



THE 'RADICAL ISLAMISM CONTAINMENT': A NEW AMERICAN DOCTRINE THAT REPLACES THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

Frédéric A. ZAKHIA

*EMAM (Équipe Monde Arabe et Méditerranée) – UMR 7324 CITERES (CNRS /
Université de Tours)*

Abstract

The September 11, 2001 attacks on American soil is the beginning of a long war between the United States and the International terrorism, particularly with *Al-Qaeda* and Islamist movements. This paper analyses the relation between the US and the Islamism movements and suggest that these relations are governed by a new American doctrine, the 'Radical Islamism containment', which started with George W. Bush and continued with the successive American Presidents. This new doctrine replaces the old doctrine of 'Communism containment' and presents the same schema with military interventions and political and economical pressures and sanctions on Islamist movements.

Keywords

Islamism – United States – Soviet Union – Communism – September 11 attack – Islamic containment – American doctrines.

Résumé

Les attentats du 11 septembre 2001 sur le sol américain marquent le début d'une longue guerre entre les États-Unis et le terrorisme international, notamment avec *Al-Qaïda* et les mouvements islamistes. Cet article analyse les relations entre les États-Unis et les mouvements islamistes et soutient que ces relations sont régies par une nouvelle doctrine américaine, « l'Endiguement de l'islamisme », qui a commencé avec George W. Bush et s'est poursuivie avec les présidents américains successifs. Cette nouvelle doctrine remplace l'ancienne doctrine de « l'Endiguement du communisme » et présente le même schéma avec des interventions militaires et des pressions et sanctions politiques et économiques contre les mouvements islamistes.

Mots-clés

Islamisme – États-Unis – Union soviétique – Communisme – Attentat du 11 septembre – Endiguement de l'islamisme – Doctrines américaines.

Islamism is a multifaceted term that encompasses various political movements seeking to establish Islamic principles within the governance of a state. At its core, Islamism involves the intertwining of political and religious ideologies, aiming to shape public policy and societal norms in accordance with Islamic teachings. It is important to distinguish between Islamism and terrorism, as not all Islamists resort to violence. Terrorism, on the other hand, is the use of violence and intimidation for political purposes. Within Islamism, there exists a spectrum ranging from moderate or reformist to fundamentalist or radical expressions (Winter and Barak, 2023). While moderate Islamists may seek political change through democratic means, fundamentalist or radical Islamists often advocate for more drastic measures, including the imposition of strict Islamic law. Understanding these nuances is crucial for a comprehensive grasp of the diverse ideologies within the broader concept of Islamism. Examples of Islamist movements include the Muslim Brotherhood, known for its political activities, and more radical groups like Al-Qaeda or ISIS, associated with violence. The Islamic revolution in Iran, which supports groups that share its ideological goals, such as Hezbollah, is another example of an Islamic movement (Rosen and Eilam, 2023).

The goal of the present paper is to offer an analysis of the relations between the USA and the radical Islamism and to suggest that these relations are now governed by a new American doctrine which we introduce here and we call it the 'Radical Islamism containment'. After a literature review and an overview of various American doctrines throughout history, we present our new doctrine, followed by an analysis of the origin of hostilities between the United States and violent Islamists. We also provide concrete examples such as the relation between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran as well as the American support for Israel, which claims to be constantly facing radical Islamism.

State of the Art

Literature about Islamist movements developed in the post-Cold War era, especially after the 9/11 attacks and the rise of Bin Laden (Mohiuddin, 2023; Tal, 2023; Berman, 2003; Ismail, 2003; Kuran, 2004; Bayat, 2005; Tibi, 2012; Bilgrami, 2013; Sayyid, 2015). Nevertheless, the standout publication following the collapse of the USSR and the conclusion of the Cold War is indisputably Samuel Huntington's (1996) 'The Clash of Civilizations.' Departing from observations on the battlegrounds of armed conflicts, Huntington inferred and foresaw that upcoming conflicts would no longer revolve around the ideologies of communism versus capitalism. Instead, he predicted a shift towards cultural and religious disputes. Notably, Huntington positioned Islam in contrast to

Western civilization, predominantly represented by the United States of America, the leader of the so-called “free world.”

