

**IMPERIAL HUBRIS: WHY THE WEST IS LOSING THE WAR  
ON TERROR<sup>1</sup>**REVIEWED BY MAJOR JEREMY A. BALL<sup>2</sup>

*Instead of facing reality, hubris-soaked U.S. leaders,  
elites, and media, locked behind an impenetrable wall of  
political correctness and moral cowardice, act as naive  
and arrogant cheerleaders for the universal applicability  
of Western values and feckless overseas military  
operations . . . .<sup>3</sup>*

Using provocative language that is both shocking and inflammatory,<sup>4</sup> “Anonymous”<sup>5</sup> presents a tightly reasoned argument that the West, and more specifically the United States, is engaged in a protracted, and likely unsuccessful, global war. Improperly characterized by the trite political slogan, “War on Terror,” this war is more accurately understood as a “worldwide Islamist insurgency.”<sup>6</sup> The figurative head of this

---

<sup>1</sup> ANONYMOUS, *IMPERIAL HUBRIS: WHY THE WEST IS LOSING THE WAR ON TERROR* (2004).

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Army. Written while assigned as a student, 53d Judge Advocate Officer Graduate Course, The Judge Advocate General’s Legal Center and School, U.S. Army, Charlottesville, Virginia.

<sup>3</sup> ANONYMOUS, *supra* note 1, at xv-xvi.

<sup>4</sup> The author acknowledges that his “comments are at times angry and accusatory,” but explains this approach as being reflective of his “profound belief that the lives of my children and grandchildren are at risk because most of my generation has willfully failed to understand and confront the threat America faces from bin Laden and his Islamist allies.” *Id.* at xx.

<sup>5</sup> The author, identified by the publisher only as “Anonymous,” is widely known to be former Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) officer Michael Scheuer. The publisher originally withheld Mr. Scheuer’s true name in compliance with internal CIA regulations. See Jason Vest, *The Secret History of Anonymous*, BOSTON PHOENIX, July 2-8, 2004, at 7, available at [http://www.bostonphoenix.com/boston/news\\_features/other\\_stories/multipage/documents/03949394.asp](http://www.bostonphoenix.com/boston/news_features/other_stories/multipage/documents/03949394.asp). Although Mr. Scheuer gave numerous media interviews following the book’s publication, senior officials within the CIA subsequently ordered Mr. Scheuer to stop granting interviews without written approval. See James Risen, *Agency Curbs War Critic Author*, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 5, 2004, at A12, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/08/05/politics/05author.html>. On 12 November 2004, Mr. Scheuer resigned from the CIA. See *Bin Laden Expert Steps Forward*, CBS NEWS.COM, Nov. 14, 2004, at <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/11/12/60minutes/main65407.shtml>.

<sup>6</sup> ANONYMOUS, *supra* note 1, at 241. The 9/11 Commission acknowledged that the words “terrorism” or “terrorist” fails to identify adequately the enemy. Ultimately, the commission concluded that “[o]ur enemy is twofold: al Qaeda, a stateless network of terrorists that struck us on 9/11; and a radical ideological movement in the Islamic world,

insurgency is Osama bin Laden, whose most significant threat “lies in the coherence and consistency of his ideas, their precise articulation, and the acts of war he takes to implement them.”<sup>7</sup> Applying these conclusions regarding the nature of the conflict, Anonymous makes a compelling argument that the United States has, since September 11th, “waged two failed half-wars and, in doing so, left Afghanistan and Iraq seething with anti-U.S. sentiment, fertile grounds for the expansion of al Qaeda and kindred groups.”<sup>8</sup>

The underlying cause of the West’s failure is “imperial hubris,” a term Anonymous uses to describe the phenomena that causes Americans to “see and interpret people and events outside North America” in a way that “is heavily clouded by arrogance and self-centeredness.”<sup>9</sup> It is this imperial hubris that has caused the United States to see and define bin Laden and al Qaeda as what American’s imagine them to be, rather than what they are. Perhaps the best example of imperial hubris is the assumption that both the Afghani and Iraqi peoples either want, or are able, to be governed by a constitutional democracy.<sup>10</sup> While such may be the case, Anonymous argues strongly that two of the fundamental democratic principles cherished by the West, freedom of religion and the rule of law, are contrary to, or at least conflicting with, mainstream Muslim belief.<sup>11</sup> To make this point, Anonymous states that, “For Muslims, God’s word—as He revealed it in the Koran—and the Prophet’s sayings and traditions (the Sunnah) are meant to guide all aspects of life: personal, familial, societal, political, and international. God makes laws, man does not.”<sup>12</sup> From this conflict, Anonymous draws the conclusion that, “as Americans today confront bin Laden and

