

Research Article¹

The Events of 11.09.2001 in the Balance of International Justice Between Security Options and the "Green Peril" Thesis

Ben Daoud Abdelkader–

PhD Student, Assistant Professor (Class A)

Faculty of Law and Political Science

Mohamed Ben Ahmed University – Oran 2 – Algeria

Bendaoud-aek@yahoo.fr

Professor :L arbi Chaht Abdelkader

(Academic Supervisor), Faculty of Law and Political Science

Mohamed Ben Ahmed University – Oran 2 – Algeria

aeklarbichaht@yahoo.fr

Abstract:

This study examines the events of September 11, 2001, from the perspective of international justice and their implications for the evolution of the international legal order. It critically analyzes the security approaches adopted in the aftermath of the attacks, particularly the so-called “Green Peril” thesis, and explores how the discourse on terrorism and counter-terrorism contributed to the expansion of preventive warfare and the use of force in international relations. The study focuses on the legal and political consequences of the United States’ military interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, with particular attention to the interpretation of the inherent right of self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and the role of Security Council Resolutions 1368 and 1373. It further addresses the perceived decline of the United Nations’ role in maintaining international peace and security, the erosion of international humanitarian law, and the application of double standards in international responsibility and the protection of human rights. The study also discusses the emergence of a new international order characterized by unipolarity, hegemonic practices, and the growing tension between security policies and the principles of international legitimacy. Ultimately, it argues for strengthening international justice, ensuring equal application of international law, and establishing effective mechanisms for accountability for serious violations of international humanitarian law.

Keywords: September 11, 2001; International Justice; International Law; Terrorism; Counter-Terrorism; Self-Defense; United Nations; Preventive War; International Humanitarian Law; Human Rights; Unipolarity; International Responsibility.

Received: 20/04/2026; Accepted: 02/09/2026; Published: 08/10/2026¹

© 2026 The Author. Published by AVADA-CROMA. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, adaptation, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original author and source are properly credited.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

INTRODUCTION

During the Cold War, the Western world knew a rivalry between an East represented by the Soviet Union, East Germany and the former Warsaw Pact states on one side, and a West represented by the United States and the NATO states on the other — a rivalry known as the "Red Peril," red being the color and symbol of communism, in reference to the communist tide and the spread of socialist internationalism. After the end of the Cold War and the rise of new Western strategic schools theorizing globalization and unipolarity — such as Samuel Huntington, author of the "Clash of Civilizations" thesis, and Francis Fukuyama, author of "The End of History and the Last Man" — and after currents of thought promoting hegemony in international relations under United States leadership emerged, a new thesis appeared: the "Green Peril," green being the color and symbol of Islam in Western theorizing, referring to the Islamic tide and the emergence of Islamic nuclear powers such as Pakistan, Iran and Iraq in the Middle East. After the defeat of communism, Islam became "the new enemy," and terrorism came to be understood, under various labels — radical Islam, political Islam, Islamic internationalism and others — as essentially meaning Islam. This new current has its theorists, such as the Americans Judith Miller and Leon T. Hadar, and the Japanese-American professor Francis Fukuyama, an architect of political planning at the US State Department and the National Security Council and a member of President George W. Bush's White House advisory council. When Fukuyama wrote his 1992 book "The End of History and the Last Man," he described Islamic fundamentalism as bearing only a superficial resemblance to European fascism, and judged that its challenge to the West and to Western liberal-democratic ideology would not be strong. Then in 1999 he revised his theory in an article published in the American magazine *Newsweek*, in which he affirmed the Green Peril, saying that Islamic fascism was more dangerous to the West than communism had been.

Consequently, since this has been the dominant idea in the West over the past decade or so, every act of extremism or terrorism has from the outset been attributed to Arabs, Muslims, and Islam as the first suspect — as happened with the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing in America, where the perpetrators were American, yet the finger of accusation began, from the very first moments, to point toward the Islamic world and Muslims. Within this logic emerged the idea of "counter-terrorism," then the idea of "preventive war" — striking a suspect belonging to the elements of the Green Peril before his guilt is proven — reversing the first universal principle ("a person is presumed innocent until proven guilty") into: "a person is presumed guilty until proven innocent, especially if he is a Muslim." Thus, under the Green Peril thesis, the Islamic world became the sole accused and suspect in the "export of terrorism to the West," and the events of 11.09.2001 are the greatest witness to contemporary international power politics; the world, under unipolarity, no longer thinks according to the logic of the Magna Carta.

