

Západočeská univerzita v Plzni

Fakulta filozofická

Bakalářská práce

**The United States and its role in international
conflicts and the UN with practical analysis**

Klára Zabilanská

Plzeň 2014

Západočeská univerzita v Plzni

Fakulta filozofická

Katedra anglického jazyka a literatury

Studijní program Filologie

**Studijní obor Cizí jazyky pro komerční praxi
Kombinace angličtina – francouzština**

Bakalářská práce

**The United States and its role in international
conflicts and the UN with practical analysis**

Klára Zabilanská

Vedoucí práce:

Bc. Skyland Václav Kobylak

Katedra anglického jazyka a literatury

Fakulta filozofická Západočeské univerzity v Plzni

Plzeň 2014

Prohlašuji, že jsem práci zpracovala samostatně a použila jen uvedených pramenů a literatury.

Plzeň, duben 2014

.....

Chtěla bych poděkovat svému vedoucímu bakalářské práce Bc. Skylandu Václavu Kobylakovi za odborné vedení, pomoc a rady při zpracování této práce.

Table of contents

Foreword	1
1 Historical context	3
1.1 Afghanistan.....	3
1.1.1 The Soviet invasion	4
1.2 Iraq.....	6
1.2.1 The Iran-Iraq War (The First Gulf War).....	7
1.2.2 The Second Gulf War (1990-1991)	10
2 The United Nations Organization	12
2.1 UN bodies	13
2.2 The role of US in UN	14
3 Afghanistan	15
3.1 The cause of conflict in 2001	16
3.2 Development.....	18
3.3 The end of the conflict.....	19
3.4 Impact of conflict and contemporary situation.....	21
3.5 UN solution.....	23
4 Iraq	24
4.1 The cause of conflict in 2003	26
4.2 Development.....	27
4.3 The end of conflict.....	28
4.4 Impact of conflict and contemporary situation.....	28
4.5 UN solution.....	30
5 Comparison of solutions taken in conflicts	32
6 Criticism	33
6.1 Another point of view	33
6.1.1 Western point of view	34
6.1.2 Eastern point of view	36

6.2	Conspiracy theories	37
7	Conclusion	42
8	Abstract	45
9	Résumé.....	46
10	Endnotes	47
11	Bibliography.....	49
12	Appendices	53
12.1	Appendix I – Questionnaire 1	53
12.2	Appendix II – Questionnaire 2	57
12.3	Appendix III – FBI records	60

Foreword

The aim of this thesis is to analyse the role of the United States in modern international conflicts and to describe its position in the United Nations Organization. Because of the number and large extent of these conflicts, this work will be focused on the situation in the Middle East, solely Afghanistan and Iraq, since September 11, 2001 up to the present. Although conflicts in this area have been studied in detail since the airborne attack on the World Trade Centre in New York, it has significant origin in the second half of the 20th century. Two conflicts could be highlighted as a notional beginning of an American interest in this area – the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan (1979 - 1989) and the Gulf War, also known as the Operation Desert Storm (1990 - 1991).

The thesis is divided into two parts – theoretical and practical. The historical background that is necessary to understand the context of conflicts is mentioned in the first theoretical part and the analysis itself follows. Ensuing chapters are mainly interested in the US methods. The work will reveal where was the first problem that could have been substantive for outbreak of war, steps taken over the whole course of the conflict, how the situation was dealt with (and whether it was solved) and what its results and impacts are up to now. In connection with the international character of both wars it is also necessary to evaluate the procedure of the UN and find out which solutions came into force in order to find compromise and make peace. At the end of this work there will be important notes made on some theories that are not officially approved but often discussed.

Essential sources for this theme are numerous – books about history, nation and those describing general information about Afghanistan and Iraq were the most useful for the theoretical section. On the other hand, the same sources are not fully sufficient for the practical section. Some books contain also this modern history but for complete and contemporary information it is necessary to use academic texts and various media and news websites as well. The following

chapters thus deal strictly with Afghanistan and Iraq in the context of American involvement.

This work should serve to the reader as a brief but valuable summary on the issues involved and possibly leave room for further research on the topic.

1 Historical context

1.1 Afghanistan

In order to gain a complex idea of this topic we will start with a short introduction of the states themselves.

Afghanistan is a relatively small landlocked country situated in the middle of South and Central Asia hidden by great mountains – *Hindu Kush* and *Pamir Mountains*. This state constitutes one of the poorest countries of this area because, besides other reasons, its landscape does not permit any extensive agriculture and moreover it offers a great opportunity for dissenters – *Islamic fundamentalists* – who fight the official national policy and international cooperation.

In terms of religion, Afghanistan has one of the strictest Muslim rules in the world. As far as Afghan history is concerned, the country saw a short period of relative relaxation to its strict order, mainly in the years 1960 – 1970. Although it is difficult to imagine relaxed manners in strict and reserved Afghanistan it was a reality in the country for a short period of time. In these years, *Kabul* was a cultural and fashion centre. It was a meeting place of the old traditions and modern trends. Women were “allowed” to dress up according to their tastes even on condition that they were more exposed and they were perceived equal to men in area of education and choice of career. In 1969, even the *Vogue* magazine was interested in local fashion and so a *Vogue* team was sent to Afghanistan in order to collect information and photos with intention to publish an article in the December issue. With regard to this bright past the sadder is the present where women are suppressed and denied to live according to their own consideration. After the *Taliban* took control of the country, however, it fell to a much stricter, heavy-handed regime.

In spite of the fact that the territory is not vast, it is impossible to find a unifying executive body that would ensure prospering economy, settle the political situation, to establish the appropriate infrastructure and safe living conditions for inhabitants. Up to the present this is unfortunately impossible to

establish because of continuing power struggles. Despite existing government and democratically elected president there are many traditional tribes all around the territory that make the official power valid only in the capital city (Kabul) and other close big cities. This situation has remained unchanged already for centuries. Neither the authoritarian emirs could not change this aspect, nor the pro-soviet communists despite their respectable try.

1.1.1 The Soviet invasion

The Saur Revolution in 1978 was an important turning point in the history of Afghanistan. Most of all it ended decades-lasting reign of monarchy and unity of the state itself. The former regime was replaced with new pro-soviet communist movement that did not have many supporters beyond the borders of the capital city. New governing party *PDPA*¹ relied on the soviet support and help in case of riots.

Unfortunately, the split country was not the only problem of new regime. Power struggles occurred also inside the party and its leadership changed few times. In 1978, Hafizullah Amin became the leader of the party after series of murders of his main opponent and his adherents. New government started to introduce new edicts and it caused huge wave of immigration of influential intelligence to Pakistan. Dissatisfaction with the new regime manifested soon. The inability to control the whole area brought out rising of self-proclaimed leaders all around the territory who had different ambitions than the official governing party.

Although PDPA tried to get more supporters, the number of its adversaries rose and already in 1978, majority of inhabitants was against. This fact forced H. Amin to ask the Soviets for help fearing uprising against the party. The *USSR* intended to help Afghanistan but they did not support the present leader because his reign was unsustainable. The Soviets found new candidate – Babrak Kamal – who was meant to be the new president (it was already the third putsch in two

¹ People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan

last years). Distrusted by the Soviets, Amin was assassinated by the soviet special forces.

During Karmal's presidency, Afghanistan experienced a great development in the field of industry and modernization of infrastructure. However, riots did not cease. Arrival of the Soviet troops even made the conflict more intense and provoked US support of the opposition. The US provided revolutionaries with money and munition to be able to fend off the attack of enemy. At the beginning the troops were not perceived as occupants because it was believed that they will stop increasing intensity of civil war. Because of the decreasing number of native soldiers, the Soviets were gradually forced to fight the opposition, however, their first target was only to protect and help.

We can clearly divide the Soviet war into four phases. In the first phase (1980 – 1982), the aim of the Soviet troops was to secure big cities and important roads and to wage attacks against the opposition. They successfully gained control over the given area but only because of opposition's inability of defence. However, the dissents found the tactics and initiated partisan combats.

In the second phase or war (1982 – 1985), the Soviets focused on damaging economic and social bases and it significantly affected the native inhabitants. This approach caused the definite loose of the rest of Afghan support. After Mikhail Gorbachev's ascension to the post of general secretary in 1985, the approach of the Soviets changed. Distrusted by the Soviets, B. Karmal was deprived of his function. In 1986, Mohammad Najibullah (another former member of PDPA) became new Afghan president.

In spite of creation of new regime the problems still remained and civil war continued. The third phase did not bring any new progress for the Soviets but the opposition grew stronger thanks to the international help from the US. In that time, 1986 – 1987, American support reached maximum. This help followed adoption of the *Reagan Doctrine* n°166 (1985) concerning the national security that should have made the enemy to leave Afghan territory. However, the departure of the Soviet troops had already been preparing.

Reagan stated that “Our mission is to nourish and defend freedom and democracy [...] We must not break faith with those who are risking their lives – on every continent, from Afghanistan to Nicaragua – to defy Soviet-supported aggression and secure rights which have been ours from birth [...] Support of freedom fighters is self-defence [...]” [1]

The last phase, dated 1987 – 1988, was about Soviet departure. The Soviet leadership focused mainly on protection of its troops and roads necessary for depart. It was also time of placing antipersonnel mines along the main roads that remain there up to now.

The Reagan Doctrine contained also the help connected to cooperation between political parties included in the matter. After the Soviet war the US insisted on creation of the alliance of seven respected parties in order to get permission for being present at international meetings. In 1988, this alliance was officially recognized by the US and the UN.

In conclusion, Mohammad Najibullah intended to maintain the reign peacefully but after departure of Soviet troops Afghanistan experienced even larger disputes and disintegration of central power. Great segmentation of the whole area and power struggles predestined the situation for next decades. Parallel existence of communist regime and its opposition in 80’ reinforced the sense of fragmentation. In following years power struggles between remaining pressure groups continued and none of them had enough potency to unify the territory and conclude peace. At the beginning of 1990, one group of revolutionaries decided, after series of attacks against native inhabitants, to support those leaders who fight only in order of maintaining the original Islamic values. This group, renamed Taliban, armed with the US support, became the mortal enemy for the US itself later on.