---

inspired in part by al Qaeda, which has spawned terrorist groups and violence across the globe.” THE 9/11 COMMISSION REPORT: FINAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TERRORIST ATTACKS UPON THE UNITED STATES 362-63 (2004) [hereinafter 9/11 COMMISSION REPORT]. This definition, unlike the broader articulation by Anonymous, fails to include many of those individuals and groups involved in the now widespread Iraqi insurgency. See Jonathan S. Landay & Warren P. Stroebel, *Outlook: The Growing Insurgency Could Doom U.S. Plans for Iraq, Analysts Say*, PHILA. INQUIRER, Sept. 15, 2004, at 1.

<sup>7</sup> ANONYMOUS, *supra* note 1, at xvii.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 252.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 165.

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., President George W. Bush, Remarks at the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., on Winston Churchill and the War on Terror (Feb. 4, 2004), at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/02/20040204-4.html> [hereinafter President Bush Remarks at the Library of Congress].

<sup>11</sup> ANONYMOUS, *supra* note 1, at 2.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

militant Islam, they must recognize that the solution to this conflict can never be a painless, quick transformation of the Muslim world to a Western-style democratic system.”<sup>13</sup>

The larger significance of *Imperial Hubris*, however, is that it makes clear that the United States has failed to develop a viable national political strategy. Although Anonymous does not cast his criticism in these terms, his ultimate conclusion is that America must choose “between keeping current policies, which will produce an escalating expenditure of American treasure and blood, or devising new policies, which may, over time, reduce the expenditure of both.”<sup>14</sup> The process of arriving at this choice is the essence of developing national strategy. Two of the nation’s leading scholars on national strategy, Gordon A. Craig and Felix Gilbert, have described the concept in the following terms:

Strategy is not merely the art of preparing for the armed conflicts in which a nation may become involved and planning the use of its resources and the deployment of its forces in such a way as to bring a successful issue. It [strategy] is the *rational determination of a nation’s vital interests, the things that are essential to its security, its fundamental purposes in its relations with other nations, and its priorities with respect to goals.* This broader form of strategy should animate and guide the narrower strategy of war planning and war fighting . . . .<sup>15</sup>

The contribution of *Imperial Hubris*, and what makes it essential reading for any American serious about understanding the War on Terror, is that it provides a starting point for fully understanding the enemy in the War on Terror. Armed with this knowledge, which has been largely lacking since September 11th, all Americans, but especially policy makers, are in a much better position to formulate a viable national strategy.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 205.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 253.

<sup>15</sup> Gordon A. Craig & Felix Gilbert, *Reflections on Strategy in the Present and Future, in MAKERS OF MODERN STRATEGY FROM MACHIAVELLI TO THE NUCLEAR AGE* 863, 869 (Peter Paret ed., 1986) (emphasis added).

*Identifying the Enemy*

Anonymous's most powerful arguments are found in his identification and analysis of the enemy. In this regard, Anonymous builds upon his previous work, *Through Our Enemies' Eyes*.<sup>16</sup> In contrast to the amorphous concept of waging a war against terrorists, as articulated by President George W. Bush,<sup>17</sup> Anonymous concludes:

The threat facing America is the defensive jihad, an Islamic military reaction triggered by an attack by non-Muslims on the Islamic faith, on Muslims, on Muslim territory, or on all three. In this scenario, it is doctrinally incumbent on each Muslim—as an unavoidable personal

---

<sup>16</sup> ANONYMOUS, *THROUGH OUR ENEMIES' EYES* (2002)); see also Benjamin Schwarz, *Imperial Hubris: Why the West Is Losing the War on Terror*, ATLANTIC MONTHLY, Aug. 10, 2004, at 123.

<sup>17</sup> On numerous occasions, President Bush has offered various descriptions of the enemy in the War on Terror. For example,

Any person involved in committing or planning terrorist attacks against the American people becomes an enemy of this country, and a target of American justice. Any person, organization, or government that supports, protects, or harbors terrorists is complicit in the murder of the innocent, and equally guilty of terrorist crimes. Any outlaw regime that has ties to terrorist groups and seeks or possesses weapons of mass destruction is a grave danger to the civilized world - and will be confronted.