Indeed, after the events of 11.09.2001, the United States went beyond the 1974 concept of aggression, defined in Article 2 of the draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind as: "any act of aggression, including the use by a state's authorities of armed force against another state for purposes other than legitimate national or collective self-defense, or in implementation of a decision or recommendation of a competent United Nations body." America portrayed to world public opinion the attacks on the World Trade Center as though they were an assault carried out by a state, even though the perpetrators had acted from within American territory as individuals, not as regular soldiers belonging to any state. International legitimacy therefore

required gathering evidence and presenting it to the state in which the planners or instigators were located — such as the suspect Osama bin Laden. Had there been legally valid evidence and indications against him, it should have been communicated to Afghanistan through diplomatic channels, or through the mediation of Pakistan, which had diplomatic relations with the Taliban government. The Afghan government thus had to choose the most diplomatically appropriate of three options:

- 1) Hand Osama bin Laden over to America to be tried under its domestic law, on the grounds that the attacks of 11.09.2001 took place on its territory and its domestic courts therefore had specific jurisdiction;
- 2) Or try him in Afghanistan and avoid extradition, on the grounds that there were no diplomatic relations between the two parties and no extradition treaty between Afghanistan and the United States;
- 3) Or hand him over to the International Criminal Court in the Netherlands, since it has specific jurisdiction under the Rome Statute to try individuals accused of crimes against humanity.

What happened, however, is that America insisted it possessed conclusive evidence against Osama bin Laden beyond any doubt, while Afghanistan asked to be informed of that evidence, which America did not provide. Afghanistan therefore refused to hand over bin Laden, since the causal link between him and the 11.09.2001 bombings had not been established, no evidence of his guilt having been submitted to it.

The United Nations Security Council took two resolutions on the matter: Resolution 1368 (2001), adopted at its 4370th meeting held on 12/09/2001, calling on all states to work together urgently to bring the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these terrorist attacks to justice, stressing that those responsible for aiding, supporting or harboring the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these acts will be held accountable, and expressing its readiness to take all necessary steps to respond to the terrorist attacks of 11.09.2001 and to combat terrorism in all its forms, in accordance with its responsibilities under the UN Charter.

The Security Council then issued its second resolution, No. 1373 (2001), at its 4385th meeting held on 28.09.2001, reaffirming the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense as recognized in the UN Charter and as reaffirmed in Resolution 1368 (2001), and stressing the need to strengthen coordinated efforts at the national, sub-regional, regional and international levels in order to reinforce a global response to this serious challenge and threat to international security.

The United States regarded these two resolutions, 1368 and 1373, as a green light to wage a preventive war on Afghanistan without Security Council approval, on the pretext of America's right of self-defense — itself derived from a supposed "right of retortion" — whereas the concept of the right of self-defense in legal doctrine and international law is specific and restricted under Article 51 of the UN Charter, adopted in San Francisco on 26/06/1945: Article 51 restricts the principle of self-defense strictly to cases where a state has been subjected to an armed attack or aggression by another state — a condition that did not exist with respect to Afghanistan regarding the events of 11.09.2001 specifically. Moreover, resorting to force to settle international disputes or to extradite criminals is itself, in the international sense, terrorism and extremism, because it violates the UN Charter and the provisions and principles of humanitarian law, and is a flagrant breach of the law of war.

And if we wished to adhere to international legitimacy, we would find that Security Council Resolution 1373 of 28/09/2001 contradicts General Assembly Resolution 2625 of 24/10/1970, even though it is cited as one of its bases: Resolution 2625 called on all states to refrain from the use or threat of force against any other state, and called on all states to refrain from organizing, assisting or participating in any terrorist act intended to coerce another state for political purposes or any specific advantage — a call that includes refraining from any assistance that might support a terrorist act — and called for refraining from the use of force to deprive peoples of their national identity and to prevent them from exercising their right to self-determination.

Yet Resolution 2625, issued in 1970, was issued against a particular global strategic backdrop based on the "balance of terror," or as Pierre Hassner's famous formula puts it, "the terror of balance," since international politics was then divided between a communist East led by the Soviet Union and a capitalist West led by America — and the rights and freedoms of individuals and states were then weighed on scales more just than those of today, under the unipolarity that has produced the globalization of terrorism and the terrorism of globalization.