1.2 Iraq

Iraq is a country situated in Western Asia surrounded by many neighbour states – *Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria* and two others – *Iran and Kuwait* –

the most important countries for purposes of this thesis. Already in the past this area was a part of many political systems that always led to numerous conflicts. Although the country and its capital city itself – *Baghdad* – had always been an important cultural, political and educational centre, the influence of plentiful dynasties and reigns caused its gradual stagnation and decline. Later on, in the 20th century when the oil was found, Iraq experienced great recovery and the state became a part of world's interest again – either positive or negative.

Nowadays, this country is most often discussed in connection with struggles between various religious groups, but also in context of worldwide terrorist attacks. “In a simplified way it is said to be the consequence of war in 2003 and destruction of Saddam Hussein's dictatorial regime.” [2]

In general, Iraq is considered to be multi-ethnic and multi-religious country from the very beginning and thus its identity can be maintained only by means of dictatorial regime otherwise the situation would turn into chaos and struggles between religious groups. The religious tension became world-discussed thanks to the western media that revealed the cruel machinations (which had existed already before the Hussein's regime) but also made the whole thing excessively exaggerated. Situation in this area intensified after the Iran-Iraq War, the Second Gulf War and the Iraq War in 2003.

1.2.1 The Iran-Iraq War (The First Gulf War)

The new president's dictatorial regime could be marked as an essential aspect of both conflicts at the end of the 20th century. In 1979, Saddam Hussein was proposed as a presidential candidate. He did not hesitate to take an oath and the new era could begin. As soon as he was inaugurated he started to implement his own rules, such as the ethnic cleansing in institutions, prohibition of critics, censorships of media, abolition of freedom of speech and interdict of membership in oppositional political parties. Arrests, tortures and executions were not exceptional either.

Saddam Hussein's regime was one of the cruellest dictatorships of its time based on the personality cult. As autocrat he took control over all leading positions in the public service.

The reasons for the first conflict – the Iran-Iraq War, dated 1980-1988, - were not exceptionally religious. Though, certain animosity exists between those two nationalities, this conflict burst out because of disputes about the territory and borders. Many conventions were signed to settle down the situation but the peace had not been kept for long. The massive conflict started already in 1979 when the first Iraq airborne attack hit Iran. Since these attacks became more frequent. The reason why the war had still persisted is clear – Saddam Hussein was afraid of opposition and loss of his leading position. He was hoping to cause chaos by attacks and to gain the power over both countries, but his prognosis of situation development was wrong. His aim was to become the most powerful person in the Persian Gulf and the leader of the Middle East.

In 1980, Iraq and Iran stopped their international relations, moreover peace and territorial conventions were annulled. A year after the superiority switched and Iran conquered strategic important area – the city Khorramshahr. However, S. Hussein wanted to end struggles in order not to be called the aggressor who provoked the whole conflict, he did not accomplish any goal. Despite these pointless efforts the struggles continued and, in 1984, both countries started to attack one each other tankers in the Persian Gulf. The UN inspectors confirmed that Iraq used chemical weapons.

In spite of the fact that the conflict claimed countless number of victims especially on population the situation did not seem to be coming to the end. In 1987, the warring states started to attack oil extractive devices. At that time the phase of city struggles began. In reaction to these steps the UN issued the Resolution 598 that called for an immediate ending of combats and the end of the Iran-Iraq War – Iraq accepted, Iran did not accept it immediately. However, Iran finally also accepted the new Resolution (after few more chemical attacks and Iraq territory re-conquest), Iraq is subsequently unwilling to sign the peace

agreement because S. Hussein was sure he would have been called the primal aggressor causing the war and Iraq would have to face the consequences. The USSR should have been the mediator leading peace talks. At last, the peace agreement was concluded after the Iraq invasion in Kuwait.

Iraq and Iran were the only actively warring states but the conflict was strongly internationalized. Iran had unfortunately only weak support in the Middle East area. Those who supported Iran were - Syria and Libya, on the other hand, Iraq was enjoying backup of Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait who were afraid of Iran Islamic revolution. This was the reason why they were providing Iraq with finance and other non-material privileges even though it caused immense impact on their economy. Nevertheless, these were not the only supporters of Iraq because Kuwait asked for help the US and the USSR to provide them with security for tankers, guns supply included. The US had two reasons to join this conflict – firstly, it was providing security for states who asked for and, secondly, it was the instable situation in this region. In the concrete it means that the US president Ronald Reagan wanted to prevent raise of the USSR influence in Middle East. US participation in this conflict was the only reason why finally Iraq won the war. In 1984, the US and Iraq renewed the international relations and it specifically means technical, food and economic aid for Iraq.

In this conflict, Hussein only confirmed his manipulative skills and convinced almost the whole Middle East that he was the hero who protected the other states from aggressor – Iran. However, this false propaganda did not strengthen his position as a president. Consequences of his actions were destructive – complete exhaustion of economics, paralysis of industry, civil loss, decreasing level of living and financial dependence on allies. The rapid growth of Iraq army increased fear of neighbour states.

“The eight-year-long Iran-Iraq War expressed in numbers comprises costs of 453millions euro [...] with regard to costs and number of victims this conflict is considered as one of the cruellest of its time. Precise estimation of number of victims is

unknown - it greatly changes according to the source - it is estimated up to 1million.” [3]

1.2.2 The Second Gulf War (1990-1991)

The very beginning of this conflict can be considered the dispute over oil and strategic position of a port that Iraq was longing for. Iraq was negotiating with Kuwait hiring its islands in order to establish an Iraq port that would be situated more in the centre of The Persian Gulf. Despite of insistence from the Iraq side, Kuwait refused and required paying back of the Iraq debt from the time of the Iran-Iraq war. In connection to this fact Saddam Hussein accused Kuwait and Saudi Arabia of intentional rising of oil extraction amount that was ordered by *OPEC* and so Iraq suffered from money lost from oil sale.

In 1990, S. Hussein required suspension of Iraq debts repayment, stabilization of oil prices and establishing the supportive programme for his state under threat of gaining it forcibly. And so the Iraq army moved to the borders with Kuwait and started to occupy its territory. S. Hussein claimed that he wanted to protect local revolutionaries, overthrow the old regime and to set up new one in order to justify his steps. The same year he established interim government that should have assured the strategic and economic Iraq interests. None accepted this establishment and so Iraq proclaimed Kuwait as its province and annexed it.

Iraq did not presume consequences of this approach. In response to this, the US and Europe imposed an embargo against Iraq, forbade the import of Iraq and Kuwait oil and stopped the weapon sale and entire cooperation so as the UN Security Council had determined sanctions, imposed a ban on oil export and embargo on weapon sale. This situation was only getting worse and led to misappropriation of Kuwait property and growth of Iraq army. The reaction of the Middle East was not as strict as the western one but local states refused to support S. Hussein and even required the pull-out of the Iraq army from Kuwait.

A coalition with George Herbert Walker Bush as a leader that would be in charge of expulsion the aggressor from Kuwait was established as an answer to

American request. The US joined the coalition in order to protect its own interests that concerned the oil from the Persian Gulf that they were dependent on (as well as China and Japan) – after the annexation of Kuwait Iraq owned two-times bigger oil supply which represent 20 % of the world stock.

Although, Saudi Arabia agreed to provide the US army with military base, the “Middle East world” reacted differently and mostly negatively. After all Iraq was forced by circumstances to conclude peace with Iran. S. Hussein claimed that the 8-year-long war with Iran was pointless and states started to cooperate. When Iran support was assured S. Hussein easily managed to close the Kuwait borders and approached to hold captives to ransom the other states. However, this step was against the human rights held by the UN and so Iraq was forced to release the captives. Finally, the UN issued the Resolution 678 which provided the coalition with permission to drive the aggressor out of Kuwait in case that Iraq did not do it voluntarily.

Adoption that was taken by the UN after the default on ultimatum (*Desert Storm*) was supposed to force Iraq to leave Kuwait. The strategy was to cut them off supply, attacks on the infrastructure, the troops and arm depots. These actions were accompanied by numerous demonstrations in the Middle East. However, the majority of inhabitants of western countries agreed there were also some disapproving attitudes.

Even though, Iraq intended to distract the world’s attention from Kuwait and the Persian Gulf crisis by its new strategy – attack Israel, they did not succeed because the US as a leader of coalition had calmed down the situation and persuaded Israel not to return fire. The coalition launched an offensive after the last refuse of the US ultimatum to move the troops from Kuwait. In first days they gained superiority over the territory. Many oil extracting devices were damaged during Iraq army retreat and massive let out of oil caused one of the most serious catastrophes in the human being history. Other conditions had to be fulfilled in connection with the defeat – such as acceptance of the UN’s resolution and revelation of the mine fields. As a consequence of the defeat the

annexation of Kuwait had to be annulled and Iraq had to accept another UN resolution – the Resolution 687 – so called the Mother of UN resolutions which ordered:

“to disarm, to highlight and destroy all weapons of mass destruction that belong to the property of Iraq, to set up borders between Iraq and Kuwait and admit its sovereignty, to release the local inhabitants and, finally, create a commission that would determine the damage caused in Kuwait and ensure its compensation of 30 % profit from the oil sale until complete repayment of the debt.” [4]

The world's view on this eastern situation is following. The Western Europe, the US, the USSR and Japan were fully supporting this solution. On the other hand, the Eastern world differed in opinions – they were usually supporting the idea of non-appropriate intervention in Kuwait but at the same time they were strictly refusing the coalition approach – they would let the countries to solve the problem on their own. Eventually, the US is considered by the east as the guilty party that had caused the problem only bigger in order to strengthen its own influence. In general, Saddam Hussein became so-called hero who made stand against the Western power. He got the support of many states such as Jordan, Libya, Tunisia, Yemen, Sudan, etc. and some resistance movements like *Hamaz*.

After this huge conflict there is an immense hatred on the East against the West. The conflict itself harmed Iraq the most because of subsequent repayment of the debt and the economic crisis. Official records concerning the toll do not exist and the total impact had an influence on the whole world because of oil price rise (of more than 50 %). 80 % of all expenses on the Gulf War were carried by the US.