President George W. Bush, Remarks from the USS Abraham Lincoln at Sea off the Coast of San Diego, California (May 1, 2003), at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/05/iraq/20030501-15.html>. Additionally, President Bush has remarked,

Events during the past two years have set before us the clearest of divides: between those who seek order, and those who spread chaos; between those who work for peaceful change, and those who adopt the methods of gangsters; between those who honor the rights of man, and those who deliberately take the lives of men and women and children without mercy or shame.

President George W. Bush, Address to the United Nations General Assembly (Sept. 23, 2003), at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/09/20030923-4.html>. Further, “[t]oday, we are engaged in a different struggle. Instead of an armed empire, we face stateless networks. Instead of massed armies, we face deadly technologies that must be kept out of the hands of terrorists and outlaw regimes.” President Bush Remarks at the Library of Congress, *supra* note 10.

responsibility—to contribute to the fight against the attacker [the United States] to the best of his ability.<sup>18</sup>

At the forefront of this defensive jihad is Osama bin Laden, whose “genius,” according to Anonymous, has been his ability to “construct[] and articulat[e] a consistent, convincing case that an attack on Islam is under way and is being led and directed by America.”<sup>19</sup> The enemy, therefore, is not a discrete group of radical ideologues; rather, they are a politically diverse group motivated by a common religious calling to resist the effects of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East.

Anonymous convincingly argues that al Qaeda is not a band of religious zealots who perform acts of terror for their own sake. To the contrary, bin Laden has repeatedly articulated six policy goals of al Qaeda that resonate throughout the Muslim world: (1) “the end of all U.S. aid to Israel, the elimination of the Jewish state, and . . . the creation of an Islamic Palestinian state;” (2) “the withdrawal of all U.S. and Western military forces from the Arabian Peninsula;” (3) “the end of all of U.S. involvement in Afghanistan and Iraq;” (4) “the end of U.S. support for, and acquiescence in, the oppression of Muslims by the Chinese, Russian, Indian, and other governments;” (5) the “restoration of full Muslim control over the Islamic world’s energy resources;” and (6) “the replacement of U.S.-protected Muslim regimes that do not govern according to Islam by regimes that do.”<sup>20</sup> Just as the ubiquitous phrase War on Terror fails to identify the enemy, it necessarily fails to identify the enemy’s political objectives. By expressly identifying al Qaeda’s objectives, Anonymous takes us one step closer to being able to properly debate national strategy.

Within this debate, the importance of identifying the enemy cannot be overstated. Perhaps the most well known axiom about knowing one’s enemy comes from *The Art of War*, by Sun Tzu:

Know the enemy and know yourself; in a hundred battles you will never be in peril. When you are ignorant of the enemy but know yourself, your chances of winning or losing are equal. If ignorant both of your

---

<sup>18</sup> ANONYMOUS, *supra* note 1, at 7.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at 7-8.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at 210.

enemy and yourself, you are certain in every battle to be in peril.<sup>21</sup>

In the words of Anonymous, “[w]e face a foe more dangerous than a traditional nation-state because it has a nation-state’s goals and resources, draws manpower from a 1.3 billion-person pool, has no fixed address to attack, and fights for a cause in which death while killing enemies earns paradise.”<sup>22</sup> Applying the principal stated by Sun Tzu to the facts about al Qaeda supplied by Anonymous, one might logically conclude that the United States, having failed to define, much less “know,” the enemy before invading Afghanistan and Iraq, may be in peril of losing both conflicts.

#### *Losing the War on Terror?*

Arguing that the West is losing the war necessarily requires some common understanding of what it means to either win or lose. Unfortunately, Anonymous fails to provide a working definition by which to assess either the West or al Qaeda. His failure, however, does not warrant much criticism. As demonstrated so tragically by the Vietnam War,<sup>23</sup> assessing victory requires a clear articulation of the objectives of the conflict. In the case of the War on Terror, there is no such clarity, at least with regard to the objectives of the West. Although one might conclude, as did the 9/11 Commission, that the goal of the War on Terror is the “elimination of terrorism as a threat to our way of life,”<sup>24</sup> that assumption is belied by statements of the Bush administration that would seem to extend the goals of the war to spreading democracy throughout the Middle East.<sup>25</sup> Anonymous, lacking any defined standard

---

<sup>21</sup> SUN TZU, *THE ART OF WAR* 84 (Samuel B. Griffith trans., Oxford Univ. Press 1971) (1963).

<sup>22</sup> ANONYMOUS, *supra* note 1, at 246.