Consequently, under the cover of fighting political Islam, radical Islam, or Islamic extremism, and under the banner of combating the Green Peril, an international campaign of terror and extremism is being waged in violation of international law and of Islam, Christianity, and even the Jewish law as originally revealed — in what has come to be called preventive war, white terrorism, or counter-terrorism, i.e., fighting terrorism with terrorism. Yet in the end the victims are innocent peoples, and the result is war crimes against humanity by every measure, beginning with the war against Afghanistan and then the war against Iraq, which ended in the "Kelly-gate" scandal and the revelation that intelligence reports about weapons of mass destruction in Iraq had been false — American, British and innocent Iraqi soldiers died on the basis of an international political lie that was merely one episode in a propaganda and psychological war within the ongoing campaign against the Green Peril. This left the Islamic world at a crossroads amid contemporary international power politics, and led to a decline in the United Nations' role in preserving international peace and the rights and freedoms of the international community through the peaceful settlement of disputes. Just as the League of Nations (1919–1939) ended with the outbreak of the Second World War, the end of the United Nations has become clearly visible on the horizon, ever since the declared war on terrorism became a goal justifying all means — even illegitimate ones — for encroaching on individuals and states; even individuals have not been spared violations of their freedoms and rights in the name of fighting terrorism, as happened with the Algerian pilot Raissi, who was first acquitted by British justice and later found innocent by American justice as well.

THE WORLD AFTER 2001.09.11

Globalization after 11/09/2001 took on a final American character, presenting the world with security options premised on the notion that resorting to force is a means of making the world safer, and that declaring war is in fact a means of preserving peace — concepts turned upside down, contrary to all international conventions on war, the treatment of prisoners, the principles of natural law, and the rules of justice.

Some 700 detainees are held administratively at the Guantánamo Bay base in Cuba without formal charge and without either ordinary or special trial, among them at least three children aged between 13 and 15, according to statements by the Director-General of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Angelo Gnaedinger — a flagrant violation of the principles of international justice, particularly the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, ratified by the UN

General Assembly at its 61st session on 20/11/1989 and signed by 191 states, with only two states — the United States and the Republic of Somalia — still withholding their signature to this day, as well as a violation of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, dated 25/05/2000. Despite these international conventions, the White House still refuses to classify the Guantánamo detainees as "prisoners of war," so as to evade the three Geneva Conventions on prisoners of war (1906, 1929, 1949) and the various international human-rights instruments. Humanitarian law has, since 2001.09.11, come under a campaign of erosion, as violence has increasingly been met with violence, and injustice has bred greater injustice and greater corruption. As Irene Khan, then Secretary-General of Amnesty International, put it on the organization's website: "Governments have no right to respond to terrorism with terrorism." Even setting aside the situation of the Guantánamo detainees, the base itself stands as evidence of the United States' practice of state terrorism, as the human-rights expert at the French delegation to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Thierry Meyssan, president of the Voltaire Network website, has stated: Guantánamo was granted to the United States for 99 years by Cuba, which had gained its independence following the end of the Spanish-American War; Fidel Castro did not renew the lease upon its expiry, yet the United States did not withdraw from Guantánamo and continues to occupy it illegally to this day; under international law, Cuban law applies on the base's territory, even though the Cuban government cannot exercise its authority there. In this way America has even evaded applying the guarantees of American law to detainees at the occupied Cuban base, on the grounds that American law does not apply on the base's territory — with the result that Guantánamo is a base of lawlessness, occupied without law. All this in a world that promised a spring of rights and freedoms on the threshold of the twenty-first century — a century that began, as wars and conflicts had begun before it, with 1989, the year the Cold War ended with the fall of the Berlin Wall, marking the end of the twentieth century, followed by a transitional period of tension extending to 11/09/2001, which was the true, earlier starting date of the twenty-first century. Contrary to Fukuyama's thesis, the world did not witness the end of history — rather, the world witnessed the beginning of a history.

THE DECLINE OF THE UNITED NATIONS' ROLE AND THE BEGINNING OF THE COLLAPSE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Everyone knows that, under UN-imposed controls, Libya was forced to compensate the victims of the Lockerbie plane from its oil revenues, and Iraq was forced to sell its oil products and pay full compensation for its 1990 invasion of Kuwait, without regard for any legal safeguards or fair settlement mechanisms — while America did not pay a single dollar for its war on Vietnam over a full decade (1964–1975), and refused to pay the compensation ordered by the International Court of Justice as a penalty for the war it waged, through the "Contras," against Sandinista Nicaragua (1981–1990), in which it intervened with naval forces, and in which the CIA ran the operation of landing anti-revolutionary exiles and planting mines against revolutionary forces.

