. Department of State. (2007a) *The United States Information Agency: A Commemoration.* Washington, DC: Department of State. Available at http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/usia/abtusia/commins.pdf. (Accessed June 24, 2007).

U.S. Department of State. (June 2007b) *Strategic Communication and Public Diplomacy Policy Coordinating Center (PCC).* Washington, DC: U.S. National Strategy for Public Diplomacy and Strategic Communication. Available at http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/pdfs/stratcommo_plan_070531.pdf. (Accessed January 29, 2010).

Van de Velde, R.W. (1962) Instruments of Statecraft. *Army* 13 (5): 1–6.

Waldman, Peter. (February 3, 2004) A Historian's Take on Islam Steers U.S. in Terrorist Fight. *Wall Street Journal Online.* Available at http://online.wsj.com/article_email/SB107576070484918411-IBje4Nklah3m5uvZ32GcKiEm4.html. (Accessed July 3, 2007).

Weisman, Steven R (September 28, 2005) Saudi Women Have Message for U.S. Envoy. *New York Times.* Available at http://www.nytimes.com/2005/09/28/international/middleeast/28hughes.html. (Accessed May 4, 2010).

White House. (September 2002) The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2002/index.html. (Accessed December 6, 2008).

White House. (March 2006) The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Available at http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/nss.pdf. (Accessed January 29, 2010).

Wictorowicz, Quintan. (2006) Anatomy of the Salafi Movement. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 29: 207–239.

Protecting Free Elections for Palestinians. (January 27, 2006) Christian Science Monitor.