2 The United Nations Organization

The United Nations Organization is an intergovernmental organization created in 1945 in San Francisco. Its Charter was a conclusion of the United Nations Conference on International Organization. The Organization was created

for the purpose of saving succeeding generations from war, defending fundamental human rights (as well as maintenance of men and women rights equality), guarding international agreements compliance, supporting freedom, promoting social progress and ameliorating the living conditions.

Working on the assumption that people would tolerate each other, unify in order to maintain international peace and security, stop using armed forces in common interest and ensure economic and social advancement the governments of future member states agreed on the present *Charter* and established international organization known as the United Nations Organization.

Let us divide the main purposes of the UN into two following points: firstly, the UN's intent is to maintain peace and security by means of adopting preventive measures, eliminating threats and suppressing aggression peacefully, justly and according to international law. Secondly, the UN intends to develop friendly relations among nations and achieve international cooperation that would ensure solution to the international problems.

2.1 UN bodies

The UN is composed of the following administrative bodies. The *General Assembly* may discuss any questions touching the present Charter or powers and functions of bodies and can advise the *Security Council* or the UN members. The General Assembly shall consist of all the members of the United Nations (each member state can have up to 5 representatives).

The Security Council assumes the responsibility for international peace and security. It is charged to act on behalf of its members. In special cases the Security Council can table a proposal to the General Assembly. It consists of fifteen members – five of them are permanent: the People's Republic of China (formerly The Republic of China), France, the Russian Federation (the USSR), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. Ten of them are non-permanent members that are elected by the General Assembly for a term of two years.

The *Economic and Social Council* may initiate studies and reports concerning economic, social, cultural, educational, health and other related matters and recommend the General Assembly with regard to it. The Economic and Social Council consists of fifty-four members elected by the General Assembly.

The authority of the *Trusteeship Council* includes submitting reports, accepting petitions and ensuring visits of the respective trust territories. Members of the Trusteeship Council are those who are administering trust authorities or others elected by the General Assembly.

The *International Court of Justice* is the principal judicial body of the UN and has to function in accordance to the present Charter. All members of the UN take part in the International Court of Justice.

The *Secretariat* consists of a *Secretary-General* and his staff needed to fulfil all the requirements of the UN. The Secretary-General is recommended by the Security Council and appointed by the General Assembly. The Secretary-General fulfils all tasks required by any of the bodies of the Organization and releases the annual report on the work of the UN. This body can also point out any matter that it considers a threat to security.

2.2 The role of US in UN

The United States of America is a founding member of the United Nations Organization and also has been a permanent member of the Security Council since 1945. As a permanent member the US takes part in several issues with connection to the UN.

First of all, the United States plays a crucial role in stabilizing peace and security. It means that it supports stabilization of critical situations, prevents conflicts from spinning out of control and state failures. Another issue where the US plays significant role concerns promotion of economic development and maintenance of democratic values. Defending human rights (fight with genocide and crimes against humanity), combating diseases and helping refugees are other large tasks for the US. The United States has also adopted quite a strict attitude to

disarmament (in order to reduce reliance on nuclear weapons) and climate changes that also afflict the world community.

The US is in the spotlight in terms of meeting challenges of the 21st century who is the principal founder and sponsor of the UN. It also tries to spread the UN reach by means of diverse programmes that target university students around the world. Purpose of these programmes is to inform students about current world issues and ameliorate their diplomatic skills.

3 Afghanistan

The UN had tried to interfere in power struggles between belligerent groups in Afghanistan already in 1994 They had sent a peacekeeping mission with *Tunisian Ministry of External Affairs* deputy Mahmúd Mistírí, as a leader, to initiate negotiations with leaders of local military groups and the exile intelligence in order to hand down power to the new Afghan government. Unfortunately, this plan failed because of new military – political group birth – the *Taliban*.

Taliban was Islamic fundamentalist political movement led by Mohammed Omar recruiting men coming from numerous Middle East states. *Kandahar* became their military base and they were supplied with weapons from Islam organizations from all over the world via Pakistan. Eventually, that big group of very well armed soldiers presented great power and threat for local enemies. Originally its objective was to stop struggles, make peace and establish divine order. They were believed to accomplish their goal only if everyone respected strict principles of orthodox Islam. The greatest Taliban potential consisted in its members because those were Muslim zealots ready to die in order to meet their liabilities in fight against Islam enemies.

This movement is well known for cooperation with terrorist organization *Al Qaeda*² and M. Omar for his close connection with Usama Bin Laden. It is said that their connection came from the time of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan

² Terrorist organization based in 1989 by Usama Bin Laden, contemporary symbol of terrorism

(1979 – 1989). M. Omar was looking up to him and became dependent on his support. The fact that Usama Bin Laden, in cooperation with the US, provided Afghanistan with weapons, recruits and also financial support later on is paradoxical with regard to future development of the situation. At the late nineties, Bin Laden had made a step to force M. Omar to adopt his militant tactics against the Western world and vision of *Jihad*.

“And kill them wherever you overtake them and expel them from wherever they have expelled you, and fitnah is worse than killing. And do not fight them at al-Masjid al- Haram until they fight you there. But if they fight you, then kill them. Such is the recompense of the disbelievers.” [5]

After the Al Qaeda terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 on the *World Trade Centre* in New York and partly on *Pentagon* in Washington, Pakistan president decided to support the US in oncoming conflict and so Afghanistan became fully dependent on Al Qaeda. After rejection of turning Bin Laden in to the US, M. Omar risked his life and Afghan welfare because his decision had led to dragging Afghanistan in open conflict.

3.1 The cause of conflict in 2001

This new Afghan movement was firmly supported because they were believed to bring peace back to Afghanistan by means of fighting rebel groups and their numbers were rapidly rising. Already in 1995, one third of the whole area was under their control.

Pakistan provided the Taliban with material support and also with soldiers because it was in its interests to establish new permanent regime that would calm the situation down and enable the trade. The Taliban was welcomed from the beginning by the general public because they assured cessation of looting, kidnapping of women and they were trying to stop corruption. However, gradually its members started to break the human rights and that caused huge Afghan disagreement wave and demonstrations all over the world.

The Taliban values had never been meant to be spread abroad and they did not threaten the Western world with Jihad until the US engaging in the conflict. Mohammed Omar only wanted his regime to be accepted on international level, though unsuccessfully.

Between 1995 and 2001, the Taliban took control of almost the whole territory and its opposition had been disintegrating because of deadening of the foreign interest (especially of Iran, Russia). On the other hand, the Taliban was strongly supported not only by Pakistan but also by Saudi Arabia. The war gained new dimension after the attacks on Iran consulate and assassination of eleven Iranian diplomats and few journalists. The conflict between Iran and Afghanistan or more precisely Pakistan was imminent. At the same in 1998, the attacks on American consulates in Kenya and Tanzania were also probably provoked by terrorist Usama Bin Laden. Although there is no credible proof the US revenged on terrorist bases in Afghanistan by airborne attacks.

However, it seemed that Afghanistan was trying to solve the problem diplomatically, later on it turned out that it was only a red herring. Further, the UN was not able to establish any peaceful solution for this chaotic situation continuing from the time already before the Soviet invasion.

In 2001, many attacks on civilians and human rights violations have caused creation of new UN resolution (1333) which contained sanctions and embargo on weapons supply. In reaction on this, the Afghan president Burhanuddin Rabbani tried to unify all existent anti-Taliban forces and instituted diplomatic activity. After European parliamentary session, he was accepted to present his speech concerning current situation. However, this approach had forced the leader of the Taliban and Al Qaeda to launch retaliatory measures and commit assassination of Ahmad Shah Massoud³. According to some Afghan testimonies this was the reason for American retaliatory measures against the Taliban. Although this was eve of another attack that should become the decisive for future development of international relations.

³ Afghan politician and military leader, significant figure of the Afghan resistance against the Soviet occupation

3.2 Development

It is said that the attacks on the World Trade Centre in 2001 were not the first initiated by Afghan terrorists. The WTC was attacked already in 1993. In 2001, the US reaction on attacks was creation of leading world powers coalition.

“Already on 20 September, George Bush gave an ultimatum to Taliban concerning turning leaders of Al Qaeda and especially Bin Laden in to the US. However the ultimatum was not accepted and the White House considered this step as a reason for launching war.” [6]

Further on September the US, the UK and Australia started to move their military units to the Persian Gulf. Post-Soviet states in this area were great advantage for the coalition because invasion could not be successful without their support. Though, the most important was Pakistan airspace because of air corridors from the gulf. It was a tricky decision for Pakistan to support the US because the Taliban was actually mostly masterpiece of its international politics. Although, Pakistan lost Afghan trust, on the other hand they gained support of the US and promise of the US, British and Japan financial support for their military development. Their agreement concerned also guarantee of Pakistan control over the south Afghan territory, further overlooking the fact that Pakistan soldiers also took part in the Taliban army and conviction of the Taliban leaders to give their reign up. Since the conflict had begun the current regime of the Taliban started to lose its allies.

In 2001, the US and the UK have decided to launch airborne attack in Afghanistan in order to apprehend world-most-wanted terrorist Usama Bin Laden. All military organizations had used this situation for creation of the *Northern Alliance* and take over cooperation with the US. The objective was to launch common offensive to overthrow the Taliban regime.

On October 7, 2001, the US and the UK have launched the decisive *Operation Enduring Freedom*. In its first phase attacks were oriented mostly on the infrastructure and potentially dangerous devices. In following days targets

were extended up to the military bases, administrative buildings and supposed military Al Qaeda headquarters. Civilian objects and even the US allies units were not hit exceptionally because of misunderstandings in guidance. In connection with aerial bombardment the humanitarian aid as well as propagandist leaflets were dropped, however, those actions were not particularly successful because of local illiteracy and missing the targets.

The Czech Republic was also included in this operation. *Afghan Radio Freedom* started to broadcast from Prague these days. It was the US who supported it financially. And in the second half of October ground assault called *Operation Free Hunting* was launched. Ground forces successively started to build permanent bases in south Afghanistan to start research activity against the Taliban. In this operation pilots had a free hand in attacking tanks and other movable devices that could had been dangerous. Arming local allies with Russian vehicles also took part of their mission.