The American Jewish intellectual Noam Chomsky, a critic of American policy and of Zionist terrorism, said in an interview with David Barsamian: "Nicaragua suffered a violent American attack in the 1980s, tens of thousands died as a result, the country was largely destroyed and may never fully recover, and its tragedies are far worse than the tragedies that struck New York that day — September 11th. But the Nicaraguans did not set off bombs in Washington; instead they went to the International Court, which ruled in their favor, condemning the United States for what that court called 'an unlawful use of force' — meaning, international terrorism — and ordered the United States to cease its actions and to pay Nicaragua substantial reparations. The United States, however,

rejected the Court's ruling with contempt, so Nicaragua then went to the Security Council, which adopted a draft resolution calling on the United States to respect international law, but the United States exercised its veto; the Nicaraguans then went to the UN General Assembly, where they obtained a similar resolution adopted by near-unanimity, with only the United States and Israel opposed... The United States is the only country that has been condemned by the International Court and has rejected a Security Council resolution calling for respect for international law, and the United States continues to practice international terrorism — and that is the least of what it does... The United States is officially committed to what is called 'low-intensity warfare' — this is official doctrine. If you read the definition of this term in military manuals and compare it with the United States' own definition of terrorism, you find that the two definitions almost coincide: terrorism is the use of coercive means directed at civilian populations in pursuit of political, religious or other objectives — which applies to the September 11 bombings of the World Trade Center, but is also official American doctrine." He went on to say: "Terrorism, quite simply, is part of what this country, America, does." Thus, although the Nicaraguans did not respond to the violence of aggression with the violence of resistance — a legitimate right — but instead resorted to international justice, the United States met the ruling of international justice with contempt, as though it had never been issued. It follows that abandoning resistance in favor of recourse to international justice is not always the optimal choice. I have cited here the testimony of an American Jew against American terrorism, in keeping with the Qur'anic principle: "and a witness from her own people testified" — because had this testimony come from someone who was neither Jewish nor American, he would have been prosecuted and tried under France's Fabius law, as happened to the French thinker Roger Garaudy, on a charge of "antisemitism" — a charge that has become a fashionable new device for classifying thought-crimes around the world.

Along the same lines, we see that a new international order was spawned by America's last three wars: the first, waged under NATO's cover, in Kosovo; the second against Afghanistan after the events of 2001.09.11; and the third against Iraq in April 2003, on the pretext of disarming weapons of mass destruction and toppling the Iraqi Ba'athist regime. Yet had America's campaign to eliminate weapons of mass destruction been comprehensive — extending to Israel and to inspecting its nuclear reactor at Dimona — one might believe that the world and human rights, after the fall of the Soviet Union, were faring well. Instead, the White House thinks and makes its decisions according to a double standard that distinguishes between "America and the world."

America has never once spoken of compensating Palestinian civilians for the Zionist terrorism it supports through protection, weapons, endorsement and justification, and through the use of its veto in the Security Council on Israel's behalf — a blatant and shameless cover-up of Israel's crimes against humanity and its violation of every international convention.

International law, under the new world order, has ceased to be a protector of human rights and has instead become a protector of the rights of the stronger victor; its first rule has become "woe to the vanquished" — exactly as was the case with the Nuremberg tribunal for trying the criminals of the Second World War, established by the war's victors to try the defeated and to burden them with the guilt of the war and the compensation for its losses — inaugurating a new school of war, persisting between the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, in which war reparations are paid from the money of the victims rather than the money of the aggressors.

Perhaps the most dangerous consequence of 2001.09.11 has been the decline of the United Nations' role in resolving international disputes by peaceful means, marking the beginning of the UN's failure, as was the case earlier with its predecessor, the League of Nations — since wars and acts of

aggression have increasingly been carried out without regard for prior Security Council endorsement, in order to lend legitimacy to the international use of force; indeed matters have deteriorated to the point where Security Council endorsement now arrives after the fact, to ratify illegal wars and acts of aggression already launched by the United States, such as its aggression against Afghanistan and then Iraq — squandering the rights and freedoms of individuals, states, and the international community as a whole.

DOUBLE STANDARDS, OR WHEN THE EXECUTIONER PUTS THE VICTIM ON TRIAL

When Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, Prime Minister of Malaysia from July 1981 to October 2003, published his first three books — *The Malay Dilemma*, then *The Challenge*, then *A New Deal for Asia* — they drew no particular attention. But when he published his fourth book, *Islam and the Islamic Ummah*, in May 2002 — printed in its first Arabic edition by Dar al-Fikr in Damascus — it began to draw the attention of Western circles and strategic-studies centers. And when, at the last Islamic conference, he unveiled the realities of the post-2001.09.11 world by declaring to the world that Jews had come to rule the world by proxy, and that if Europe had killed six million Jews, it was the Islamic world that was now paying the price, his statements caused an uproar; he was accused of antisemitism, and America blocked a billion dollars in aid to his country. Yet the man was being objective: the European Union has sought an agreement to root its history and religion in claims of Jewish origin, and the Hebrew state, founded on a theocratic basis, practices state terrorism without being described as such in official circles. Consequently, the post-2001.09.11 world has come to suffer under an Israeli-American stranglehold that leaves no room for rights or freedoms, and human rights have become a general term with a narrow, particular meaning, as new conceptions of "the human being" emerge that largely exclude the peoples of the Third World, and of the Islamic world in particular, so long as the new enemy is the Islamic world, cast as the Green Peril.