Anatomy and structures of the United States doctrines

As leaders of a superpower nation, each American president has adopted a doctrine to shape their foreign policy. Monroe, for instance, advocated for isolationism, wherein the USA refrained from interfering in the internal affairs of European countries, and, in turn, requested European empires not to intervene in American affairs. Throughout history, particularly after the Second World War, the United States harbored concerns about the spread of communism. Post the Soviet defeat of the German Nazis in Kursk in 1943, the United States executed a military landing at Normandy. This move aimed not only to expedite the end of the war but also to safeguard France and the West from potential Russian domination, given an underlying conflict between the Soviets and the West (Carley, 2014). The Truman administration subsequently embraced a novel doctrine: the containment of communism. This doctrine originated from a report submitted by George Frost Kennan, an American diplomat stationed in Moscow. Kennan cautioned the U.S. administration about the communist ideology and the Soviet Union’s persistent inclination for perpetual conflict against capitalism. His proposal entailed fortifying American institutions to reduce vulnerability to Soviet attacks and curb Russian expansionist tendencies. The significance of Kennan’s lengthy telegram was duly acknowledged, leading President Truman to address Congress in March 1947. During this speech, he introduced the ‘Communism Containment’ doctrine, outlining forthcoming measures to counter Soviet geopolitical expansion. The examination of different American doctrines reveals a recurring theme—they often emerge as responses to feelings of fear and insecurity. This foundation of fear and insecurity consistently underlies the adoption of new foreign policy strategies by the United States to safeguard its interests. During the Monroe era, there was apprehension about European expansionism, while the Truman administration grappled with the fear of Soviet expansion. In more recent times, under the presidencies of Bush, Obama, and Trump, concerns shifted to fears of Islamist expansionism and global terror. Presently, with the Biden administration, there is an additional layer of anxiety regarding the economic threat posed by China, coupled with the persisting concerns about international Islamic terror.

With the Truman Doctrine, the United States embarked on a policy of supporting anti-communist regimes globally. This support extended beyond frequent military interventions to encompass economic aid, notably through the Marshall Plan. The aim was to bolster European institutions financially, particularly in the aftermath

of the economic challenges post-World War II. A similar pattern emerges in the doctrine of Radical Islamic Containment that we present below, featuring economic assistance for nations like Iraq. This assistance manifested in the establishment of law enforcement, army restructuring, and the training of judges following Western standards. Additionally, there were recurrent military interventions in regions where Islamic groups gained influence. The doctrine also employed the principle of preventive war, seeking to mitigate the terrorist or Islamist threat in a country and prevent a shift towards Islamism in the regime.

On each occasion, these novel doctrines articulate a stance of the United States, which increasingly asserts itself globally as a superpower, wielding both military and economic dominance. However, following the conclusion of the Cold War, just as the Americans began to taste their hegemony in a unipolar world where they held the preeminent position, the Islamic and terrorist threat emerged, primarily targeting American interests. This newfound adversary proves challenging to control for several reasons. Firstly, various Islamist organizations lack centralization under a single command, often operating independently and without coordination, all sharing the common objective of dismantling 'the Great Satan.' Secondly, as highlighted by Huntington, one can hold dual nationality but not dual ideology; an American Islamist citizen may simultaneously identify as American and Afghan or American and Bosnian, but they cannot be both Islamist and Protestant. Consequently, an unprecedented and elusive war unfolds, wherein the enemy remains almost invisible but manifests through consequential actions: the destruction of a tower, an assault on an embassy, and sporadic hostage takings. Pursuing criminals in this scenario is akin to searching for a needle in a haystack or attempting to strafe mosquitoes.

Doctrine of the Radical Islamism Containment

Following the implosion of the Soviet Union and the eradication of the communist threat, the former world order of the Cold War era crumbled. The United States identified a new adversary: Islamist groups employing violence globally, prompting the initiation of containment strategies against these radical movements. Similar to other American doctrines, this containment entails both military intervention and economic pressures, including sanctions on countries harboring Islamic movements or with Islamic regimes, as well as sanctions on the movements themselves. This new doctrine has given rise to new theories and principles in the military realm, such as the uniquely American concept of 'Preventive war,' which doesn't always garner the support or approval of the United Nations when implemented.

