

THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF FREEDOM IN U.S. POLITICS: A NORMATIVE STRATEGY TO PRESERVE GLOBAL LIBERAL VALUES

*Kahina GOUDJIL**

Abstract

This work aims at analyzing the conceptualization of freedom in current American political culture.

It investigates the myriad changes and adaptations that the concept of freedom went through. Many definitions were introduced by philosophers and politicians to this concept of freedom. Eventually, this latter was defined in different ways with different logical and philosophical analysis; what made it very difficult to decide on which meaning the concept of freedom can carry. Modern freedom encountered variable changes and remote results in questioning the shift from collective freedom to individual one.

The 20th century liberation of human rights and the rise of self intellect in the American society were the reasons behind this shift.

The 21st century witnessed skeptical infringing policies in terms of freedom at home and abroad. The concept of freedom did not keep the same value it has as it was amalgamated with foreign policy and politics. A possible answer is provided in an investigation study which analyzes the skeptical ideologies and strategies set to protect, promote and put in real practice the concept of freedom in Afghanistan. The appeal, in Operation Enduring Freedom campaign, was to preserve freedom, liberal values and deter terrorism in Afghanistan. Unfortunately, this operation witnessed heinous violation to International Law, Human Rights and State's sovereignty.

The findings prove that, by infringing these norms US foreign policy failed to preserve global liberal values. US has a double standard; What the concept of freedom means to Americans and American government does not cope with their practical side in foreign policy and international relations. Freedom in US minds, thoughts and actions is reshaping depending on US area of interests.

Keywords: *Freedom, liberal democracy, International law, US policy, state Sovereignty, human rights, conceptualization*

JEL Classification: [K33, K37].

Settling on an empirical finding to the concept of freedom and what it encompasses its real meaning is still a primordial need to the transformation that the concept went through. The conceptual framework of freedom witnessed a plethora of changes and conceptualization mostly affected by the social and political changes the American history went through. Hitherto, contemporary American politics and foreign policy perceive freedom as a core value in its generated form.

The strong conceptual partnership between American freedom and foreign policy draw a new trajectory to US policy which influenced its international credibility, practicality and its essence of interpretation worldwide.

1. The Concept of Freedom in Political and Philosophical Thought.

1.1. Freedom Perceived by Plato

There is no denial that freedom and all what it encompassed were praised by ancient and modern philosophers, rational thinkers and theorists. It was a magnanimous concept which interweaves with any history, culture and civilization.

Like ‘the pursuit of happiness and life’, the term ‘liberty/freedom’ was so porous that there are significant interpretations to its meaning. Ancient and modern political thinkers were the influential contributors to the myriad interpretations brought to this term through history.

The evolution of this concept went through time and created the history of American freedom. Understanding this latter as a concept rests upon the clarity these philosophers brought to this term.

Philosophers held that the key concept in Plato’s moral and political thought was freedom. The major contributions of Plato to the notion of freedom were found in his two books *The Republic* and *The Law*; he particularly analyzed the democratic concept of freedom.

In *The Republic*, Plato tackled freedom and its conception in the civil society and launched his view of democracy as the third deviation from the ideal constitution after timocracy and oligarchy corruptions. He believed strongly that democracy which was seen to help establish free and equal society with preservation to all civil rights would create an ill-disciplined people who lack self-control (ed. Harrison 2003: 88).

He stated that in the social context of democracy there would be no ruler, no rule and no obligation to obey the rule or to work for the common good of the community.

In its extreme realization democracy seems to draw paths to anarchy. In advocating Plato’s idea, Hansen in his article “On Democratic Freedom” stated

that the freedom to do as one want may create an allegory of a lost state which appears like a patchwork dress with a myriad of persons. According to Plato “the human soul has three parts: reason, spirit and appetite” (23), if a person lives with the democratic notion of freedom and adapts the concept of ‘people have the right to do what pleases them’, the appetite of the soul comes over and occupy the rational.

Men become coerced by their own desires and turn into slaves. In terms of freedom Plato’s conviction was freedom from evil appetite which must be controlled and dominated by our consciousness or by a legitimate law.

1.2. The Second Treatise by John Locke

Given the conceptual idea of freedom in Locke’s thinking forces Schwartz to unfold what he advanced as ideas in the *Second Treatise of Government* (1690). His new conception of the meaning of liberty highlighted important ideas that had enormous impact on the British American thinking. Consequently, lead to the American Revolution and even to enact the Declaration of Independence (qtd. in Kasper 2005:4).