Israel's refusal to allow the return of Palestinians expelled from their homes in 1948, its ongoing destruction of the Palestinian economy over the years, and the Israeli army's closure of Palestinian areas, ought, under international conventions and the principles of humanitarian law, to be met with the same standards applied in favor of the Kuwaiti economy by the UN Compensation Commission, established under Security Council Resolution 692 (1991) — that is, holding Israel responsible for the collapse of the Palestinian economy and the cost of its recovery, in order to move the peace process forward within a framework of protecting rights and preserving freedoms, without first needing to argue over the "roadmap" or any staged plan. The key to peace is putting an end to Israel's acts of aggression and compensating the Palestinians for the resulting damage — yet the Security Council has shown no interest whatsoever in this, as though none of it had ever happened. Security after 2001.09.11 has meant the security of America and Israel, and war for the rest of the world's states, and states that defy the logic of hegemony are classified, in the new international vocabulary, as "rogue states."

With all this, the rules of international responsibility remain deeply shaken, and rights and freedoms remain without genuine protection, owing to these great and dangerous deficiencies in international justice — whether in matters of international criminal responsibility or international civil responsibility — leading to a great regression in international law, since the stronger party, the world's overwhelming power (America), seizes for itself the authority to dispense justice without regard for international law or for justice itself, turning the world from a "global village" into a "global jungle." It is no longer the principle of the "survival of the strongest" alone that reigns, nor the principle of the "survival of the fittest" that ought to prevail, but rather a new principle has

emerged: the "survival of whoever has the capacity to adapt," in a world of unipolarity and comprehensive Americanization, in an age of the violence of globalization and the globalization of violence. Yet no one can be certain that American hegemony will last forever, however overwhelming its power and however weak the rest of the world may be by comparison — for the fall of nations and civilizations is one of history's laws, governed by no precise or inevitable standards. Rome, an empire that endured and dominated the world under unipolarity for a thousand years, eventually fell; the Soviet Union was, by every measure, far stronger than Rome, yet it fell only fifty years after its rise and the ascent of its star. It is no idle saying that no state of affairs endures forever — such is God's way with His creation.

2001.09.11 AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

Staff Brigadier General Elias Hanna holds that the Chinese believe a transition from one global order to another occurs only after a major war: over the past 200 years, there have been four global orders, roughly one every 50 years, producing four systems:

The first: the Vienna system, which followed Napoleon's defeat.

The second: which resulted from internal transformations in Italy, Germany and Japan, and the entry of the United States onto the international stage — a development that upset the previous configuration and reshuffled the balance of power.

The third: which emerged from the Treaty of Versailles after the end of the Second World War.

The fourth: which emerged from the Yalta Conference, based on the principle of distributing spheres of influence among the victorious powers of the war. In light of this view, and owing to what followed from the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s — America's sole ascendancy — the global order changed entirely, after 11/09/2001, in favor of the United States alone. The events of 11/09/2001 came, as the Chinese had predicted, though somewhat differently, as the "war" from which the new order of hegemony emerged — given that, according to experts' estimates, the explosive force of a single [hijacked] aircraft was equivalent to 1/25th of the Hiroshima bomb. This new unipolarity has, in effect, gone through three "editions": the edition of Bush senior, following the second Gulf War of 1990–1991, aimed at establishing a new international order; the edition of Bill Clinton, making the economy the engine of international politics and adopting a policy of containment and entanglement; and finally the edition of Bush junior, who combined defiance with strategy and tactics under the slogan "us and the world." America's features as a state flouting international law appeared in many disastrous actions: the ABM Treaty concluded in 1972 under Nixon and Brezhnev on ballistic missiles, from which America withdrew under Bush junior; America's abandonment, under his presidency, of the Kyoto Protocol limiting carbon-dioxide emissions to protect the ozone layer — thereby declaring a premeditated American war on the environment and deliberate pollution; its rejection of the verification protocol for the Biological Weapons Convention; its refusal to pay its UN dues and its bypassing of the UN as a point of reference in the new preventive wars; and America's withdrawal from the Durban Conference, with no regard for the future of the oppressed in racist states. The list is long, and history alone will keep a full record of it.