This proposed doctrine runs parallel to George Bush's doctrine, which advocates the promotion of democracy and a global war on terror (Challiant, 2016). Notably, the Bush Doctrine doesn't explicitly address violent Islamism but centers on terrorism (Woodward, 2002; 2011). Opting for the term 'Radical Islamism containment,' we aim to illustrate how the evidence aligns with this approach and bolsters the doctrine. In essence, Bush aimed to draw a distinction between Islamist movements that employ terrorism and moderate Islam. In the aftermath of terrorist attacks, the President visited the Islamic Center of Washington, engaging with American Muslim leaders to convey a message of tolerance and solidarity. The President explicitly condemned unwarranted attacks on Americans of the Muslim faith, urging Americans to express support for their Muslim friends (The Global War on Terrorism, American National Archives, 2001). Bush delivered this speech:

"This new enemy seeks to destroy our freedom and impose its views. We value life; the terrorists ruthlessly destroy it... We respect people of all faiths and welcome the free practice of religion; our enemy wants to dictate how to think and how to worship even to their fellow Muslims" – President George W. Bush, 11/8/01 (The Global war on Terrorism, 2001)

Now, "the new enemy" is Al-Qaeda and international terrorism, and to some extent, Islam when violence and terrorism are employed (Byman and Waxman, 2002; Byman 2015).

Nevertheless, it is crucial to provide context and nuance when delving into complex topics like U.S. foreign policy and its interaction with Islam. It would be inaccurate and overly simplistic to label Islam as an "enemy" of any U.S. president or the United States as a whole. U.S. foreign policy is shaped by a myriad of factors, and relationships with Islamic countries and communities are diverse and multifaceted.

During George W. Bush's presidency, his administration grappled with significant challenges related to terrorism, especially in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks. The emphasis was on countering Islamist extremist groups, such as Al-Qaeda, which were responsible for the attacks. The War on Terror, initiated during Bush's tenure, aimed to address this threat on a global scale.

Furthermore, the shaping of U.S. foreign policy extends beyond the influence of singular figures like President Bush; other prominent personalities, such as General David Petraeus, played pivotal roles in understanding the capabilities of the enemy, particularly within the context of military strategies in Iraq and Afghanistan. Petraeus's military service spanned different presidential administrations, and he occupied key positions during critical periods in U.S. military engagements in both Iraq and Afghanistan (Pires, 2021).

Several examples illustrate the relationship between the United States and violent Islamism, such as the current conflict between Hamas and Israel or the case of the Islamic State in Syria and the Levant (ISIL).

Since the assault perpetrated by the Palestinian Islamist movement, Hamas, in Israel on October 7th, 2023, the American President, Joe Biden, has spared no efforts, along with the U.S. administration, to secure the release of the hostages (including American hostages) held in Gaza. Since the beginning of this conflict, Biden has been providing significant military support to Israel in its war against Islamism. Israel appears to be framing the Palestinian resistance as Islamist. This narrative positions Israel in a supposed state of war against Islamism, claiming an existential threat. Israel benefits from unconditional American support and strategically leverages the specter of Islamist terror, drawing parallels to the challenges the United States faced during the September 11, 2001 attacks.

On the other hand, a pivotal moment unfolded on March 22, 2019. President Donald Trump declared the defeat of the Islamic State (IS) and the triumph of the United States over this organization (Riechmann and Baldor, 2019). The last remaining territories in Syria under the control of Islamists were completely secured by the U.S. army and the allied Syrian Democratic Forces, all while under the watchful eyes of the Assad regime. For years, terrorists had been expanding their influence in Iraq and Syria, spreading terror and violence, and indiscriminately shedding blood, particularly that of minorities branded as disbelievers by the Jihadist group. Various Christian communities, Yazidis, and even Muslims who did not adhere to the IS interpretation of Sharia were mercilessly executed. Islamist fighters also destroyed ancient antiquities, a shocking spectacle for the Western world. Unprecedented methods of torture, convictions, and unconventional executions were not only carried out but also publicized, recorded, and disseminated. Notably, IS prisoners and victims were often seen dressed in orange-colored suits, resembling the uniform color used at the Guantanamo American jail, where numerous Islamists are detained (Bennett, 2015). This symbolism conveyed a clear message from the Islamists to the Americans – a declaration of sacred war, the great Jihad directed against the United States.