3.3 The end of the conflict

The decisive step was taken in November 2001 when all anti-Taliban forces were activated. Main Taliban bases in south Afghanistan were under fire and their 5-year-reign could be considered as fallen. Struggles around big cities should probably serve only as a pretext for unnoticed break of the main Taliban leaders (highly probably to Pakistan).

Although, thanks to the cooperation between the US leadership and Northern Alliance activity the Taliban army was forced to leave cities, though, they have never left completely and partial partisan struggles exist up these days in eastern and south-eastern part of Afghanistan – the Afghan government has never been able to take control over this area because of mountainous terrain.

Conclusion of the Taliban reign was only the first part of coalition war's goal. The second target was to capture Al Qaeda combatants and Usama Bin Laden above all. The US and Britain special units kept looking for the world-most-wanted terrorist but only empty hiding places and audio recordings made by Qatari broadcaster *Al Jazeera* were found.

Although there were few records broadcasted by Al Jazeera no one precisely knew where exactly Usama Bin Laden could had been hiding after the war. Specialists were only estimating his possible location somewhere on heavily accessible borders of Afghanistan and Pakistan. On basis of more or less official information about Bin Laden's hideout the US launched military actions such as *Operation Anaconda*, *Condor* and many others that should end up with capture of Taliban and Al Qaeda leaders unfortunately unsuccessfully. Information concerning these actions differed a lot for no explicable reasons.

In connection to the beginning of the Iraq War in 2003 number of struggles even raised. Riots and conflicts with international troops burst out especially on the south and south-eastern borders with Pakistan.

By the time the operations were officially cancelled and re-initiated. After all, the Americans declared their intention to capture Bin Laden until the end of 2004, when the biggest military operation after the war in Afghanistan began. Though the situation remained the same and this last action was labelled as George Bush's pre-election campaign. Further struggles and international soldiers' presence worsen the local situation because they have already been hated. Finally after long years, Usama Bin Laden was killed on May 2, 2011.

“The Al Qaeda leader was killed by US special forces in northern Pakistan on Monday. His body was then buried at sea from a US aircraft carrier. [...]

On Monday, Mr Obama said he had made it his top national security priority to find Bin Laden. [...]

Mr Obama has decided not to publish photos of Bin Laden's body, saying the images could pose a national security risk.” [7]

Usama Bin Laden was admired by great part of Muslims because of his deep hatred for the Western world and considered hero fighting for the Islam rights. War and terrorism meant for him the most important aspect necessary for power maintenance.

Despite all efforts it seemed that the US was more interested in apprehension of Al Qaeda leaders than in the democratization process and stabilization of Afghan situation.

It is generally known that the US had been trying for a long time to penetrate the area economically, politically and also military although it was difficult according to the geopolitical situation. The specialist public was expressing mostly precariousness with regard to Afghan guile in previous conflicts. However, this situation was different because of new US high tech devices concerning computers and homing devices.

3.4 Impact of conflict and contemporary situation

It is absolutely necessary to perceive the Taliban reign as a desperate outcome of long-lasting chaotic situation of a country. On one hand, it is natural in Afghan countryside to follow strict and conservative Islamic laws, but it was naive to think that these rules can work on the whole Afghan territory because of the ethnical diversity and instability of political situation. The necessity of maintenance costs expended on the north and central territory was unbearable and moreover it was corruption, what worsen the situation. Factors, mentioned above, point to the fact that the Taliban could maintain its regime only until it was supported from the outside (such as all Afghan regimes in the history).

In November 2001, Hamid Karzai appeared as a leader of tribes who were fighting the Taliban and later on he became the most preferred candidate for the presidential post and for unification of the territory. The *Bonn Agreement*⁴ has established him as a temporal president, although for the coalition it was a good choice, in Afghanistan he was considered to be strongly influenced and dependent on foreign aid. However, Karzai was accepted by majority as a president and creation of stable government seemingly helped to stabilized the situation, this did not solve the situation of fragmented country. New laws concerning general disarming were not really successful and probably the most

⁴ Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan Pending the Re-Establishment of Permanent Government Institutions

pressing problem was lack of finance, which was partly solved by foreign financial aid.

Though, the Americans were still quite respected there were rising number of disagreements with the US soldiers presence. Gradually the US forces had become being perceived as occupation forces and president was renamed as an American puppet.

“Expressing ‘extreme anger’ towards the United States government, Afghan President Hamid Karzai has said in an interview that the war in Afghanistan was not fought with his country's interests in mind.

‘Afghans died in a war that's not ours,’ Karzai said in an interview with the Washington Post newspaper published late on Sunday, just a month before the election to pick his successor.

He was quoted as saying he was certain the 12-year-old war, the United States' longest and launched after the attacks of September 11, 2001, was "for the US security and for the Western interest."

Karzai's refusal to sign a security deal with Washington that would permit foreign troops to stay in Afghanistan beyond this year has frustrated the White House, and President Barack Obama has told the Pentagon to prepare for the possibility that no US troops will be left in Afghanistan after 2014.” [8]

But there exist still speculations concerning continuing cooperation between hiding Al Qaeda and the Taliban. It was presumed that their activity was probably moved to Iran and Pakistan so it means that the US goal was not fully accomplished.

Up these days the international community is not able to fully help Afghanistan because of its difficult internal politics. The majority of resolutions in not respected and serve only for personal purposes of influential individuals.

3.5 UN solution

In 1996, the UN reacted to the escalating situation in Afghanistan by creating the Resolution 1076, which appealed to combatants to stop struggles in order to find a political and peaceful way of dealing with the situation. The community feared increase of resistance that could result in terrorist grouping and drug trafficking. Two years later, everyone knew that passed fears had come true. The UN Security Council realized the growing ethnic character of the conflict and maybe the oncoming threat preceded by harassment of humanitarian organizations which were forced by the Taliban to move to Kabul. The UN concerns about terrorist presence on Afghan territory were confirmed by bomb attacks on the United States embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. This led to adoption of resolutions demanding the Taliban to stop providing training to terrorists and asking for cooperation in surrendering them to justice. In 1999, the Security Council applied wider sanctions on the Taliban. Adopted resolution accusing Bin Laden of terrorist attacks on American embassies in 1998 and sanctions included also freezing of the Taliban's funds.

The situation was even worse in terms of the area of human rights - forced civilian displacements, executions, abuse of civilians and violence against women were not exceptional. The *UN Drug Control Programme* was also included in this matter because Afghanistan was quickly becoming the world biggest opium supplier. Until 2001, the situation remained unchanged. Humanitarian aid was still being delivered to those living on the edge of survival and food aid and medical care were provided as well as non-discriminatory education to children. On September 4, 2001, a special programme called "*The Deepening Crisis*" was created to strengthen the worsening humanitarian situation and help needed Afghans to survive oncoming winter.

Although the UN claimed that it is necessary to support Afghan civilians also after the 9/11 attacks it was not actively possible when the American intervention in Afghanistan was launched. The humanitarian aid had to be paused because no UN missions were allowed to stay there in that time. Later on in 2001, the Security Council agreed after many negotiations on adopting resolution

establishing *Security Assistance Force (ISAF)* to help maintaining power in Afghanistan that also meant another wave of humanitarian aid.

“Our challenge is to help the Afghans help themselves,’ Mr. Annan added, describing the country's reconstruction needs as immense. They include the reintegration of former combatants; revival of economic activity; a fairer justice system, democratic institutions and mechanisms to protect human rights; such basic serves as clean water, sanitation, schools, health care and roads; ensuring the country is no longer a haven for terrorists or drug traffickers; ending violence against women; protecting children's rights; and ensuring security throughout the country.” [9]

4 Iraq

There existed few presumed reasons why the coalition did not overthrow Saddam Hussein's regime. First of all the US did not get the UN permission for it. The Resolution 678 provided the coalition only with authority to make Iraq army leave Kuwait. In accordance with some speculations it is said that the US even preferred S. Hussein to remain in his position because of keeping the region's stability. It was presumed that in case of overthrowing his reign the area would suffer from instability and separatist violence. After the war one of the most feared threats for the Western world was an Iraqi nuclear attack, because the US specialists concluded that Iraq had still maintained a part of its nuclear weapons.

In spite of the fact that Iraq was defeated, Saddam Hussein wanted to keep his political power so he presented himself as an Eastern-world hero and continued his absolutistic reign although he was afraid of strengthening exile movements mostly supported by the US.

In connection to Iraq War in 2003 it is necessary to mention security strategy of the United States. The US is generally known for its uncompromising position of leader, which is upheld in many agreements that other states have

signed with the US. In terms of other states submitting to strict controls in diverse areas, not many of them are known to supervise the US.

The *National Security Strategy (NSS)* and the *National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction (NSCWMD)* are the most important documents elaborated in 2002. The NSS concerns Bush's administrative approach to national and international security strategy. It contains goals such as: the spread of democracy, free trade and development all over the world, and so on. However, one of the most important aspects of this document is militarism, as a term which represents mainly US military capability, highlighting the fact that the US will not hesitate to employ its military power in order to protect its interests.

The NSCWMD is a paper dealing with the most feared potential threat of the 21st century – weapons of mass destruction. Currently, there exist many states that could maintain these weapons in order to be able to present a threat to the US and possibly to its allies. Iran, Iraq and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are considered to be such “dangerous” states. This document was created to help the US to exert pressure on Iraq to give up, on the UN to provide the US with necessary mandate and on the US allies to get support.

Both of these papers are retrospectively regarded as adapted support of Bush's decision for the Iraq invasion in 2003.

“The great struggles of the twentieth century between liberty and totalitarianism ended with a decisive victory for the forces of freedom — and a single sustainable model for national success: freedom, democracy, and free enterprise. In the twenty-first century, only nations that share a commitment to protecting basic human rights and guaranteeing political and economic freedom will be able to unleash the potential of their people and assure their future prosperity. [...]