By one of the ironies of this age of crises, as I was preparing this lecture for publication, on 14/12/2003, I learned that the American military governor in Iraq, Paul Bremer, announced at a press conference that his forces had captured Saddam Hussein, without resistance, in his birthplace

of Tikrit — disheveled, his beard streaked with white — and that America was committed to bringing him to public trial. Without further comment, the world of the new international order was about to witness, once again, the executioner putting the victim on trial — judge and party in one — one of the most dangerous images of hegemony in this age of the violence of globalization.

2001.09.11 AND THE FINGERPRINTS OF THE "BLUE PERIL"

Since it has become customary to label Islam and Muslims the "Green Peril," I propose to call the Jews and Zionists the "Blue Peril," blue being the color of the Jews. From this standpoint, and despite everything said and written about the perpetrators of the 11/09/2001 attacks — the greatest event of the new century — the fingerprints of the Blue Peril in the events of 11/09/2001 are very large and require no magnifying glass to see, were it not for the media blackout. America detained 60 Israelis and acknowledged that they were "of interest to the government"; an Israeli spy ring, known as the "Art Students Network," was also uncovered in the wake of 11/09/2001, and its members were deported from the United States — whereas had they been of any other nationality, they would have been thrown into the cells of Guantánamo, or eliminated outright.

The "Art Students Network" was a group of young Israeli intelligence operatives who entered America disguised as art students selling cheap paintings. The report "Intelligence Online" published their names, among them Peer Segalowitz, military number 5087989, Aran Ophir — son of an Israeli army general — Yaron Ohana, Ronen Kalfon, Ze'ev Cohen, and Naor Topaz. A detailed report on this network and Israel's involvement in the events of 2001.09.11 was published by Professor Maha Shahba in the weekly magazine *Nisf al-Dunya*, issued by Egypt's Al-Ahram organization, in issue 713, page 23 onward. Unfortunately, however, the battles waged by the "fourth estate" — the Western media and satellite channels — over the Green Peril, and the fear-mongering about the Islamic world, have left international justice color-blind: it sees the Blue Peril and mistakes it for the Green Peril, and views the suffering of nations and peoples through a magnifying lens that makes small things look large and fails to see large things at all — which has prevented the opening of any independent, thorough media or even judicial investigations to establish the facts and background of 2001.09.11, because the charge of antisemitism has become a barrier preventing any further search for a truth that might expose the Israeli-Jewish network and its crimes against humanity, in particular its involvement in the events of 2001.09.11.

In support of this thesis, Lyndon LaRouche, a candidate for the Democratic Party's presidential nomination in the 2004 elections, stated: "No force from outside America ever carried out the September 11 operation. It is possible that individuals from other countries were used in it, but the operation was carried out by forces present inside America, with the aim of an administrative coup within it and dragging it into war. We should not think of intervening in Afghanistan; we should rein in Israel, because it poses a danger to America, and we should establish peace in the Middle East, because the tension in this region is part of a war planned for Asia."

In the same vein, Efraim Halevy, the head of Israel's Mossad, is reported to have exposed his agency's involvement, saying: "How can we turn the world against Arabs and Muslims? We must set the world on fire if we want to keep Israel warm. Since the days of our great teacher David Ben-Gurion, we have tried, without success, to separate the geography of the Middle East from its history — until I hit upon the idea of fragmenting the geography by means of history. That is how we directed our best spies to infiltrate extremist Islamic organizations, presenting ourselves as Iraqi intelligence — and thus, by God's will, Mama America offered up her sacrifice so that our Lord might smooth the way for our next operations. Operation 'Ababil Birds' [flocks of birds] was entirely

clean. The best thing we can do is to terrorize others and clear the way for them toward our objective."

It is, in any case, nothing new for Jews to have carried out terrorist operations against their own sponsor, the United States — history still remembers the "Lavon Affair," which Professor Maha Shahba wrote about in her report published in *Nisf al-Dunya*, issue 713, cited above, and which the British naval officer Donald McCormick recounted in detail in his famous book "The Israeli Secret Service" (he wrote under the pen name Richard Deacon). The book was published in Arabic by the Cultural Library in Beirut under the title "Mossad: The Bloody Jewish Death Machine," first edition, 1995. According to this account, Israel bombed American and British offices in Egypt using letter bombs in 1954, in order to spoil relations between America and Egypt and ensure the continued presence of British forces in the Suez Canal Zone — an operation Israel tried to pin on Gamal Abdel Nasser, until, in 1960, the charge against Israel was confirmed, ending in a diplomatic scandal and the resignation of Israeli Defense Minister Pinhas Lavon in 1955. It emerged that the sabotage plot had been engineered at a high level by Shimon Peres, then Lavon's deputy defense minister, along with Moshe Dayan and Avraham Givli. The scandal was treated by the media with striking casualness: the American Times, in its edition of 29/12/1960, called it "an ill-considered adventure of 1954."