The defeat of the Islamic State group left countries in ruins, marked by devastation. While the remaining pockets of fighters in the former IS territories were eradicated, this does not signify the conclusive end of the nightmare for the West. The formal conclusion of the Caliphate does not eradicate the ongoing Islamist threat that looms over the West, targeting the 'Great Satan,' a term historically used by the Khomeini Islamist regime of Iran to refer to the United States. Drawing insights from history, this triumph over the Islamic State represents merely one battle in the protracted war initiated by the USA against Islamist movements worldwide.

This conflict commenced shortly after the September 11 attacks in 2001, nearly a decade after the dissolution of the Soviet Union (USSR). The ongoing war between extremists and the West persists. In fact, IS combatants who managed to escape the conflicts in Syria and Iraq have dispersed to the East or returned to their home countries in Europe or America, constituting an ongoing source of individual risk.

The origin of hostilities between the US and the Islamists

Amidst the Cold War, the Soviets actively backed Arab countries as a counterbalance to US influence. Notable instances include their support for Nasser in Egypt's endeavor to construct the High Aswan Dam. The Arabs and Muslims, finding greater affinity with Soviet policies than American ones, were particularly swayed by the USA's support for Israel. Meanwhile, Islamist attacks against American interests worldwide during the Cold War era largely escaped global attention. The focal point of American administrations remained on the expansion of communism and the potential inclusion of more southern countries within communist geopolitical spheres. While Islamist extremism was germinating and making local appearances, it remained beneath the surface, akin to the tip of the iceberg. Notwithstanding, several notable attacks occurred during this period, such as the significant bombing of the Marines' barracks in Beirut in October 1983.

The 9/11 attacks signify the emergence of international Islamist extremism and mark the initiation of worldwide Islamist terrorism. Islamism, rooted in the principles and laws of sharia, was asserting its influence on minority groups in countries like Egypt, Afghanistan, and Iran. However, their focus shifted primarily towards the West, especially the United States. This shift was evident in the various messages conveyed by Osama Bin Laden. Through these messages, Bin Laden elucidated the rationale behind the anti-American sentiment, attributing it to the unwavering support for Israel and perceived injustices by the United States towards the Arab people in Palestine.

In response, President Bush delivered one of the most radical reactions in U.S. history, both in rhetoric – referencing a 'Crusade' against Islamists – and in military action. He introduced the principle of 'preventive war' and inaugurated the Radical Islamism containment doctrine. This manifested in direct intervention in Afghanistan to dismantle the Islamist Taliban regime, accused of harboring Bin Laden, who was then declared the number one enemy of the United States. President Bush's actions appeared to be in continuity with those of his predecessors, starting with Harry Truman, who concluded a prolonged period of American isolationism by taking various military actions against communist expansion. Throughout these events, concerns about security and the apprehension of Islamist expansion resonated strongly within the public opinion in the USA.

With the overthrow of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, prompted by the direct response to Al-Qaeda's attack on American soil, the United States' anti-Islamic interventionism took firm root. The terms Islamism and terrorism began to be frequently interchangeable in Western media, press, and literature (Al-Ibia, 2015), given that a majority of terrorist acts were committed by Islamic extremists. This led to the commencement of a television news campaign in numerous European countries, implicitly aimed at demonizing and placing blame on Islam.

In France, numerous attacks were carried out by individuals with Islamist affiliations, predominantly of Maghrebin immigrant descent. Examples include Mohamad Merah (2012), the attacks on the newspaper Charlie Hebdo and the Bataclan Theater (2015), as well as more recent incidents like the homicides in Sarcelles (2020) or the Rambouillet knife attack, where a police employee was fatally stabbed (2021), among others. Europeans declared a moral and military alliance with the U.S., expressing full solidarity in the war on terrorism, as it was seen as a defense of shared values of freedom and democracy. Surprisingly, even Russia, an old adversary, announced through President Putin its willingness to provide the USA with secret intelligence data useful in combating terrorist and Islamist networks. Thus, erstwhile enemies found themselves aligned on the same front, akin to their collaboration against the Nazi regime.