Today, the United States enjoys a position of unparalleled military strength and great economic and political influence. In keeping with our heritage and principles, we do not use our

strength to press for unilateral advantage. We seek instead to create a balance of power that favors human freedom: conditions in which all nations and all societies can choose for themselves the rewards and challenges of political and economic liberty. [...]” [10]

4.1 The cause of conflict in 2003

In 1991, the UN had established a special commission called *UNSCOM*⁵ to supervise disposal of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. However, efforts of commissioners were often sabotaged. They were denied access to warehouses where the weapons and resources for its production were stored. Finally, in 1998, they were forced by the regime to leave Iraq. Despite Iraqi hostile approach, the UN commissioners had discovered possession of nerve gas and weapon production devices. Unfortunately, they were not able to monitor its complete destruction.

After the UN inspections turned out to be ineffective, the US president Bill Clinton had decided to approach to *Desert Fox operation* in 1998 and to launch airborne attacks in retaliation for violation of the UN resolutions.

One year later the UN replaced former UNSCOM by another commission with the same goal - *UNMOVIC*⁶ - established according to the UN Resolution 1441. Accession to Iraq was admitted in 2002 but it ran only for four months because of war launching and disengagement of the US units. The UNMOVIC did not find any proof of weapons of mass destruction possession or any documents concerning its elimination.

Iraqi reluctance to submit to the UN resolutions caused world’s suspicion that Iraq was endowed with nuclear weapons and moreover it was believed that Iraqi weapons posed a threat to the US. Especially after 9/11 attacks, presumed cooperation between Iraq and terrorist organizations (Al Qaeda) troubled the US, though there was no direct proof of such relation and that means no justified reasons for war.

⁵ The United Nations Special Commission

⁶ The United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission

The US president George W. Bush's most important ally was the *UK Prime Minister* Tony Blair and both of them were acting on base of analysis carried out by their secret services. They were trying to persuade the society of the fact that Iraq was continuing in its weapons of mass destruction programme and was breaking the UN resolutions. Although they made efforts to get the UN and NATO approval for war, they gained only few supporters who agreed with their approach.

4.2 Development

On March 20, 2003 the operation *Iraqi Freedom* began and lasted until May 1. The US president gave an ultimatum to S. Hussein who was given two days to give up and leave Iraq, which he refused. G. W. Bush declared that he had support of forty states but this information served only to threaten the enemy because in fact it was only Great Britain, Australia and Poland who were actively involved in struggles. The other states Bush was mentioning expressed "only" political and moral support.

When the ultimatum was not fulfilled, the US launched airborne attacks on Bagdad – called *Shock and Awe* – that took few days. This time, targets were not only infrastructure, power plants and munitions factories but also military headquarters, radar stations, government buildings and private presidential residences because it was the death of S. Hussein the US was longing for. At the same time, troops were transferred from Kuwait to Iraq to take over local cities. In first ten days of conflict the US and its allies proceeded to Bagdad and conquered Basra and Umm Qasr. Although the US captured many Iraqi cities it did not mean that they had the situation under control. The most serious problem was the situation development in these cities because the US troops were not able to prevent the despoilment of governmental buildings, community centres and military compounds that strengthen revolutionaries.

The most important aspect that influenced development and consequences of the conflict was the actual break-up of Iraqi army. They were incapable of counter attack despite its numbers and armour. The Iraqi soldiers were not

willing to risk lives and goodwill of their families for tyrannical regime. At the end of struggles there were no government officials that would have been able to discuss conditions of truce.

4.3 The end of conflict

The official end of the Iraqi Freedom operation and the Iraq War was on May 1, 2003. The Iraqi army resistance had already given up with capture of the last rebelling city – *Tikrit*, but struggles of non-state groups with the coalition continued few years further.

Although the regime was overthrown and Saddam Hussein defeated after 24-year-long struggles, he and other governmental officials were hiding from justice. Their capture remained the most important objective of the US army (with cooperation with the UK and Australian troops) besides searching for weapons of mass destruction which were still believed to be hidden in Iraq.

“One of the US aims was democratization of local regime, revitalization of ruined economy, development of infrastructure and creation of stable and functional government - that required destruction of terrorist groups.” [11]

Immediately after the end of war the US grasped that their primary vision of Iraqi democratization was quite distorted by the Western perception of the world. Later on they were trying to justify their excessively optimistic steps as follows – “The US leaders ignored or did not take into consideration the fact that Iraqi historical, cultural or political setting is completely different from ours [...]. [12]

4.4 Impact of conflict and contemporary situation

After the end of war the coalition learned that it would be very difficult to ensure security and peace. Although, US troops were trying to revitalize public services, infrastructure, electric power and water distribution they had to face up to everyday militant non-state groups attacks. Although the Shia Islam adherents were oppressed by the Hussein’s reign and embraced its fall they did not appreciate their liberator and faced him similarly. They were expressing their

defiance with armed attacks on coalition soldiers and they were bothered with the non-sensitive US approach to the local culture.

All subjects that were fighting coalition army had the same strategy – they were trying to avoid face-to-face fights and intended to cause great loss of lives without noticing the aggressor. This strategy pursued brief goal – to scare the enemy, demoralize them and make the foreign governments to recall their troops. Later on it turned out that aggressors were often foreign anti-American Islamic fundamentalists with connections to Al Qaeda and other religious groups that did not support presence of foreign soldiers in their country.

The coalition had to face up to a great dilemma in that time. In order to ensure security it was necessary to raise numbers of soldiers but, on the other hand, with rising numbers of soldiers the risk of attacks and riots was increasing as well. In 2003, the coalition started the enlistment to the Iraqi civil defence forces because it was necessary to train local police and military forces. Unfortunately, the interest in becoming a member of these forces was decreasing because even natives were becoming terrorist targets alongside the US soldiers. Though, local forces creation was essential condition for the US withdrawal.

Capture of one of the world's most-wanted persons – Saddam Hussein – was considered as a biggest success of the US army in 2003. Great relief from fear of his revenge and hope for better future flooded Iraq after announcement of this event. In order to prevent spreading previous Hussein's ideology his political party was eliminated and its members were forbidden to act as civil servants. Saddam Hussein was prosecuted for war crimes and in 2006 he was eventually sentenced to death for commanding his servants to kill.

Attacks on the coalition army were not exceptional in following years. The most aggressive attack from the end of war took place in May 2005 when the US army launched the operation *Matador*. This action was focused on finding ways of black weapons market and paths where Syrian fighters were entering Iraq. Struggles between the Shia Islam and Sunni Islam adherents were becoming more frequent and cruel as well.

In 2007, numbers of soldiers participating in Iraqi struggles were raised in order to calm down the situation between belligerent religious groups. After this action the situation became stable and struggles were almost ceased. Majority of those groups experienced great loss and the other were concluding peace.

In 2009, Barack Obama, who became new American president, had promised in his election campaign to stop the US activity in Iraq and cease the war. However, it seemed impossible to fulfil that promise, and American troops definitely left Iraq in December 2011.

After the war, Iraq was again allowed to participate in the world trade. The exportation of goods was renewed and a new currency – the Iraqi dinar – was created. However, the economic recession caused unemployment, poverty and recruitment of new members to rebellious groups.

Despite Iraqi general discontent with then US army presence in their country, the contemporary Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki pleaded for help from the United States two years after the US troops' withdrawal. Iraq has always faced civil unrest and nowadays also “resurgent” Al Qaeda's threat. “The United Nations said 2013 was the deadliest year in Iraq since 2008, with almost 8,000 people killed.” [13]

“Given such issues to deal with, it's no wonder al-Maliki is calling on Obama to seek more assistance to help combat terrorism and other security concerns. Among other things, he's seeking military equipment and other aid to help bolster border security, combat terrorism and tackle other threats.” [14]

4.5 UN solution

First of all, let us mention the “scandalous” *Oil-for-Food programme* which is surrounded with suspicion of corruption. “The OFFP was established in 1995 as a means of allowing Iraq to sell oil on the world market in exchange for humanitarian relief items [...]” [15] In that time, Iraq was suffering after the Kuwait invasion from strict UN sanctions and it is said that, however, the oil was sold, no or only a part of humanitarian aid was being delivered to needy Iraqis,

while officials were profiting. The Security Council steps taken against signs of corruption were as follows:

“As early as 2000, UN oil overseers alerted the Security Council to suspicions of illegal oil surcharges by the Iraqi Government. The Secretary-General himself drew attention to the problem in a 2001 public report to the Security Council. In response, the Council instituted a "retroactive pricing" mechanism designed to curb the practice. [...]" [16]

An unfavourable development of the Iraqi situation caused doubts that the US military action fulfilled its goals. They were not able to present any credible proof of weapons of mass destruction existence either of the Iraqi cooperation with Al Qaeda and moreover the numbers of victims (US soldiers as well as civilians) were rapidly rising.

The war dissenters were arguing with the fact that the US did not get any official UN mandate to launch a war and the conflict was believed to be G. W. Bush's personal objective to finish his father's task – to throw down Saddam Hussein's regime. The US supervision of the Iraqi territory could also have a reason of oil trade controlling ability.

“However, the United Nations Security Council did not mandate the US for the invasion of 2003 but the Resolution 1511 provided them with occupation status and allowed them to use any means necessary for stabilization of the country and ensuring security. The Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) was created in 2003, authorized to administrate Iraq and granted executive, legislative and judicial power. Its leader was Paul Bremer and one of its main tasks was setting up of interim constitution and handover of the power to the new local government composed of Iraqi politicians”. [17]

In 2003, CPA created the *Iraqi Governing Council (IGC)* as temporarily supreme legislative body in Iraq. Establishment of the independent interim government was approved by the UN Security Council Resolution 1546 in 2004

and concluded ally occupation. The new government officials were partly nominated by a UN representative and indirectly by CPA and IGC.

The constitution was based on principles of human rights and freedoms, ensured ethnic and religious groups laws, determined duties of inhabitants as well as autonomy of Iraqi regions. The final version of constitution had to reach a compromise between individual religious and ethnic group requirements.

The last UN Resolution that annually mandated the coalition with activity in Iraq was issued in 2007. Later on it was necessary to conclude a bilateral contract (Status of forces agreement between Iraqi government and the coalition) concerning their future status and powers. This agreement had fixed the date December 31, 2011 for definitive withdrawal of the US army from Iraq. Apart from this the US and Iraq had also concluded an agreement concerning military aid in case of external, either internal threat to Iraq but also economic and cultural cooperation.