Likewise the strike on the American ship USS Liberty in 1967, which killed 34 people and wounded more than 100 — described as Israeli "friendly fire" by mistake. But the ship's commander and the surviving crew affirmed that the attack was deliberate. Ironically, Israel used American torpedoes and napalm to strike American interests, just as American civilian aircraft were used in the attack of 2001.09.11. Israel's goal in attacking the American ship in 1967 was to implicate the Syrians and Egyptians, had the ship's commander and his crew not survived and had their radio distress signals not succeeded — and a second, more important goal was to draw America into the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, so that the United States would take up the cause of that war. The same scenario, it is claimed, was repeated in the 2023 Gaza war and then in the wars in Yemen and Iran, drawing the United States into war in a way that harmed its treasury, its taxpayers' money, and the image of the United States in the world.

Another striking irony, according to Professor Maha Shahba's report, was the arrest of five Israeli "tourists" eight hours after the attack on New York in the World Trade Center events of 2001, found carrying maps linking them to the site of the explosions — a story reported by the American newspaper *The Bergen Record*, in which a source close to the investigation was quoted as saying that evidence had been found linking these men to the bombings.

Yet the world's media and the investigations obscure and erase the fingerprints of the Blue Peril from the events of 2001.09.11, so that al-Qaeda and bin Laden could serve as the justification America had itself created in 1979, to trouble the Soviet Union in "the great chess game," and used it, beginning at the end of 2001, to justify the start of a never-ending war against "terrorism" — a term on which there has been agreement neither as to its definition nor as to the geographic scope of the war declared against it, despite the international success in defining the crime of aggression in 1974 and again at the ICC Review Conference in 2010; terrorism, however, has remained without a systematically agreed, unified international definition.

Here, we add our voice to that of Professor Mahmoud al-Maraghi, who raised the question: why did the accusations come out of Washington within hours of the collapse of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon building, and why was the decision to go to war taken within days, even though

the investigation had not yet been completed? In any case, the war came, and interest receded in the dangerous question — who did it? — that is, who was truly responsible on that bloody Tuesday (September 11th). Interest in that question faded, and the primary concern became instead: what would the armies of the world's greatest power do to one of the poorest countries on earth, Afghanistan?... and where would the armies go after Afghanistan, after Bush declared it a war extended in both geography and time, with some calling it a "ten-year war"? Even before that, Bush senior had entered the second Gulf War on the pretext of Iraq's occupation of Kuwait; the occupation ended, but the armies remained there, and American strikes continued, for ten years as well. Questions were raised when the decision to go to war was issued on 19/09/2001 — only eight days after the fall of the symbol of globalization and of power, the World Trade Center and the Pentagon building — questions about the objectives and strategy of this war, its subsequent phases, and the place of the Arabs, or of the Middle East, within it.

After all this, it appears that the scope of international protection for the rights and freedoms of states and peoples has receded, as the Security Council has turned into a council of war — a council already marked by inequality among states because of the fatal veto privilege that can kill any just resolution — and the Council's mandate was distorted when, at America's and Britain's instigation, it was expanded to cover the matter of reparations in the case of Iraq, through a compulsory executive mechanism — a compensation fund financed by 30 percent of the revenue from Iraqi oil exports — a novel approach to war reparations. No such measure was ever taken against the United States for its acts of aggression against the sovereignty of Nicaragua in 1981, of Afghanistan in 2001, of Iraq in 2003, or, before that, of Sudan in 1998, when it launched a missile strike against a civilian pharmaceutical factory it believed was manufacturing the "VX nerve agent," only to later discover its own error and that of its intelligence services — yet its act of aggression went unpunished, and its victims uncompensated, even though the Security Council includes a specialized body, the UN Compensation Commission, established under Security Council Resolution 692 (1991) — (S/AC.26).

CONCLUSION

Just as an international tribunal was established to try persons responsible for grave violations of international humanitarian law committed in the territory of the former Yugoslavia — the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, created by Security Council Resolution 808 (1993) —

And just as an international criminal tribunal was established to try persons responsible for grave violations of international humanitarian law committed in the territory of Rwanda, and Rwandan citizens responsible for similar violations committed in the territory of neighboring states — created by Security Council Resolution 955 (1994) —

The Security Council, as is well known, is composed of 15 members: 5 permanent members holding the veto, and 10 members elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms, who rotate the Council's presidency monthly according to the English alphabetical order of their countries' names.