The death of Osama bin Laden in Pakistan in 2011, following an operation conducted by elite U.S. marine troops, did not signal the end of the new historical period of conflict between Americans and Islamists. Bin Laden, an anti-American leader and a prominent figure of Islamism and global terrorism, may have been removed, but his demise did not bring an end to terrorism, and his religious dogma continues to endure. As President George W. Bush asserted on March 20, 2004, to the House of Representatives, 'the U.S. war on terror will be lengthy' (Presidential letter, 2004). 'After the death of bin Laden, [one can expect] the advent of a 'Jihad without a leader,' wrote Marc Hecker (Hecker, 2011). A leaderless Jihad is much worse because it will strike everywhere and at any time. Al-Qaeda has indeed evolved, and 'subsidiaries' have been created in Iraq, the Maghreb, and the Arabian Peninsula. The powerful ideology of bin Laden inspired many major attacks, for which he was not the direct instigator, such as the bombings of Bali (2002, 202 dead), Casablanca (2003, 45 dead), Madrid (2004, 191 dead), London (2005, 56 dead), or Sharm el-Sheikh (2005, 68 dead) (Ayad, 2011).

Since September 11, 2001, the United States has engaged in a series of interventions against Islamic groups, witnessing a proliferation of military actions. Following the war in Afghanistan (2001), which targeted al-Qaeda terrorists and the Taliban in response to 9/11 through Operation 'Enduring Freedom,' the United States entered the war in Iraq (2003-2011). In 2004, additional wars against terrorism

unfolded in Georgia, Djibouti, Kenya, Ethiopia, Yemen, and Eritrea. Subsequently, in the second decade of the 21st century, a new wave of American interventions transpired in the ongoing war against Islamism.

As early as 2014, a fresh military intervention occurred in Iraq with the emergence of the Islamic State group. Concurrently, Americans expanded their intervention to Syria to combat IS. Leading a military coalition and collaborating with Syrian local forces, the Americans confronted not only the IS but also various Islamic jihadist armed groups like Al-Nusra Front (Syria and Iraq) or the Khorasan group (Syria).

Moreover, upon entering Syria, the Americans encountered other forces with a less welcoming stance towards their presence. Russian armed forces, Iranians, and Lebanese Hezbollah militia fighters were already on the ground, all rallying to support the regime of the veteran dictator, Al-Assad.

Containing Iran and the Lebanese Hezbollah

Al-Qaeda and ISIS are prominent examples of Sunni Islamist groups, while Iran represents Shiite Islamism. Alongside Syria and the Shiite movement Hezbollah, Iran forms the core of a resistance axis against American hegemony. At the foundation of this ideological alliance lies Shiite Islamism, in competition with Sunni Islam, which predominates in many Arab countries under pro-American governance.

Since the Islamic revolution led by Khomeini and the overthrow of the pro-American Shah in Iran, a rhetoric of animosity towards the United States has prevailed. Khomeini, the supreme leader and founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran, famously referred to the U.S. as the 'Great Satan'. Iranian military parades during significant occasions, such as the commemoration of the Islamic revolution, often involve soldiers marching over American flags as a symbolic gesture of disdain. This hostility has manifested in various terrorist acts, including the taking of hostages in Lebanon by pro-Iranian militias and attacks against U.S. nationals.

Notably, the Dahran bombing in Saudi Arabia, resulting in the deaths of 19 American soldiers, raised suspicions about Iranian involvement. George W. Bush subsequently included Iran in the list of countries comprising the «axis of evil.»

Despite the desire to overthrow the Islamic regime in Iran, accused of human rights violations and openly opposing U.S. interests, the United States has refrained from direct military action on Iranian soil since Khomeini's arrival in 1979. Instead, they have targeted some Iranian positions in Syria. The containment policy against Iran is primarily implemented through economic and political sanctions, intensified due to the progression of the Iranian nuclear program.