The Declaration of Independence found its flow in Locke’s thoughts.

The Americans took Locke’s ideas of power division that were manifested in the separation of church from the state and adapted them to their Declaration of Independence as well as to the Amendments of the Constitution. Currently, the foundation of classical liberal thoughts such as “equality before the law, constitutional small government and free market built on secure property” (4), were embraced by political thinkers and became part of their beliefs.

In *The Second Treatise* Locke illustrated the meaning of freedom clearly; men are naturally in a “[...] state of perfect freedom to order their actions and dispose of their possessions, and persons as they see fit, within the bounds of the law of nature, without dependence on any other man” (4). In this sense, man is naturally free to do whatever he wants or wishes to himself or with his property.

The person, according to Locke’s definition, must not be dependent on other people because it will be considered as an absolute slavery. Locke assigned responsibility to rationality, reason, self-reliance, and self-preservation. He believed that the person who acquired these characteristics possesses real freedom.

A man should assist to “preserve the rest of mankind” especially if it does not conflict with his own needs which is the case when the common good is targeted.

Locke’s ideas on freedom radically redefined the rights of freedom of a common man; the existence of a reasonable, strict and powerful government would enhance and defend liberty (ed.qtd. in Harrison2003: 89).

1.3. Jean Jacques Rousseau's Thoughts on Freedom

In the eighteenth century the French political philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau analyzed freedom as 'an ideal continually contested'. The concept of freedom resonates contemporary debates as Rousseau put foundations to the *Social Contract* and to the political system that both could offer a citizen some sort of freedom.

His theory of 'rights' and 'free will' that later referred to by 'civil liberties' and 'natural freedom' emphasized the absence of external constraints and a "limitless right of each individual to do what he desires" (qtd. in Hurtado 1).

Autonomy was Rousseau's privilege as contrary to many other philosophers, for him freedom is the privatized moral which he believed could check on the selfishness of human nature as a good way to protest the influence of others.

He started his characterization of freedom with 'free will' or 'natural freedom'; he defined this former as an endless right of individuals to do whatever they cherish and eager to acquire.

Though, acquiring requires cognitive and moral conscious capacities in the sense that individuals can analyze the reasons and consequences of their actions. Rousseau denied that people have any natural obligation to one another.

Consequently, natural freedom is the way freedom perceives a person in the state of nature, he defined this right as "an unlimited right to everything that tempt him and he can reach... which has no other bounds than the individual's force" (qtd. in Mathew 2002: 50). In this sense the concept of natural freedom is the total absence of constraints and obstacles that may limit the individual in the state of nature.

The concept of natural freedom advocates that every single person is completely unbounded by responsibility toward others and free to make his own choices. However, a political society, as Rousseau mentioned in *The Social Contract* (1762), asked citizens to sacrifice some of their individual freedoms for the general will of the community.

He thought that prioritizing a unitary commonwealth is more beneficial than attaining individual's desires.

He noted that natural freedom is limitless no one will be able to do much or to act indefinitely free because each person's actions are limited and constrained by other people's actions.

In view of that, Rousseau proposed a social sphere, harmonically built, which extends freedom to become a civil and social right in society where the freedom of people will be expressed in the 'general will' (qtd. in Stivers2008: 19).

This latter is seen as the cohesive decision of a common community (Bertram 1), and it is also identified as “a standard to which that decision must conform” (1). In a social sphere people interact with other members of the community; this relationship defines the natural dependence of one on the other.

The general will is not the property of the state only; it is the property of each citizen within it. That is why it is for the individual best interests to subordinate his individual will to the general one. Hence, the general will is seen as the solution to the fundamental problem of extended freedoms of individuals in societies.

1.4. Individual Freedom by John Stuart Mill

If man reacts positively to progress and evolution, then so should be the reaction of the principles which govern and restricts them. This could happen only when the citizens of the same society are mature, educated and strong in character.

It is with these fundamental characteristics that a person could reach the stage of liberty. In his book *On liberty* (1859), which was seen as “the most powerful, eloquent, and imaginative defense known of the libertarian principle” (qtd. in Shaw-Miller2011:197), Mill saw that modern societies were at risk, there were social and political conspiracies that Mill tried to solve by recommending fundamental cures.