And just as international law provides that when the Security Council takes a measure of prevention or enforcement against a UN member state, the General Assembly may, on the Security Council's recommendation, suspend that state's enjoyment of the rights and privileges of membership — and that, should a member state repeatedly violate the principles of the Charter without exception, the

General Assembly may, on the Security Council's recommendation, expel it from the United Nations —

For all these reasons, the member states of the Security Council ought to work toward expelling the United States from the United Nations, on a Security Council recommendation, and to issue a resolution establishing an international tribunal to try persons responsible for grave violations of international humanitarian law committed in the territory of Afghanistan, Venezuela, Iraq, Gaza and Iran. Should such a resolution be met with a veto and thereby defeated, then self-respecting states ought to declare the end of the United Nations, just as the League of Nations came to an end in 1939, and cease funding a United Nations sustained by pointless contributions drawn from the wealth of their peoples — or else fall in under the banner of the United States, so that the whole world becomes America and America becomes the whole world, with all sovereignties dissolved into it — a global setback at the dawn of the twenty-first century, one that would prove Fukuyama right when he spoke of "the end of history and the last man."

NOTES

[1] This is the thesis put forward by Samuel Huntington, the Albert J. Weatherhead III University Professor at Harvard University, where he serves as Director of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies and chairman of the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies. The title of the article in which he first put forward the "Clash of Civilizations" thesis in 1993, later expanded into the book "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order," was published in English in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 6, November/December 1996. Its central argument is that the deepest source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or economic; rather, culture will be the dominant source of the great divisions and clashes among human beings. Nation-states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal clashes of global politics will emerge between nations and groups belonging to different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics, and the cultural fault lines between civilizations will, at the same time, be the battle lines between them.

[2] The Magna Carta, or "Great Charter," is the declaration of rights issued by the English King John in 1215, considered the oldest constitutional document in English history and regarded by the West as a symbol of civilization and progress, and as the origin of the development of the idea of human rights, which culminated in the issuance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the UN General Assembly on 10/12/1948. King John's charter thus predates even the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 26/08/1789, comprising 30 articles, issued by the French National Assembly during the French Revolution.

[3] The Saudi businessman Abu Abdullah Osama bin Mohammed bin Laden, born in 1957, held an undergraduate degree in business administration from King Abdulaziz University in Jeddah (class of 1979). He joined the ranks of the Afghan mujahideen after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan that same year, then worked with the Palestinian sheikh Abdullah Azzam from 1984 until 1989, the year of the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan. Saudi authorities revoked his citizenship in 1994 and froze his assets over his support for fundamentalist movements and his opposition to the American presence in the Gulf. Intelligence services suspected him in connection with the 1995 attempt to assassinate Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak in Addis Ababa, and in 1998 he became a fugitive from US federal justice, charged with conspiring to attack American military installations and with financing Islamic terrorism through al-Qaeda. Following the World Trade Center bombings in New York, suspicion turned directly to him even before investigations were officially announced; he then

appeared on the Qatari satellite channel Al Jazeera denying responsibility for the bombings the first time, before later appearing, together with the Egyptian Ayman al-Zawahiri and others, claiming responsibility for them. The full truth beyond all doubt has never been established.

[4] Comité international de la Croix-Rouge.

[5] L'Intelligent (France), international weekly, no. 2238, 30 September–6 December 2003, p. 16.

[6] www.reseauvoltaire.net

[7] Thierry Meyssan, "L'Effroyable Imposture" [The Horrifying Fraud, 11/09/2001], translated by Suzanne Kazan and Maya Salman, Dar Kan'an for Studies and Publishing, Damascus, 2002, p. 117.

[8] Interview conducted on 2001.09.20, published in the Lebanese magazine Al-Adab, issue 09/10, 2001, 49th year, pp. 8–9.

[9] See the article by Staff Brigadier General Elias Hanna of Lebanon: "The International Order and the New American Options," Shu'un al-Awsat magazine, issue 105, Winter 2002, p. 58.

[10] Professor Youssef al-Jahmani, "Tora Bora — The First War of the Century (The Great American-Zionist Conspiracy)," Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi, Damascus–Cairo, special edition, 2002, back cover.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Mahmoud al-Maraghi, "The War of the Robe and the Missile (US State Department Documents on Terrorism)," Dar al-Shorouk, Cairo, 1st edition, 2002, pp. 7–8.