5 Comparison of solutions taken in conflicts

When comparing the UN and the US approach to conflicts in Afghanistan and in Iraq, it is clear that both differ very much simply because of different background.

From time immemorial, Afghanistan has always been a territory full of conflicts, so the UN approach was appealing to stopping struggles and starting to solve it peacefully and rather diplomatically. However, the terrorist attacks on American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania caused the adoption of financial sanctions against the Taliban. This was, let us say, the most radical UN step in the solution to Afghan problems. Otherwise, the UN approach was in spirit of humanitarian aid to Afghan civilians who suffered from never-ending war. The *United Nations Peacekeeping missions* touching Afghan situation at that time were *UNGOMAP*⁷ and current *UNAMA*⁸.

⁷ United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan

⁸ United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan

Already after the end of the Gulf War, Iraq had been suspected of weapons of mass destruction maintenance and the UN adapted its attitude to it. Two commissions charged to investigate the Iraqi situation in detail were created but none of them proved this serious accusation, although the Iraqi hostile reaction indicated the exact opposite. In reaction to this the US began war despite the fact that they were provided only with occupation status. The US radically took the control over territory and later on resolved to form new government and constitution respecting human rights and ethics.

After mentioning all those aspects it seems that the UN approach to situation in Afghanistan was slightly more positive and helpful. The US approach to Afghanistan with regard to 9/11 attacks may seem to have been appropriately severe because America lasted for revenge and to capture the responsible offender. The United Nations Peacekeeping missions touching the Iraq situation at that time were called *UNIMOG*⁹ and *UNIKOM*¹⁰.

On the other hand, the UN and the US approach to the Iraqi situation were more likely aggressive and offensive highly probably because of the Iraqi reluctance to cooperate and submit to security guarding authorities. The nature of the conflicts themselves thus affected each approach and solution taken, making them in the end quite different from one another.

6 Criticism

6.1 Another point of view

The reaction to the US approach in wars in Iraq and Afghanistan differed very much. There is not only the problem that they did not get the support from the UN and NATO for the Iraqi intervention but they have also faced huge criticism from vast the majority of people all over the world. States that expressed their political support for launching the war (in Iraq) were Spain, Japan, South Korea and the Philippines. Although Germany, France, Russia,

⁹ United Nations Iran-Iraq Military observer group

¹⁰ United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission

China and Canada were usual traditional allies, the US did not get their support in this conflict.

According to the public opinion survey the majority of the US inhabitants agreed with the G. W. Bush decision and supported the intervention in Afghanistan but there were also those who organized demonstrations expressing disagreement with the war either in Iraq or in Afghanistan. The American society became divided into two unbending camps according to their opinion. They were arguing whether the 9/11 attacks led by Al Qaeda or suspicion that Iraq maintained weapons of mass destruction entitled the US to launch wars. The demonstrations were accompanied with political discussions especially in Europe where the majority found the war in Iraq unjust. Since these conflicts, the justifications, duration and results of the two wars have been a constant point of debate in media, amongst the public, and the topic of a vast number of documentaries.

6.1.1 Western point of view

The following information was gained from the conversation held with an American native living in the Czech Republic. From given answers it is clear that the respondent agrees with the military intervention in Afghanistan because, according to him, it was definitely necessary for America to return the strike after 9/11 attacks. However, it was reasonable to try to attack the Taliban who claimed its responsibility for the World Trade Centre tragedy in New York, he expressed absolute disagreement with the military long-term intervention in Afghanistan. According to him, the dawning civil war was partly American's fault.

The only possible solution that the respondent suggested was that America should leave Afghanistan and let it solve the situation itself without any external influence, though America should assume certain responsibility for what they have caused there. With regard to Afghan history, cultural habits and fragmentation of territory it is highly probable that Afghanistan will not keep any of American innovations and will fall back under the reign of the Taliban which has never disappeared from the Afghan background.

Underestimation of cultural differences was definitely determined as biggest mistake America made because Afghanistan would not be able to accept the Western democracy as we know it under any circumstances. Moreover the intervention only increased the Afghan hate against America.

As for Iraq the respondent definitely does not agree with the military intervention under any circumstances. He claimed that the American invasion was absolutely unreasonable and that they only aggravated the local situation.

The only possible solution he proposed was that America should leave the country and take responsibility for what happened afterwards. In the future it is highly possible that the problems between Sunni and Shia will only get worse.

The respondent sees the same mistakes in the US approach as in case of Afghanistan – there are cultural differences between the West and the East and so it is highly unlikely that Iraq could adopt the Western style of democracy.

Although the US intervention in Iraq was officially justified as searching for weapons of mass destruction, the respondent said that he rather believes in an unofficial version. He said that it is 100 % sure that America was highly interested in Iraqi oil and that it was maybe a family business of Bush Jr who wanted to finish his father's goal from the first Persian Gulf conflict. Possession of weapons of mass destruction was only trustworthy pretext for invasion.

To conclude, we can compare the American approach to Afghanistan and Iraq. The respondent sees certain differences in authorization for interventions. In Afghanistan, the Americans still had a justified reason for invasion in form of revenge on Al Qaeda for 9/11 terrorist attacks. On the other hand, in Iraq it was different. There were no serious reasons to invade there. The retrograde justification of invasion was presumed Iraqi maintenance of weapons of mass destruction which unfortunately for America were not found.

In connection to drone attacks the respondent said: "I do not agree with that! I do not think that a country should assassinate its own citizens! [...] It is unconstitutional." [18] Although there are American citizens who are suspected

to present a threat to national security America should still not be allowed to attack them.

According to what the Americans say about the conspiracy theories, it is obvious that they definitely refuse any suspicion of American involvement in 9/11 “terrorist” attacks. The respondent claimed:

“I do not believe that September 11 was planned by the United States government. But I do believe some of the information that the United States government denies. Some of the information is connected with CIA and the training of the Taliban [...] CIA did actually do training and weapons to the Taliban during the Soviet occupation.” [19]

6.1.2 Eastern point of view

Source for subsequent information was a conversation held with a student of medicine whose family comes from the border area between Afghanistan and Pakistan. His testimony provided this thesis with an opinion of a person who has mediated experience with the local situation that has been dealt with in this work.

The respondent feels the previous situation and invasion was unjust although Iraq was suspected of weapons of mass destruction maintenance and Afghanistan was considered as a threat for the Western world as far as it was breeding ground for extremists. He considered the US invasion in Afghanistan to be based on 9/11 attacks, although he believes in the conspiracy theory that the American government was responsible for the controlled destruction of twin towers. He also mentioned that the US reaction was unreasonable. With Iraq, he gave similar responses. Although Iraq was believed to hide weapons of mass destruction, no proof has been found and intervention was taken in order to control Saddam Hussein’s regime which was initially supported by the US.

He sees the contemporary situation in the Middle East in general to have been provoked and supported by America, who makes profit from war. In his opinion it is difficult to come up with possible solutions for both countries and if some exist, then they would definitely take long to take effect. The situation in

Iraq is also difficult because of civil unrest between Muslim castes Sunni and Shia. The American influence of this area without ceasing will only deepen hatred towards the West and probably cause some other problems.

The US quick decision to launch wars was determined by the respondent as one big mistake. He believes that democracy in these countries will come but it will definitely take time; however, he does not really feel the American democracy is as democratic as it is promoted.

Differences between the US approach to Afghanistan and Iraq were given by dissimilar characters of causes. In the case of Afghanistan, it was fear of terrorists; in the case of Iraq, however, the official reason were weapons of mass destruction perceived as a global threat, although, in fact the cause was probably oil.

As the respondent said he does not agree with drone attacks already as these are used for targeting supposed terrorists because some doubts questioning its efficiency occurred. However, if it is proved that the target really constitutes a threat for national security then it could be a suitable solution.

The respondent admitted that he strictly believes in the following conspiracy theories: CIA supported and trained Taliban fighters against the Soviets and that 9/11 attacks were not led by Usama Bin Laden but were a plan of the American government. His belief that oil was the main reason for the invasion of Iraq could be also possibly interpreted as a sort of conspiracy.

6.2 Conspiracy theories

A conspiracy theory is sort of clarification that has opposite meaning than the official explanation. The conspiracy theories are as a rule not accepted by governments, mainstream media and the majority public as official or truthful versions of events. It is usually deeply political and plotted action, which may also help pressure groups to further their own threats (e.g. terrorist organizations). It is about accusing the doer of doing something against the law through secret planning. In human history there were many such theories touching for example on Pearl Harbour, Usama Bin Laden's death or recently

doubts about Barack Obama's origin and his presumed aim in American politics were raised, etc.

Since the September 11, 2001 there exist plenty of serious accusations targeting George W. Bush and his government. But this trend of need to accuse someone move ahead with time and so it is not exceptional that Barack Obama as new American president is not spared suspicion. Despite those theories, it was statistically proven that only a small minority of Americans believe in the conspiracy of 9/11. Research carried out in 2006 in America showed that only 15% of respondents believe that the WTC tragedy and Pentagon attack were caused by intentional destruction planned by the American government; there are, however, many believers among foreigners.

Although many official reports have been published since 9/11 explaining what precisely happened, there are still questions rising that need to be answered and this fact gives free space to theorists. In 2011, the BBC News Magazine published an article summarizing the most discussed 9/11 conspiracy theories circulating in the internet communities. In order to outline the difference between the official version and conspiracy author asked basic questions and subsequently answered by means of mentioning both. To be brief, let us follow the same structure:

The first proposed question was "Why did the world's most powerful air force fail to intercept any of the four hijacked planes?" [20] According to conspiracy theorists the air force failed because they were ordered by the US Vice President Dick Cheney to stand down. The Official version mentioned that unfortunately it was not possible because multiple hijacking is unusual and that the planes even could not have been located because their positioning system was turned off. Despite this fact, the military training exercise took place the same day and so communication between civilian air traffic control and the military was confusing.

The second point deals with the question: "Why did the Twin Towers collapse so quickly, within their own footprint, after fires on a few floors that

lasted only for an hour or two?” [21] The theorists say that the WTC was destroyed by planned demolition. This theory is backed up with following “proof” – fire on lower floors than the struck one, very fast collapse of both towers and numerous testimonies of audible explosions – that are also visible on the videos immediately taken. On the other hand, the official version says that the strike was strong enough to damage the support columns and the leaking jet fuel through several floors caused fire which resulted in fast collapse.