The reason behind any development in humanity is freedom. It helps each individual or citizen to sick his paths in life and contributes with his potential to develop himself and his society.

Thus, according to Mill the freedom of individual is the most fundamental characteristic of human nature and its evolution (qtd. in Harington 1).

Being acquainted with the notion of freedom according to some major politicians and philosophers so far, Mill found it quite different and independent.

He believed that freedom, as an unrestrained experiment, is an endeavor to self-realization with special purposes and presumed consequences. Furthermore, Mill supported his case for liberty with another subordinate argument “each is the best judge and guardian of his own interests” (qtd. in Edwin 1965:7).

This new conception of freedom was fiercely encouraged by classical economists and politicians for it promote ‘Liberty for its own sake’.

The relationship between a society and its individuals stresses stability which merely depends on a consensus that should be a self-imposed agreement to secure stability.

Mill encouraged a new notion which is more concerned with social stability and welfare, a notion where individuals may mark their contributions by showing the right and the idol of them to the other members of society.

Mill adapted conservative libertarian thoughts when he stresses the need for social institutions to check on government. In his *Libertarian Philosophy of J. S. Mill* (1983), Nicholas Capaldi exhibited Mill as a pure Libertarian. A libertarian is the moral dimension that cherishes primordially the value of individual liberty.

This moral position has social, political and economic implications. Libertarian narrowly viewed as holding only an economic position favorable to 'laissez faire'. Mill held a libertarian position in his *On Liberty*, especially in politics.

Moral libertarianism is a state which inflicts that there are no goals or needs more valuable than the status of being free (04). Eventually, Mill's commitment to this notion of freedom helped him to pave the paths for modern liberalism.

1.5. The Two Concept of Freedom by Isaiah Berlin

Freedom was so porous that there is a significant amount of interpretation of its meaning. Isaiah Berlin gave substantive content to freedom, a modern political thinker, who introduced the best influential "Two Concepts of Liberty" (1958). The article is known to be "The strongest and the best-known counterattacks".

This article raised an indistinct problem which cannot be denied (qtd. in Richard 1996: 20). Isaiah Berlin called these two concepts of liberty negative and positive respectively.

The reason for using these labels is that in the first case liberty seems to be a mere *absence* of obstacles, barriers, constraints or interference from others, whereas in the second case it seems to require the *presence* of control, self-mastery, self-determination or self-realization.

According to Berlin in his *Two Concepts of Freedom* (1969) negative freedom is to be free, unbounded and no one interferes in your activity. In other words, the individual does what he wants when he wants. Berlin distinguished between individual liberty and a political one in the sense that this latter involves an area where a man can act or do what he wants without being restrained by others or by state' law, if a person is deprived of what he may do. Thus, he is not free; a man can even be coerced if his area of freedom is contrasted deliberately by men.

He described this situation as being 'enslaved'

The core value of 'positive freedom' persisted on "free to choose" perspective, "being free to choose goals of one's own" (qtd. in Schmidt 2011:

3). This may be interpreted differently since the choice was already defined with negative freedom perspective.

Looking differently to the quality of choice identified with positive freedom may eliminate this ambiguity. In positive freedom the freedom to choose is more identified with the freedom of conscious, because positive freedom; as Harrison mentioned in *Understanding Political Ideas and Movements*, implied individual capability to use their individuality by means of reason ‘to be moved by reason’.

In other words, it is the assertion of the reasonable self with the mass of other people to achieve their objectives.

Positive freedom can be accomplished in negative freedom by coupling the two concepts into a unitary concept.

The rejection of negative freedom will dim the concept of freedom. Instead, the co-existence of the two concepts interactively and interdependently will strengthen the productivity of both concepts on both social and individual areas (Pomper 2003: 90). Both positive and negative freedom contains ideals; seeing them apart as dichotomies is not in favor of a valuable practicality of the two concepts.

Pomper elucidated that positive freedom is the citadel and the future of negative freedom because it empirically identifies with it “being able to do what I want without interference, requires us to create and maintain social structures that equalize power in the process of creating the contexts that construct us as desiring, choosing individuals” (90).

2. Freedom as a Key Value to Democracy ‘Liberal Democracy’

The shields of progress in any empirical civilization are; its social development, its scientific progress and the chronological and institutional triumph reached through a period of time. We mean by social development the progress of high morals and values.