In 1995, Washington imposed a trade embargo on Iran, occasionally easing sanctions based on the outcomes of Iranian presidential elections. Sanctions were tightened during the tenure of Conservative President Ahmadinejad. The foundation of the Radical Islamism containment doctrine lies in the persistent apprehension of the insecurity posed by such a regime against American interests.

Iran, a substantial country with a significant oil reserve (roughly 10% of the world's total), raises concerns that its anti-American rhetoric might conceal a genuine and ongoing weapons program. The development of new military technologies, including ballistic missiles that could alter regional dynamics, is particularly alarming, potentially threatening the security of Israel—an unwavering ally of the United States (Fawcett and Payne, 2023).

The U.S. administration consistently accuses Iran of supporting terrorists and financing anti-American activities. Iran extends support to Hezbollah through financial aid, arms, and the dispatch of Iranian military experts to train militia members. In dealing with Iran and its satellite militias, the U.S. applies Islamic containment militarily outside Iranian soil. This involves interventions in conflict zones, collaborating with Arab or international coalitions where Iranians and Shiite Islamic movements are engaged, such as in Yemen, Iraq, and Syria. Key leaders of these Islamic movements, like Qasem Soleimani, have been targeted and eliminated, as exemplified by his assassination in the Baghdad International Airport in January 2020.

Israel, The USA and the Islamist attack propaganda

The USA and Israel utilize anti-Islamist propaganda to justify their military actions. Israel, the sole state without official defined borders, benefits from the American doctrine of Radical Islamist Containment through military support. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is reframed by Israeli media and politicians as a state struggle against terrorist and Islamist movements, such as Hamas. The latter, a Sunni movement, is openly supported by Shia powers Iran and Hezbollah. However, its actions are limited due to confinement on Palestinian soil. Israel extended its intervention onto Syrian territory by assassinating Imad Mughniyah in 2008, the number two in Hezbollah's leadership. President Truman's swift recognition of Israel's independence in 1948, despite objections from Secretary of State George Marshall (Lenczowski, 1990), firmly aligned the U.S. with the Jewish camp in the Arab-Israeli conflict. This stance sparked indignation and hatred among Arab and especially Muslim populations, who view the Palestinian people as victims of unjust colonization. Since then, Israelis and Americans have maintained a political symbiosis. As explained earlier, the United States extends military and political backing to Israel, and Israel's actions against Islamists and

its counterterrorism efforts align with U.S. interests. This dynamic was evident in the Israeli war against the Hezbollah militia in Lebanon in July 2006, serving as a form of proxy American battle against Islamism and representing another facet of containment, here termed «The Islamic containment by proxies.»

Conclusion. The return of Russia?

The 'Radical Islamism containment' doctrine shares a structure analogous to previous American doctrines, unfolding in response to significant global geopolitical shifts that perpetuate a pervasive sense of fear and insecurity for U.S. interests on both domestic and foreign fronts. It echoes patterns observed in doctrines like communism containment and becomes manifest following major events, with the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center serving as a pivotal moment. President George W. Bush, following the footsteps of Truman, presents the anti-terror doctrine to the American Congress, signaling the onset of the American war against terrorism. Securing approvals from both Congress and the United Nations, Bush initiates military interventions in Afghanistan. This doctrine persists through subsequent administrations, including Obama's deployment of U.S. troops for war in Afghanistan despite receiving the Nobel Peace Prize. The doctrine reaches its zenith with the audacious Donald Trump, who proposes an unprecedented ban on individuals belonging to the Islam religion from entering the United States and the rejection of visa applications from select countries with Muslim majorities—an action unparalleled in U.S. and world history.

A noteworthy observation is that this new foreign policy of containment garners widespread acceptance and direct adoption, irrespective of the political party in power. It is crucial to note that Truman faced challenges in introducing his doctrine, given his Democratic affiliation, as he had to convince traditionally conservative Republicans, who leaned towards isolationism, about the necessity of interventionism.

Similar to other American containment doctrines, this doctrine is typically implemented on two fronts. On one hand, it necessitates military interventions, while on the other, it operates at the political and economic levels, entailing sanctions imposed on the relevant countries or groups. As mentioned earlier, this doctrine, like the Truman doctrine, stems from feelings of fear and insecurity, akin to those evoked by communism. The underlying reasons for any containment doctrine remain consistent, but in the post-Cold War era, they take a different shape. The Communist International gives way to the Islamic International, a transition facilitated by the fact that every Muslim, by virtue of their religion, has

historically professed allegiance to a singular international Ummah—a unified world nation governed by Sharia, itself rooted in the Quran.