And in connection to previous one: “How could a skyscraper, which was not hit by a plane¹¹, collapse so quickly and symmetrically, when no other steel-framed skyscraper has collapsed because of fire?” [22] The theorists say that the WTC Building 7 was destroyed by a controlled demolition as well because only explosives can cause such a fast destruction. But according to some scientists, easily ignitable material was found in dust so rise of temperature and subsequent damage of its construction caused destruction of this building.

Next note was about attack on the Pentagon. The key question: “How could an amateur pilot fly a commercial plane in a complicated manoeuvre and crash it into the headquarters of the world's most powerful military, 78 minutes after the first report of a possible hijack and leave no trace?” [23] The theorists say that it was possibly a small aircraft or a drone that hit the Pentagon in place of a hijacked Boeing 757 and that the military base itself controlled the attack. The official reports claim that the black boxes from crashed plane were found and kept by FBI and that there are victims who saw the accident live.

Besides other things CIA and FBI are seriously suspected of hiding information on oncoming terrorist attacks from public and other important American security bodies. They are believed to have concealed the background of 9/11 already since the beginning of 2000 when the first suspicion of planning this action appeared. It is said that the CIA was being informed by numerous sources such as Uzbek spies in Al Qaeda training camps and subsequently also by foreign secret services (French, German). They also had devices for means of

¹¹ This comment refers to the WTC 7 building, which collapsed although it was not hit directly by a plane.

eavesdropping Hussein's and many others phones. Lately, when CIA got to know also names of 4 terrorists chosen for the 9/11 attacks the Intelligence Agency was said to provide them trouble-free arrival in the US and allegedly intentionally erased various misdemeanours they had on file in the US in order to keep them safe and able to commit the acts they came for.

Facts that the United States Air Force did not even make any efforts to protect the city from attacks only encourage the conspiracy theory and could be understood as proof of the American government guilt. There exist reports concerning Bush's fear of detail revelation to the public that could certainly cause a wave of questions.

Few days before attacks the US was warned by numerous political world powers of the threat coming but no official local warning was published so the public was definitely not informed. Another discussed item could be promotion by merit of those who are supposed to be guilty with concealing the information of oncoming attacks.

It is not exceptional that the official version of 9/11 is called into question also by some politicians and academics who even created on-line magazine *Journal of 9/11 Studies* and call for reinvestigation of the case. Many people understand these steps as pretext for the invasion in Iraq in order to gain control over the oil deposits. So Iraq was accused of participation on the 9/11 attacks and production of weapons of mass destruction.

Although every year some new official explications clarifying the then situation appear, the conspiracy theories are being modified and specified with time. However, majority of conspiracy theories are not very detailed because then these could be easily called into question.

“This paper deals only with observations which provide evidence that the buildings were brought down by “controlled demolition” using explosives. Its purpose is to provide a clear picture by collecting together the most compelling evidence for

demolition, while avoiding those aspects of 9/11 which are still in dispute. [...]

Given the astonishing discrepancy between the official explanation for the collapse of these buildings and the observed facts it is clear that there is an urgent need for an independent investigation. It is abundantly clear that the investigation should address the question of whether the use of explosives would fit the observations better than the official explanation. [...]

As long as an incorrect explanation is accepted government policy will be based on a false premise and many decisions will be made which are not in the best interests of the nation or indeed of the world.” [24]

7 Conclusion

The purpose of this bachelor thesis was to analyse the role of the United States in modern international conflicts with focus on Afghanistan and Iraq and to describe its position in the United Nations Organization. This paper can be useful for students who are interested in the Middle East conflicts, in the United States general approach to conflicts and the role of the UN in such situations.

This thesis follows brief structure using sub-chapters in order to facilitate the reader's orientation in the text. The introductory chapter served as a brief presentation of both countries and former conflicts that outlined the beginning of oncoming problems. The following chapter is of an informative character and describes the structure and functioning of the United Nations Organization and the role of the United States in its framework.

Furthermore, the thesis follows logical sequence of events that took place in extent of both conflicts – invasion in Afghanistan in 2001 and later on in Iraq, in 2003. These chapters are meant to give a well-arranged analysis of how the conflict began, what was its development, end, impact and the UN solution to it.

The comparison of the US and the UN approach to both countries was evaluated as considerably different. This fact is supported by the distinct background of conflicts and also by the determined goal and what the US and the UN intended to accomplish – either to apprehend terrorists responsible for the 9/11 attacks or find the weapons of mass destruction and accuse Iraq of non-respecting the UN resolutions.

In the final part of this thesis, two interviews, given to outline natives' points of view, were commented on. Both respondents come from countries involved in conflicts. The first respondent was an American native citizen living in the Czech Republic and the second one was a native coming from Afghan-Pakistan border studying in the Czech Republic. The goal of this brief research was to find out whether respondents' answers correspond and what their attitudes to these two war conflicts are. Crucial questions included whether respondents agree with the American steps taken and, if not, they were asked to give a short

suggestion of a possible solution. Further questions concerned their view on the contemporary situation, possible solution of current problems, development to the future, etc. Differences between their testimonies include the following. The American native respondent claimed that the intervention in Afghanistan was reasonable with regard to 9/11 attacks but long-term invasions in both countries were not necessary. His possible solution was that the US should definitely leave and let both countries deal with their matters themselves. Western-style-democracy is not possible in his view and he also refuses the conspiracy theories concerning the 9/11 attacks. The only acceptable theses for the first respondent was that the American government provided the Taliban with training and weapons and that the true reason for the American invasion in Iraq was oil. On the other hand, the second respondent coming from Afghanistan claimed that both invasions were unreasonable. The true reason for the Iraq invasion was oil and as far as he believes in the conspiracy about 9/11 (that American government planned the attacks itself), he found the invasion in Afghanistan completely unfair. He claimed that this is how the US makes profit. He had no ideas for a possible solution but if there is any it would definitely take time. On the contrary to the first respondent, he is optimistic about democracy in this area. He believes that democracy will happen but not in the American presented form because, in fact, this is not real democracy. Both respondents agree that oil was the main reason for the American invasion in Iraq and that America supported the Taliban in training its combatants. However, the second respondent refuses that Usama Bin Laden or Al Qaeda fundamentalists would be involved in the 9/11 attacks and he strongly believes that it was an American government's pretext for launching a war in order to finish a personal aim. Although the drone attacks executed on civilians were refused by both respondents, the second one believes that if there is credible proof of threat to the national security existence and the technology is infallible, it could be probably a good solution to a problem. From interviews given, it is clear that opinions of both are quite parallel with significant difference in view on the conspiracy theories.

The conspiracy theories also make up a part of this paper as contradictions to official versions. A few well known conspiracy theories were discussed, and this section leaves free space for further discussion.

According to the American position on a global security strategy, it is probable that similar conflicts will follow. Despite the fact, that the US plays the crucial role in the UN, the country sometimes takes the responsibility and acts on behalf of its own decisions without the UN mandate.

The situation in Afghanistan will not probably get better in the following years because of its fragmented territory, numerous struggling ethnic groups and persisting terrorist organizations which irritate not only natives but also the world to a large extent. In Iraq the situation does not much vary because of lasting civil unrest between Sunni and Shia Muslims and Kurds as well.

8 Abstract

This bachelor thesis deals with an analysis of the United States' position in modern conflicts with a focus exclusively on Afghanistan and Iraq. Related brief analysis of the UN's function and its influence on above mentioned conflicts is also included. The main aim of this thesis is to reveal similarities or differences in the US and UN engagement and approach to arisen conflicts.

The thesis itself is divided into two parts – theoretical and practical. In the theoretical section, it was necessary to deal with the historical context of both countries and their relation to past conflicts in order to understand the contemporary situation. Subsequently the practical part reveals circumstances of the beginning, development and the end of conflicts in both countries after 9/11 attacks, conspiracy theories dealing with terrorist attacks factors and two respondents' opinions evaluating the situation up to the present.

The precise answers of both respondents are also included in this study in the form of appendices.

9 Résumé

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá analýzou postavení Spojených států v novodobých válečných konfliktech se zaměřením výhradně na Afghánistán a Irák a s tím související stručnou analýzou fungování OSN a jeho působení ve výše zmíněných konfliktech. Hlavním cílem práce je odhalit podobnosti, popř. rozdíly v přístupu Spojených Států Amerických a OSN k vzniklým konfliktům a jejich angažovanost v nich.

Práce je rozdělena do dvou částí, tedy části teoretické a praktické. V teoretické části bylo nezbytné zabývat se historickým kontextem obou zemí a spojitostmi s předcházejícími konflikty, což posloužilo ke správnému porozumění situace nastalé v obou zemích. Následně v praktické části tato práce odhaluje okolnosti vzniku, průběh a ukončení konfliktů v obou zemích po 11. září 2001, konspirační teorie pojednávající o faktorech teroristického útoku a názory dvou respondentů hodnotící tehdejší situaci.

Práce je doplněna o přílohy zachycující doslovné odpovědi respondentů na kladené otázky.

10 Endnotes

1. Johnson, R. H., “Misguided Morality: Ethics and the Reagan Doctrine” [online]
2. Ponížilová, M. Stručná historie státu – Irák, p. 9. (author’s direct translation)
3. Ibid., p. 93. (author’s direct translation)
4. Ibid., p. 100-101. (author’s direct translation)
5. Quran (2:191) [online]
6. Horák, S. Afghánský konflikt, p. 129, (author’s direct translation)
7. Mardell, M. “Bin Laden death: Barack Obama at Ground Zero”, bbc.com
8. “Karzai: Afghan war fought in West's interest”, aljazeera.com
9. “Afghanistan and the United Nations”, un.org
10. George W. Bush’s administration. “National Security Strategy 2002”, National Security Strategy Archive [online]
11. Ponížilová, M. Stručná historie státu – Irák, p. 114. (author’s direct translation)
12. Ibid., p. 113. (author’s direct translation)
13. “More deadly violence, more targeting of suspected militants in Iraq”, cnn.com
14. “In Iraq, a bushel of problems threaten stability”, cnn.com
15. Weiss, T. G. What’s wrong with the United Nations and How to Fix It, p. 117.
16. “Oil-for-Food Programme”, un.org
17. Ponížilová, M. Stručná historie státu – Irák, p. 120. (author’s direct translation)
18. See appendix 1

19. Ibid.
20. “9/11 Conspiracy theories”, [bbc.com](#)
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Legge, F. “9/11 – Evidence for Controlled Demolition: a Short List of Observations” [online]

11 Bibliography

Printed sources

BABÁČEK, M. *11. září a tajné služby – promyšlený podvod*. Všeň: Grimmus. 2010.