Promoting U.S. ideals and values had been a long-standing element in U.S. foreign policy. Since the WWI, U.S. struggled to make the world safe for democracy and freedom. Democracy was the U.S. soul and spirit of reason in making the world safe, equal, better and unified by one system. Thus, endorsing democracy became the major component of U.S. foreign policy worldwide (Epstein et al 2007: 1).

The best way to operationalize the concept of democracy is to turn it to “liberal” (Smith 2012: 14). Thus, Liberalism was always the political greed of contemporary American politics and foreign policy's strategy through the constitutional state of individual political freedom and individual liberty. Liberalism is an evolutionary concept and contributor to the concept of

freedom, individual and state. It raised crucial climax between the moral character of individual and the state.

The most important aspect of liberalism is its notion of constitutionalism; the rule of law must have legitimate established procedures. Liberalism is considered as an energetic source of defense of individual's liberty, property rights, an absolute appeal to reason over customs, government limited under law and based on the consent of the governed (14).

Promoting democracy around the world was the cornerstone of Bush administration and the key element of his foreign policy. Many experts believed that democracy promotion is vital for nation's economic prosperity and an edged weapon to terrorism. U.S. foreign policy debates were essentially based on the level of repositioning the place of democracy promotion in the war on terrorism and to recalibrate democracy promotion to better fit broader changes that have occurred in the overall international context (Carothers 2007: 2).

Through its committed support to secure democratic transition in many countries in the world, the Bush Administration played a minor but a useful role in helping countries embrace democracy. U.S. democracy aids as facilitating transitions either from the authoritarian or communist rule as in Latin America and Central Europe, or from conflicts as in Bosnia and African Nations such as Sierra Leone and Liberia (Epstien et al.2007: 7). Under the slogan of promoting democracy, America committed acts of violation to provide a home security from terrorism.

The adoption of freedom as a concept went through skeptical ideologies and strategies that questioned U.S. credibility. The genuine question to raise here is whether democratization efforts are successful or just hinderers to the destabilization and the foundations of some countries?

3. US Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan

On October the 7th, 2001 the United States of American attacked Afghanistan as an anticipatory self-defense measure after the 9/11 attacks. The motto of the campaign is to preserve global liberal values and deter terrorism which threatens the international community.

The direct and side effects of the Operation Enduring Freedom(OEF) drove the world to question its legality in the first place because under the UN Charter there is no law which permits a nation to attack or occupy a foreign country under an anticipatory self-defense basis.

Attacking a nation under this pretext suspected the US international perspective of preserving freedom and global liberal values.

This campaign with all what it encompasses will show how far the concept of freedom could be adapted in the American policy.

Campaign set for international goals; preserving global liberal values and supports the global war against terrorism. The legality of the drone attacks on Afghanistan was due to some major reasons. The attacks, according to the American security, are set to attain the following objectives.

1. The destruction of all El Qaeda terrorist networks.
2. Guaranteeing a gradual progress toward a political and a democratic reform.
3. The removal of the Taliban and enhancing a new established government.
4. Preserving the global liberal values that are threatened by international terrorism.
5. Avert humanitarian disasters.

4. Violations of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan

Discussing human rights in International Law has always been about the status of individuals' rights (Lowe2002: 66-67). Undeniably, the political and legal strategy asserted under the slogan of 'war on terror' had serious damages on the social and civil sphere. In targeted countries as Afghanistan, human rights are infringed with a total denial to IL of Human Rights.

The Afghans became the victims and hostages in the US war against their government (Koechler 2002: 7-8). The campaign in Afghanistan on October 7, 2001, covered a military humanitarian intervention that did not serve humanitarian ends for what it encompassed as collateral damage to the Afghan human rights.

The rhetorical humanitarian intervention in Afghanistan curtailed an international humanitarian norm in its commencement.

U.S. military force established numerous prisons in Afghanistan; 'the Bagram air base facility' contained more than six hundred prisoners most of them were Afghan nationals (qtd. in Shah 2010). These prisoners were kept and held without any due process of law or fair trial. They were subjected to torture resulted in death casualties (112). The detainees were initially shackled and exposed to an inhuman standard of detention.

They were in cramped conditions, excessive heat, poor sanitation, breaching measures of religious beliefs of those prisoners; their photographs were spread around the world (Duffy 2005:382).