<sup>23</sup> *See generally* GEORGE C. HERRING, *AMERICA’S LONGEST WAR: THE UNITED STATES AND VIETNAM, 1950-1975*, at 280 (2d ed. 1986) (concluding that the U.S. failure in Vietnam derived from a policy [global containment] “flawed in its premises” and demonstrated “the limits of national power in an age of international diversity and nuclear weaponry”).

<sup>24</sup> 9/11 COMMISSION REPORT, *supra* note 6, at 334.

<sup>25</sup> President Bush Remarks at the Library of Congress, *supra* note 10. The President said:

The tradition of liberty has advocates in every culture and in every religion. Our great challenges support the momentum of freedom in

for assessing victory, and lacking the information necessary to engage in a holistic assessment of the war, resorts to a blow-by-blow chronology of every significant event between 2001 and the time of the book's conclusion.<sup>26</sup> While impressive in its thoroughness, this chronology sheds little light on the question of which side may be winning or losing. Anonymous eventually concludes that "the war on terrorism has failed to defeat the main enemy, lost focus on national interests in favor of a Quixotic attempt to democratize and secularize Islam, and is generating enemies and animosities faster than we can kill or quell them."<sup>27</sup> This conclusion, while probably premature, serves the larger purpose of

---

the greater Middle East. . . . We seek the advance of democracy for the most practical of reasons: because democracies do not support terrorists or threaten the world with weapons of mass murder. America is pursuing a forward strategy of freedom in the Middle East.

*Id.* As demonstrated by the following quote from Anonymous, his opinion on the exportation of American Democracy is fundamentally different from that of the Bush administration; a difference that likely explains why his criticism of official policy decisions is so sharp:

As a people, Americans have a heritage to be proud of and one that is worth defending with their children's lives. It is not, however, a heritage whose experiences, heroes, wars, scandals, sacrifices, victories, mistakes, and villains can be condensed, loaded on a CD-ROM, and given to non-Americans with an expectation that they will quickly, and at little expense, become just like us. This is a debilitating fantasy of how the rest of the world and its peoples live and work. Far worse, it shows a profound ignorance of America, one that mocks those who fought and died resisting tyrannical monarchies and churches, secession, foreign rule, slavery, segregation, discrimination, the union of church and state, and a thousand other issues for which blood was shed to fuel the incremental but still incomplete perfecting of American democracy.

ANONYMOUS, *supra* note 1, at 205.

<sup>26</sup> See ANONYMOUS, *supra* note 1, at 86-102.

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* at 215. The managing editor of *Strategic Insights*, a publication of the Center for Contemporary Conflict at the Naval Postgraduate School, criticizes Anonymous for glossing over the fact that al Qaeda has failed to achieve its own political objectives. James H. Joyner, Jr., *Book Review: Anonymous, Imperial Hubris: Why the West is Losing the War on Terror*, STRATEGIC INSIGHTS, Sept. 2004, at <http://www.ccc.nps.navy.mil/si/2004/sep/joynerSept04.asp>. This criticism, however, is largely misplaced. Because each party to a military conflict must define its own political objectives, it is possible that war may result in no winner. The fact that al Qaeda may also be losing in terms of its own political objectives is of little solace if the United States fails to achieve its own goals.

shocking the reader into the dire need for debating national policy, something Anonymous recommends at the conclusion of the book.<sup>28</sup>

Specifically addressing the conflict in Afghanistan, Anonymous argues that the United States is losing because of a widespread failure to take account of those facts that should have been readily apparent to policy makers and military leaders alike.<sup>29</sup> He refers to these facts as “checkables.” In his view, “the list of ‘checkables’ was immense, the cadre of qualified checkers was large, and yet tragically—for Americans as well as Afghans—almost no checking seems to have been done.”<sup>30</sup> Examining in detail the many “checkables,” Anonymous arrives at seven propositions, which he dubs the “Seven Pillars of Truth about Afghanistan.”<sup>31</sup> Explained in detail in the text, the seven pillars are entitled: (1) Minorities Can Rule in Kabul, but Not for Long; (2) the Afghans Who Matter are Muslim Tribal Xenophobes; (3) Afghans Cannot Be Bought; (4) Strong Governments in Kabul Cause War; (5) An International Cockpit Not Insular Backwater; (6) Pakistan Must Have an Islamist, Pashtun-dominated Afghan Regime; and (7) There Will Be an Islamist Regime in Kabul.<sup>32</sup> Each of these “Pillars of Truth” contains a factual proposition that policy makers should have understood before invading Afghanistan. Looking back at the invasion of Afghanistan, Anonymous concludes that U.S. leaders ignored all seven, thereby ensuring disaster, if not total failure.<sup>33</sup>