In less than a decade, Huntington's thesis appears to be substantiated, despite critiques from scholars such as Said (2001), Ash (2000), and Harari (2018). We find ourselves in a phase of cultural struggle, especially evident in the Western perception, where terms like "Islamists" and "terrorists" are sometimes interchangeable, but not always. These cultural clashes are inherently tied to ideologies. Even non-political Islam, by its nature, is expansionist and proselytizing. Americanism, too, is inherently imperial and expansionist, and it's unsurprising to witness the global dissemination of American culture to different corners of the world. For instance, in India, American movies are popular, in Iran, despite being tacitly unaccepted in the workplace, young people embrace wearing jeans, and in Lebanon, where French was traditionally the primary foreign language taught, English is gaining significant ground.

Four U.S. presidents have led the nation since the 9/11 attacks, and the war on terror shows no signs of a definitive conclusion. While the Islamic containment doctrine remains in effect, recent events indicate the reemergence of another player in global affairs. Russia, aiming to reclaim a prominent role, has undertaken actions and interventions that indicate a desire to establish a new balance, reminiscent of a Cold War against the United States. Despite Biden's recent statement during his summit with Putin that he doesn't believe Russia seeks a Cold War, their actions in various hotspots demonstrate a competitive stance with the USA. Instances include their intervention in South Ossetia in 2008, countering the Georgian invasion supported by the US, interventions and war in Ukraine, Syria, and a recent landing in Venezuela, signaling a warning to the Americans against destabilizing the country. Russia aspires to lead a coalition of non-pro-American nations. However, this return to the international stage faces challenges. Unlike the Cold War era, Russia no longer has satellite countries like the expansive Soviet Union, and the current world order is multipolar, featuring emerging powers like China, Brazil, and North Korea. This complexity in international relations diminishes Russia's chances of success. Notably, the containment or suppression of radical islamism is now being executed by Muslim governments in Arab countries like Egypt and Jordan, reflecting a shift towards a 'post-Islamism' era. This development raises questions about the future relevance of the American doctrine of Islamic containment.

In conclusion, President Biden seems to continue adhering to the principles of the Islamic containment doctrine. However, in this post-Islamism era, he faces significant challenges, particularly with the rising influence of Chinese economic power. Only time will tell whether he deems it necessary to introduce a new doctrine, potentially focused on "Economic containment" in relation to China.



BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- Al-Atawneh, M., & Hatina, M. (2019). The Study of Islam and Muslims in Israel. *Israel Studies*, 24(3), 101–125. <https://doi.org/10.2979/israelstudies.24.3.05>
- Al-Ibia, S. (2015), "Islam and Terrorism in Post 9/11th Literature", *Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 10, n° 2, p. 19-25.
- Ash, T. G. (2000), *History of the present*, Penguin, p. 388-389.
- Ayad, Christophe (2011). « Al-Qaeda bouge encore », *Libération*, 3 mai 2011.
- Bayat, A. (2005), "Islamism and social movement theory" *Third World Quarterly*, 26.6, p. 891-908.
- Bennett, J. (2015), US officials says ISIS uses orange jumpsuits because of Guantanamo, in: The Daily caller, News foundation, may 2. <https://dailycaller.com/2015/02/05/isis-orange-jumpsuits-gitmo/>
- Berman, S. (2003), "Islamism, revolution, and civil society." *Perspectives on Politics* 1.2 p. 257-272.
- Bilgrami, A. (2013), Islam and the West: Conflict, Democracy, Identity, in: *Reset Doc, Dialogue and Civilizations*, Columbia University, 24 July. <https://www.resetdoc.org/story/islam-and-the-west-conflict-democracy-identity/>
- Byman, D. (2015). *Al Qaeda, the Islamic State, and the global jihadist movement: What everyone needs to know*. What Everyone Needs to Know.
- Byman, D., Waxman, M. (2002). *The dynamics of coercion: American foreign policy and the limits of military might*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carley, M. J. (2014), *Silent conflict: a hidden history of early Soviet-Western relations*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Chaliand, G., Blin, A. (Eds.). (2016). *The history of terrorism: From antiquity to ISIS*. Univ of California Press.
- Fawcett, L., Payne, A. (2023). Stuck on a hostile path? US policy towards Iran since the revolution. *Contemporary Politics*, 29(1), 1-21.
- The Global war on Terrorism, The first 100 days. Retrieved from the American National Archives. <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/12/text/100dayreport.html> [Accessed on December 16, 2023].
- Harari, Y. N. (2018), Why there is no 'clash of civilisation' between Islam and the West, September 22, 2018 <https://www.noted.co.nz/currently/social-issues/yuval-noah-harari-extract-no-clash-of-civilisations-islam-west/>
- Hecker, M. (2011), « Vers l'avènement d'un Jihad sans leader », *Le Figaro*, 3 mai 2011.
- Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*, New York, Simon and Schuster.
- Ismail, S. (2003), *Rethinking Islamist politics: Culture, the state and Islamism*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