The status quo of Afghan detainees proves that US military forces are willingly 'guilty of bluntly disregarding and systematically contravening the IL of human rights' (Shah2010: 113). President Bush designated that over 650 Guantanamo prisoners, captured in Afghanistan after November 2001, are "enemy combatants".

He denied them any right as prisoners of war, who would be entitled to the protection of the Geneva Conventions.

The right to humanitarian intervention to stop genocide and other massive violations of human rights was always welcomed by the international community even though it does not literally exist within its clauses (Kohen 2003:219).

The de facto intervention in Afghanistan did not attain the fundamental basis it was set for. OEF was not intended to stabilize the country or relieve its humanitarian crisis. The purpose was to topple the Taliban regime and to expedite El Qaeda in Afghanistan.

The two objectives were apparently realized but stability and humanitarian goals were clearly subordinated, which lead to fatal costs of the operation (Clausewitz). In his report “Operation Enduring Freedom: why high rate of civilian casualties?” Carl Conetta estimated the civilian loss between 1000-3000 civilian deaths due to aerial bombardments (Clausewitz 2002).

The last decade of the twentieth century witnessed a massive escalation in the use of force towards state’s sovereignty under the whim of the right of self-defense. US in its attacks on Afghanistan proclaimed its inherent right of self defense against what it allegedly called an armed attack.

What most scholars and politicians agreed on thereafter, is that the military intervention in a sovereign state was unjustified neither under the UN Charter nor under the norms of customary IL. By attacking Afghanistan US curtailed an inherent right of a state’s sovereignty and international norms. Thus, it is a pertinent fact to shed light on how US curtailed these global norms of inter-state relations (Shah 2010:101).

Following the Heinous attacks on New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington the UNSC adapted a resolution on September 12, 2001 in which it condemned the attacks of the 9/11 and expressed its determination to combat all forms of terrorism in accordance with the UN Charter.

Article three of the resolution urged all states to cooperate to bring to justice those responsible for these monstrous acts. It asserted a total responsibility of the Security Council to treat issues of international peace and security (Smith and Thorp 2010:2).

The UN Charter, to which all the member states adhere, provided that all the UN state members are recommended to settle international disputes peacefully without any unconventional use of force except in self-defense (War in Afghanistan 8). The UN Charter in article 2(4) prohibits the use of massive military force in self-defense except in two main situations. First, states can use self-defense as a reaction to an armed attack. Second, states may use force with the approval of the SC (Smith and Thorp 2; Magnusson 2). The right to self-defense was scrutinized in article 51 of the UN charter in which states are authorized to act if an ‘armed attack’ occurred.

The UNSC did not authorize the US military intervention in Afghanistan. This campaign on Afghanistan was not considered legitimate self defense under article 51 of the UN charter because the 9/11 attacks did not acquire the condition of an armed attack.

The attacks were not attributed to another state, it is an aggression perpetrated by a group of people considered as non-state actors. Even if the attacks were launched by a state, any act in self-defense must meet certain requirements set forth in the 19th century *Caroline* case, and cited approvingly by the (ICJ) in the *Nicaragua* judgment 22 and the *Nuclear Weapons* advisory opinion. Pursuant to the *Caroline* standard, there must be a "necessity of self-defense, instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation" and the acts must not be "unreasonable or excessive" (War in Afghanistan 9).

The US claimed that OEF is a war on terror, however, in retrospect to the UN Charter article 2(4) of state sovereignty any violent act, use of force or threat is considered a violation to the state sovereignty and curtailing the customary international law (12). Using force against terrorists (non-state actors) such as El Qaeda in another state's territory proclaiming an inherent right of self-defense is illegal. Considering the terrorist act of 9/11 as an 'armed attack'; the reaction of US after four weeks did not much the criteria of the realm of self-defense.

Under Webster *formula* the response should be underway and that the aim is to deter it. Once the attack is over and there was no instant of reprisal. The US aftermath 9/11 attacks should legally justify the use of force in these circumstances because its alibi is not compatible with the UN Charter (Kohen 2003: 209).

5. American Failure in Preserving Global Liberal Values

There is no denial that power and violence contributed effectively in history in general and in international politics in particular. An IL and governing norms do exist; American policy is particularly interested in promoting and spreading liberty because it is the core value and the identity of the American creed.