Anonymous’s criticism of the war in Afghanistan pales in comparison to the criticism he levies at the war in Iraq, which he describes as “an avaricious, premeditated, unprovoked war against a foe who posed no immediate threat but whose defeat did offer economic advantages.”<sup>34</sup> Anonymous asserts that nothing could have been more beneficial to the cause of Al Qaeda and to bin Laden, who detested the secularized, corrupt, tyranny of Saddam Hussein, than the U.S. led-invasion of Iraq. By invading Iraq, the United States validated bin Laden’s most compelling grievances against the West.<sup>35</sup> Through the use

---

<sup>28</sup> See ANONYMOUS, *supra* note 1, at 252.

<sup>29</sup> See *id.* at 29.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*

<sup>31</sup> *Id.* at 47-58.

<sup>32</sup> See *id.*

<sup>33</sup> See *id.*

<sup>34</sup> *Id.* at xvii.

<sup>35</sup> See *infra* note 20 and accompanying text (listing Bin Laden’s grievances against the United States as reflected in al Qaeda’s political objectives). In Anonymous’s opinion,



of clear, logical, fact-based analysis, Anonymous demonstrates that there could not have been a more misguided and counterproductive step in the War on Terror.<sup>36</sup> In his view, “[t]he invasion of Iraq and the subsequent insurgency there is icing on the cake for al Qaeda.”<sup>37</sup>

### *Analysis*

For all the intelligence and insight that Anonymous brings to the table, his harshly critical tone and seemingly universal contempt for senior leaders and policy makers, both political and military, dampens the credibility of his arguments.<sup>38</sup> Absent this unnecessary approach, which will likely offend many readers who possess an unconditional trust in the good faith and competence of government leaders, *Imperial Hubris* would be a shining example of fact-based critical analysis, at least with regard to his assessment of the enemy. Anonymous, likely knowing that his conclusions would create controversy, carefully documents nearly every factual assertion. Unfortunately, he extends his factual analysis into the realm of policy, opening himself to meritorious criticism in areas in which he lacks expertise.

Anonymous’s most significant policy-based error lies in his failure to see the link between national strategy and foreign policy—U.S. national strategy must be consistent with the goals of our allies and supported by the international community. This point, although partially acknowledged by the 9/11 Commission,<sup>39</sup> has been largely lost in the

---

the consequence of the invasion of Iraq was that “All Muslims would see each day on television that the United States was occupying a Muslim country, insisting that man-made laws replace God’s revealed word, stealing Iraqi oil, and paving the way for the creation of a ‘Greater Israel.’” *Id.* at 213.

<sup>36</sup> See *id.* at 212-14.

<sup>37</sup> *Id.* at 134.

<sup>38</sup> One example of this criticism regards the senior leaders of the military, whom Anonymous criticizes in the following language, “Beyond lieutenant colonel, however, things look iffy, and at the rank of brigadier general and above we find a disaster manned by senior officers, mostly men, who tuck as needed to protect their careers and their institutions insiders’ club . . . .” *Id.* at 177. As to both political and military leaders, Anonymous says, “only a dunce or a man ready to be silent to protect his career could have failed to know the U.S.-led occupation of Iraq would create a ‘mujahideen magnet’ more powerful than Moscow created in Afghanistan.” *Id.* at 182.

<sup>39</sup> See 9/11 COMMISSION REPORT, *supra* note 6, at 379. (“The United States should engage other nations in developing a comprehensive coalition strategy against Islamist terrorism.”).

Bush administration's reliance upon unilateralism.<sup>40</sup> The result has been a failure to understand the threat to our national security, not only that posed by terrorist attacks, but perhaps more significantly, the reaction of Muslims to the lengthening U.S. occupation of Iraq. In spite of the obvious international character of al Qaeda's policy goals, Anonymous mistakenly downplays the importance of international politics, claiming that "coalition-building delays action, ties our policy and goals to those of tyrants, and limits options, all of which undercut the optimal protection of our national security."<sup>41</sup>