-
- Kuran, T. (2004), *Islam and Mammon: The economic predicaments of Islamism*. Princeton University Press.
 - Lenczowski, G. (1990). *American Presidents and the Middle East*. Durham, North Carolina. Duke University Press, p. 26. ISBN 978-0-8223-0972-7.
 - Mohiuddin, A. (2023). "Islamist Movements: Evolution, Approaches and Contestation." *Navigating Religious Authority in Muslim Societies: Islamist Movements and the Challenge of Globalisation*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, p. 73-115.
 - Pires N. L. (2021). *Holistic command of war : wellington spinola and petraeus*. Lime Tree Press.
 - Remarks of President Biden in Press conference, June 16, 2021. Geneva, Switzerland. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/06/16/remarks-by-president-biden-in-press-conference-4/> [Accessed December 16, 2023]
 - Presidential letter, The White House. March 20, 2004. <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2004/03/20040322-3.html> [Accessed on December 16, 2023]
 - Riechmann D. and Baldor L.C. (2019). "White House Announces End to Islamic State-Controlled Territory in Syria", *Time*, November 22.
 - Rosen, E., Eilam, S. (2023). *The War in Gaza and the Domestic Threat in the West*. Institute for National Security Studies. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep54537>
 - Said, E.W. (2001). "The clash of ignorance", in *The Nation*. <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/clash-ignorance/> [Accessed on December 16, 2023].
 - Sayyid, S. (2015), *A fundamental fear: Eurocentrism and the emergence of Islamism*. Zed Books Ltd.
 - Tal, I. (2023). *The Islamic Movement in Israel*.
 - Tibi, B. (2012), *Islamism and Islam*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
 - Winter, O., Barak, M. (2023). *From Moderate Islam to Radical Islam? Al-Azhar Stands with Hamas*. Institute for National Security Studies. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep54266>
 - Woodward, B. (2011). *Obama's wars*. Simon and Schuster.
 - Woodward, B. (2002). *Bush at war*. Simon and Schuster.



BIOGRAPHIE

Frédéric Zakhia est microbiologiste, historien et journaliste. Titulaire d'un doctorat en microbiologie de l'Université de Montpellier II, d'une licence en journalisme et histoire, et d'un master en histoire de l'Université de Montréal, il a participé à la découverte de plusieurs nouvelles espèces bactériennes à l'Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD). Il est l'auteur de plus de 100 articles dans les domaines des sciences humaines, de la taxonomie microbienne et du journalisme. Il a récemment publié un recueil bilingue de psaumes bibliques, un psautier syriaque-arabe.



BIOGRAPHY

Frédéric Zakhia is a microbiologist, historian, and journalist. Holder of a PhD in microbiology from the University of Montpellier II, a bachelor's degree in journalism and history, and a master's degree in history from the University of Montreal, he participated in the discovery of several new bacterial species at the French Development Research Institute (IRD). He is the author of more than 100 articles in the fields of humanities, microbial taxonomy, and journalism. He recently published a bilingual collection of biblical psalms, a Syriac-Arabic psalter.