Samuel Huntington argued in his book, *The Third Wave, Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, (1991) that "The United States is the premier democratic country of the modern world, and its identity as a nation is inseparable from its commitment to liberal and democratic values" (30). Thus, spreading freedom and liberal values for American politics is an expansion to human liberty. US as a western liberal government repeatedly believed in humanitarian reasons to intervene in other state's jurisdictions to promote

liberal values abridged in that state and securing individual freedom in the corresponding state.

The campaign on Afghanistan is a fiasco “It dislodged a despicable Taliban government that gave bin Laden refuge, but in the proces it bombed villages, markets, weddings, and civilians, killing thousands” (qtd. in Loshe 2009: 17). The strategy adopted by the American military forces not only limited the collective freedom of a state as a vivid organ in international relations but also was detrimental to individual’s rights of the Afghan people (Koechler 2002: 7).

Igniting the state of self-defense by the United States on Afghanistan under the slogan of war on terror and later on other countries, opened gates on a very contemporary crisis of a fellow pathology by other states to the new constituted concept (use of force) by the US.

States around the world may get tempted to settle their disputes with their adversaries by using force and a military intervention under the whim of ‘war on terror’. The fatal result from the propagation of this doctrine will result in radical eclipse of the ‘New World Order’ announced in 1991 by President Bush Senior (4).

The war in Afghanistan witnessed a tangible failure on an international perspective because the US failed to abide by their requirement and infringed an international norm that is obeyed and applied all over the world. In a given crisis such as applying the right of self defense in Afghanistan the US prioritized its national security over the UN Charter of non-intervention and IL.

American unipolar act of abridging the set of universal norms questions its credible partnership in international human rights protection. US does not band its citizen’s by international norms, instead, it prioritizes its domestic laws.

Legally speaking, American policies in Afghanistan marginalized the UN and SC and undermined the international community. By its acts of violation America served its self interest.

The negative effects which envisage the failure of OEF, in its mission to preserving global liberal values, is its fatal and wrongful implication of the concept of freedom worldwide.

The OEF engendered the following consequences on an international scale. Large- scale political and social destabilization in geo-strategically sensitive regions; the impossibility of sustainable social and economic development; new divisions of society and political systems- internally and externally-along religious, racial, ethnic lines; economic deprivation of the masses of the people in the affected regions; marginalization of existing international structures such as the UN. (Koechler 2002: 10)

Curtailling a customary IL was evidence on the misrepresentation of American principles and values. This showed that US unconsciously failed to protect a vital norm which is respecting IL through which global freedom may flourish.

The new strategy that the US implemented after the 9/11 threatened the sovereignty of small states. Those states are confronted by the war on terror by hegemonic powers to which they have to submit. Apposing this alienation would risk them to be labeled ‘enemies of humanity’ and risk to be marginalized in international affairs.

In this context of a unipolar hegemony and under these circumstances, small states are deprived from an inherent right of state’s sovereignty although it was guaranteed by the UN. These States are left without an alternative with a limited level of national freedom. In other words, the new doctrine not only infringed the right of nations in sovereignty and self-determination, it set new paradigms for the definition of a state sovereignty and freedom that are contested by a preponderance power (5).

Thus, America declared itself the guardian of freedom in the world and rejected any partnership or multilateral behavior in reaction to the world security. Doing so, the US failed to preserve its main objective rather than succeed.

Promoting freedom in the world will never be the concerns of one unipolar nation; it is a multi-dimensional matter needs to be shared by the whole world to secure its tangible success.

6. The Future of Freedom in American Foreign Policy

The means to ‘export American values’ as Chomsky argued in his book *Profit over People- Neoliberalism and Global Order*, rose a plethora of questions on how US will extend its unipolar force global hegemony (qtd. in Kennedy and Lucas 2005: 309).

The primordial mission, of spreading democracy all over the world, that America bore since WWI till now dug its trace in the world history. However, American image worldwide still fade since it’s not clear yet whether U.S. policy ultimately succeeded in spreading valuable, tangible and practical values around the world, or has it just traced cannels in other states to legitimately interweave and penetrates those nation’s system of government?

Hence, to promote freedom and democracy and pave the path to transition from authoritarian to democratic political system became U.S. priority’s goal and genuinely endorsed in U.S. foreign policy worldwide (Huntington 1991: 192-93).

The universalization of liberal democracy was seen as a unique political model without any alternative to it. In this sense Fukuyama in his article “End

of History and the Last Man” 1989 saw liberal democracy as “the ideal that will govern the material world in the long run”.