Although not stated explicitly, one might conclude that Anonymous's purpose in presenting such a blistering critique of the United States' political and military actions is to incite Americans into a debate about the merits of the War on Terror.<sup>42</sup> He seeks not a debate like the one that has been ongoing since September 11th, characterized primarily by a cacophony of rhetoric; rather, he encourages an honest debate about U.S. foreign policy, the national strategy necessary to achieve that policy, and the continuing use of military force around the globe.<sup>43</sup> Underlying this debate must rest the facts that Anonymous establishes so persuasively throughout the book, namely that: "[w]e are at war with an al Qaeda-led worldwide Islamist insurgency because of and to defend [U.S.] policies, and not, as President Bush mistakenly has said, 'to defend freedom and all that is good and just in the world;'"<sup>44</sup> that the Islamist insurgency is engaged in a defensive jihad, both required by and rewarded by Allah; and that adherence to our current foreign policy will make large scale global military action the only option.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> See Walter Cronkite, *The Unilateral President*, DENV. POST, Nov. 23, 2003, available at [http://www.independent-media.tv/itemprint.cfm?f,edoa\\_od=3955&fcategory\\_desc=Under%20Reported](http://www.independent-media.tv/itemprint.cfm?f,edoa_od=3955&fcategory_desc=Under%20Reported) ("For almost three years now, the world has . . . seen global leadership abandoned and replaced with what now is known as American unilateralism - the Bush administration's disdain for international agreements and sometimes for diplomacy itself.").

<sup>41</sup> ANONYMOUS, *supra* note 1, at 223.

<sup>42</sup> See Michael Scheuer, *Imperial Hubris: An Author Reviews the Reviews of His Book* (Feb. 7, 2005), at <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig6/scheuer1.html> ("So far, I have failed in terms of what I intended to do. I have failed to stir any sort of substantive debate, and the nationalist, America first - not America alone - content of my argument has gone virtually unnoticed.").

<sup>43</sup> See *id.* at 252.

<sup>44</sup> *Id.* at 240-41.

<sup>45</sup> See *id.* at 242.

Perhaps most importantly, the United States must stop characterizing the enemy, including Osama bin Laden, as mere terrorists.<sup>46</sup>

Anonymous attempts to tackle the debate on his own by proposing a number of guidelines for discussion.<sup>47</sup> Although he is, by his own admission, inexperienced and unqualified in the art of developing foreign policy,<sup>48</sup> Anonymous nonetheless offers his own policy suggestions within the context of these guidelines. As he sees it, “[w]e can either reaffirm current policies, thereby denying their role in creating the hatred bin Laden personifies, or we can examine and debate the reality we face, the threat we must defeat, and then—if deemed necessary—devise policies that better serve U.S. interests.”<sup>49</sup> Whether or not one agrees with Anonymous’s specific policy suggestions, the value of this portion of his work lies in the message itself—if the United States is to be successful in the War on Terror, a debate over the critical issues that will drive our national strategy must occur.

In the article, *Reflections on Strategy in the Present and Future*, authors Gordon Craig and Felix Gilbert identify the following common elements in a successful national strategy:

complete rationality in formulation and, in their implementation, a realistic appraisal of the international context in which they were to be pursued, an accurate view of the capabilities and proclivities of potential opponents, . . . and a determination that the use of force should end with the attainment of the political objective.<sup>50</sup>

*Imperial Hubris* highlights not only the U.S.’s failure to satisfy the elements provided by Craig and Gilbert, but provides an invaluable understanding of our enemy that is essential to putting the United States back on the right track.

In a speech before the United Nations Security Council, a speaker once put forth the following appeal to the nations of the world:

---

<sup>46</sup> See *id.* at 246.

<sup>47</sup> See *id.* at 238-59.

<sup>48</sup> See *id.* at 239.

<sup>49</sup> *Id.* at 253.

<sup>50</sup> Craig & Gilbert, *supra* note 15, at 871.

We call on this body to declare war on international terror, to outlaw it and eradicate it wherever it may be. We call on this body, and above all we call on the Member States and countries of the world, to unite in a common effort to place these criminals outside the pale of human society, and with them to place any country which co-operates in any way in their nefarious activities

. . . .<sup>51</sup>

These words were not spoken by President Bush in the days following September 11, 2001. They were spoken by Chaim Herzog, then-Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations, following the dramatic rescue of Israeli hostages from terrorists in Entebbe, Uganda, in 1976. Just as Israel has done for the past twenty-eight years, it is now time for America to engage in an honest debate over our own national interests and how best to combat terrorism within the context of those interests. This debate must occur if the United States is ever to develop a successful national strategy that will truly make the world safe from terrorism.

---

<sup>51</sup> CHAIM HERZOG, *THE ARAB-ISRAELI WARS: WAR AND PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST* 336 (1984) (internal quotations omitted).