Hence, liberal democracy appeared to be new universal ideology evolutes in the western hemisphere as a “final form of human government”. For sure liberal democracy is the effective ideological system set so far by western governments but its effectiveness worldwide and its success is still questionable. Afghanistan war was the red card US had received from the worldwide community for the illegality of the US intervention in the country.

US envisaged a misrepresentation of the American creed of freedom in denial to; state sovereignty and human rights, and more dramatically to IL norms. Cuadro14).

The intervention amalgamated Democracy promotion with a military intervention. This act was interpreted and seen throughout the world as an illegitimate act with peril consequences on human lives. The tremendous act of war in Afghanistan damaged the legitimacy of democracy promotion.

The bitter result of war was not exclusive only on Afghanistan and Middle East, many other countries witnessed this pushback as the color revolution in Georgia, Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan and other post-Soviet states. The U.S. democracy programs were essential contributors in these events (Cuadro 2011:14). However, U.S. democracy aid in Georgia, Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan were gradual and modest in its nature still the continuous dramatic revolutionary interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq exacerbated many observers’ conclusions about the fact of U.S. legitimacy worldwide. They are convinced that U.S. legitimacy was lost under Bush Administration’s programs (15).

Conclusion

Abridging the right of state sovereignty and violating the Afghan human rights were the two fatal results of the campaign.

A free and sovereign state was occupied and attacked without any credible reasons and international violations of the nation’s right in self-determination.

In addition, the human rights of the Afghan people were deteriorating because of the war circumstances. American objective was to spread and preserve freedom in the world, but the actions and deeds showed that it’s passing the concept by.

How the concept of freedom is seen by Americans and interpreted by American government do not cope with what their foreign policies implement in preserving freedom and global liberal values. Freedom in US minds, thoughts and actions is reshaping depending on the area of interest of the American policy.

One could be tempted to consider that the US advises the rest of the world “do what I say but not what I do” (qtd. in Kohen 2003:229). It is true that the US has the most powerful military position in the world; however, possessing a military power totally differs from legally using it as Rousseau’s stated in his *Social Contract* “the strongest is never strong enough to be always the master, unless he transforms strength into rights and obedience into duty” (29).

Albeit it is wishful thinking to see the world reigned with effective and obeyed international norms such as respecting human rights, state sovereignty, and an equal inter-state paradigm of treatment. Still, Nations endeavor to see US supremacy flourishing by using universal norms in adapting concepts, laws and their applicability (Cuadro 2011: 14).

Bibliography

1. Berlin, Sir Isaiah, 1958, “Two concepts of liberty”: An inaugural lecture delivered before.
2. The University of Oxford on 31 October 1958. (n. p): Clarendon Press, *Africa-Wide Information*. [Web. 4 Nov. 2012].
3. Bertram, Christopher, 2004, *Routledge philosophy guidebook to Rousseau and the social Contract*, Psychology Press, London. Ebook.
4. Carl Conetta, 15 January 2002, *Operation enduring freedom: why a higher rate of civilian casualties?*, PDA. Briefing Report 11, [Web. Aug. 2014].
5. Carothers, Thomas, 2007, *US democracy promotion during and after Bush*,
6. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, DC. Ebook.
7. Clausewitz, Carl Von, “A Critical appraisal of Operation Enduring Freedom and the Afghanistan war”. Appendix4. The limits of the Bonn agreement and the challenges facing the interim government. [Web. Sep. 2014].
8. Cuadro, Mariela, 2011, "Universalisation of liberal democracy, American exceptionalism an racism". (2011): 30-43. [Web. Mar. 2014].
9. Dahl, Robert Alan, 2006, *On political equality*, Yale University Press, US. Ebook
10. Duffy, Helen, 2005, *The " War on Terror" and the framework of international law*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. Ebook.
11. Epstein, Susan B, Nina M. Serafino, and Francis T. Miko, "Democracy promotion: Cornerstone of US Foreign Policy", library of congress washington d.c congressional research service, 2007. Web. May. 2014.
12. Fukuyama, Francis, 1992, "The end of history and the last man". *Harmondsworth, Penguins*. [Web. May. 2014].
13. Harrison, Kevin; Boyd, Tony (ed.), 2003, *Understanding political ideas and movements*, Manchester University Press, Manchester. Ebook.
14. Harrington, Ralph, c, “Mill and Freedom: Individual liberty, government and society in the thought of John Stuart Mill”. [Web. Nov. 2013].
15. Huntington, Samuel P., 1991, *The third wave, Democratization in the late twentieth century*, University of Oklahoma Press, New York. Ebook.
16. Hurtado, Jimena, “Jean-Jacques Rousseau and François Quesnay on Freedom: Autonomy vs. Thought of John Stuart Mill”. *Ebrary XML* [Web. Nov. 2013].

17. Kasper, Wolfgang, 2005, *John Locke, Philosopher of freedom, in memoriam. Eleuteria* 3.
18. King, Richard, 1996, *Civil rights and the idea of freedom*, University of Georgia Press, Georgia. *EbraryXML*
19. Kennedy, Liam, and Scott Lucas, "Enduring Freedom: Public diplomacy and US foreign policy." *American Quarterly* 57.2 (2005): 309-333. [Web. Aug. 2014].
20. Koechler, Hans, 2002, "The war on terror, its impact on the sovereignty of states, and its implications for Human Rights and liberties". The National Council of Churches in the Philippines (NCCP), the World Council of Churches and the Christian Conference, Asia, Manila, 25 September 2002. Lecture. [Web. Sep. 2014].
21. Kohen, Marelo G, 2003, "The use of force by the United States after the end of the cold war, and its impact on international law". *United States Hegemony and the Foundations of International Law*, ed. Byers, Michael, and Georg Nolte, 197-232. Cambridge: University Press. [Web. Oct. 2014].
22. Lowe, Vaughan, and Colin Warbrick, (ed.), 2002, *The United Nations and the principles of international law: Essays in memory of Michael Akehurst*, Routledge, London. Ebook.
23. Már Magnusson, Andrés, 4 Aug. 2009, "Self defence or reprisals? The legality of the United States. Response to the 9/11 attacks". Lokaverkefni. [Web. Sep. 2014].
24. Mill, John Stuart, 1999, *On Liberty*, Broadview Press, Cambridge, 1999. Ebook.
25. Patterson, Orlando, 2011, "Freedom and 9/11." *Democracy: A Journal of Ideas* 22 (2011). [Web, Apr. 2014].
26. Pomper, Gerald M. and Weiner, Marc D, *The future of American democratic politics: Principles and practices*, Routgers University Press, New Jersey. Ebook.
27. Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract, book I, Ch. 1*. US: *Many Editions*. Ebook. 1690. *Second Treatise of Government. Two Treatises of Government* (1980). US. Ebook.
28. Schmitz, David; Brennan, Jason, 2011, *Brief history of liberty*, UK: Wiley-Blackwell (n.d.): *Ebrary XML*. [Web. 5 Nov. 2012].
29. Schwartz, Howard I, 2006, "How notions of public good constrain liberty in John Locke and the early liberty tradition". Web. 17Apr. 2013.
30. Simon, ShawMiller (.ed), 1859, *On Liberty*. US: Yale University Press, New Haven, ct: *Ebrary XML*. [Web. 16 Nov. 2012].
31. Simpson, Matthew, 2006, *Rousseau's theory of freedom*. A&C Black.
32. Sikander Ahmed Shah, 2010, *War on terrorism: self defense, Operation Enduring Freedom, and the U.S. drone attacks in Pakistan*, 9 Wash. U. Glob. Stud. L. Rev. [Web. 16 Nov. 2012].
33. Smith, Tony, 2012, *America's mission: The United States and the worldwide struggle for democracy*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey. Ebook.
34. Smith, Been, and Arabella Thorp, 26 February 2010, "The legal basis for the invasion of Afghanistan". International Affairs and Defence Section.. [Web. Sep. 2014].
35. Stivers, Richard, 2008, *The illusion of freedom and equality*, SUNY Press, New York. Ebook.
36. Loshe, Max, 2009, "How has neoliberalism influenced US foreign politics". Gotland University. Web. Sep. 2014].
37. UN Security Council, 2001, Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) [on threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts], 28 September 2001, S/RES/1373(2001), available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3c4e94552a.html> [accessed 10 Sep. 2017 War in Afghanistan (2001–present). [Web. Sep. 2011].

38. West, Edwin G, 1965, *Liberty and education: John Stuart Mill's dilemma*. *Philosophy*, 40.152 (1965): 129-142. [Web. 17 Apr. 2013].