BURGROVÁ, H. and JEŽOVÁ, M., Eds. “Irák” in *Současný Blízký Východ*. edited by Martin Bouchal, 147-159. Plzeň: Barrister & Principal, o. s., 2011.

EICHLER, J. *Bezpečnostní a strategická kultura USA, EU a ČR*. Praha: Karolinum, 2011.

HORÁK, S. *Afghánský konflikt*. Praha: Public History a Petit. 2005.

LAURENS, H. *Arabský Orient za časů Ameriky*. translated by Lena Arava-Novotná. Praha: Academia, 2013.

MAREK, J. *Dějiny Afghánistánu*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2006.

PONÍŽILOVÁ, M. *Stručná historie států – Irák*. Praha: Nakladatelství Libri, 2011.

ŠIŠKA, J. F. *Bojiště Afghánistán – Sovětsko-afghánský válečný konflikt 1979-1989*. Příbram: Svět křídel, 2004.

WALLERSTEIN, I. *Úpadek Americké moci – USA v chaotickém světě*. translated by Rudolf Převrátíl. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství (Slon), 2005.

WEISS, T. G. *What's wrong with the United Nations and How to Fix It*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2012.

Online sources

“9/11 conspiracy theories”, *BBC*, August 29, 2011, accessed April 2, 2014, taken from <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-14665953>.

“Afghanistan and the United Nations”, *the official website of the United Nations Organization News Centre*, accessed April 5, 2014, taken from <http://www.un.org/News/dh/latest/afghan/un-afghan-history.shtml>.

“Karzai: Afghan war fought in West's interest”, *Al Jazeera*, March 3, 2014, accessed March 23, 2014, taken from <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/asia/2014/03/karzai-afghan-war-fought-western-interest-20143353951600289.html>.

“The United Nations Oil-for-Food Programme”, *the official website of the United Nations Organization*, 2012, accessed April 12, 2014, taken from <http://www.un.org/News/dh/iraq/oip/facts-oilforfood.htm#Corrupt>.

“UNGOMAP”, *the official website of the United Nations Organization*, 2009, accessed April 5, 2014, taken from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/ungomap/>.

AUBRY, A. “When Afghanistan was in Vogue”, *the Polyglot*, December 25, 2010, accessed April 11, 2014, taken from <http://the-polyglot.blogspot.cz/2010/12/when-afghanistan-was-in-vogue.html>.

FBI ten most wanted fugitives list, *the official website of the FBI Federal bureau of investigation*, accessed March 23, 2014, taken from <http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/topten/usama-bin-laden>.

George W. Bush’s administration. “National Security Strategy 2002”, *the official Archive of the National Security Strategy*, September 17, 2002, accessed April 12, 2014, taken from http://nssarchive.us/?page_id=32.

JOHNSON, R. H. “Misguided Morality: Ethics and the Reagan Doctrine,” *Political Science quarterly* Vol. 103 (1988): p.509, accessed February 3, 2014, taken from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2150761>.

LEGGE, F. “9/11 – Evidence for Controlled Demolition: a Short List of Observations.” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*. Vol. 1, June 2006, accessed April 4,

2014, taken from http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Journal_2_Evidence_for_demolition_20.pdf.

MARDELL, M. “Bin Laden death: Barack Obama at Ground Zero”, *BBC*, May 5, 2011, accessed March 23, 2014, taken from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-13295132>.

PARENT, J. and USCINSKI, J. “Conspiracy theories are for losers”, *CNN*, August 30, 2011, accessed April 2, 2014, taken from <http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2011/08/30/conspiracy-theories-are-for-losers/?iref=allsearch>.

PEARSON, M. “In Iraq, a bushel of problems threaten stability”, *CNN*, November 3, 2013, accessed April 11, 2014, taken from <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/11/01/world/meast/iraq-five-danger-signs/index.html?iref=allsearch>.

Quran (2:191), accessed March 24, 2014, taken from <http://quran.com/2/191>.

SOMMERS, S. “Who still believes in 9/11 conspiracies? An empirical study on political affiliation and conspiratorial thinking.” *Skeptic* (2011), accessed April 1, 2014, taken from <http://go.galegroup.com.vlib.interchange.at/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA252289594&v=2.1&u=wash89460&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&asid=c22043305d7db4e011c1f1aa390f2971>

TAWFEEQ, M. “More deadly violence, more targeting of suspected militants in Iraq”, *CNN*, March 20, 2014, accessed April 11, 2014, taken from <http://edition.cnn.com/2014/03/20/world/meast/iraq-violence/index.html?iref=allsearch>.

The Charter of the United Nations, Introductory note Preamble and Chapters I, III, IV, V, X, XIII, XIV, XV, *the official website of the United Nations Organization*, accessed April 1, 2014, taken from <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter19.shtml>.

The Issues, *the official website of the United States Mission to the United Nations*, accessed April 1, 2014, taken from <http://usun.state.gov/issues/>.

The *official website of NMUN the National Model United Nations*, accessed April 1, 2014, taken from <http://www.nmun.org/>.

12 Appendices

12.1 Appendix I – Questionnaire 1

Western point of view

1. Do you agree with the military intervention in I/A?

Well I have to say that I definitely do not agree with military intervention in Iraq under any circumstances.

With the military intervention in Afghanistan I feel however that the United States, at the time, needed to react to what happened on September 11. But the aftermath of results of that invasion into Afghanistan I do not agree with. I think that America should have gone into Afghanistan and come out again.

2. Was it a reasonable reaction?

I think that the invasion of Afghanistan was maybe a logical reaction to try to attack the Taliban who claimed responsibility for the September 11's attacks but I think the public reaction – the American reaction to September 11 – was extremely exaggerated at times and people wanted blood.

With the reaction or with the intervention in Iraq, I think it was absolutely unreasonable. Absolutely!

3. How do you see the contemporary situation?

That is a good question! We have got at least ten years of American forces in Iraq, more than that in Afghanistan. I see that as 100% complete failure of any of those attempts, of any of those goals that the United States were trying for so what we have now are two countries that are on the edge of civil war thanks to the fact that America invaded them.

4. Can you suggest any possible solutions?

That is also very good question. Very difficult question! Unfortunately I think that the United States and the coalition have created a quagmire (situation that is very difficult to get out of). I think that right now the only solution is to leave both of those countries but to take some moral responsibility for what happened afterwards and possibly some financial responsibility as well.

5. Do you have any idea of future development of the situation?

I spoke about that in this last question as well, but I am quite afraid that both of these countries, well Afghanistan – I am quite afraid that they will fall back into the hands of the Taliban that still actually is part of it, after 13 years of American forces being there (not with very good results).

And Iraq I would also be afraid of the same thing. [The] Sunni and the Shia populations are killing each other. The Kurdish population, for example in Iraq, they have always been quite endangered.

That would be my prediction that those countries would fall into civil war.

6. Can you see any mistakes in the US approach?

Yes! I think that a very large mistake that the US made with both countries is that they underestimated the cultural history, the customs of these countries and to assume that a country like Afghanistan could change into a pluralist democracy is insane. The same I think goes for Iraq. I think that that was very naive idea if that was actually a real goal. And I think that what is coming back to hurt America now is the fact that Afghani people are not interested in democracy, they do not care about it. They do not even have the same concept of time that we do, at all. They think of time in terms of generations and they hate America – many of them – for doing this, for trying to spread their

democracy. I think that this was really the biggest mistake, or the biggest thing what was miscalculated.

7. Is there a chance for western style of democracy?

I have just mentioned it. I think that possibly in Iraq, maybe. Maybe one of the reasons for that is that Iraq is slightly more developed country, but not much. It has oil of course, so I think that there is definitely a chance for some kind of mutant, some form of democracy but for very successful. I don't think so. And I think that always in a country like Iraq, religion - Islam, a sort of theocracy will always be important. So I think that all these democratic rules will be, let's say bent around religious preferences, Muslim rule of law. That is a big problem.

8. What differences do you see between the US approach to I/A?

Well I can answer this in a quite short way. But I think with Afghanistan, the reasons for invading there were let's say relatively justified, or with at least some Americans I think they could be justified.

But with Iraq, the reasons they gave for invading were absolutely unjustified. There were no proofs ever of some weapons of mass destruction. [...]

So I think that is the difference. I think with Afghanistan they had more legitimate reason and also with the approach in Afghanistan, which is more tribal, there is a big challenge to American forces whereas in Iraq is more I guess just Sunni/ Shia (maybe the Kurds as well). Otherwise, trying to build democracy, education and infrastructure – this is not going to work.

9. Do you agree with targeting American citizens in drone attacks if these citizens constitute a threat to national security?

Very interesting question! [...] I do not agree with that! I do not think that a country should assassinate its own citizens! I think that the United States should be able to arrest and bring back their own citizens and prosecute them in a law court but I do not think that they should be able to assassinate them like in Pakistan, or somewhere. [...] It is unconstitutional.

10. Do you believe, at least partially, in any conspiracy theories? If so, which ones?

I do not really believe in any classic conspiracy theories. I do not believe that September 11 was planned by the United States government. But I do believe some of the information that the United States government denies. Some of the information is connected with CIA and the training of the Taliban – some of those things I could imagine. Well, the CIA did actually do training and weapons to the Taliban during the Soviet occupation. So I would believe some information about the fact that the United States was actually friends with Usama Bin Laden, with the Taliban because they hated the Soviets even more than they hated the terrorists at that time. If that counts as a conspiracy theory - then yes.

11. Do you think that oil was involved in Iraq occupation?

Absolutely, 100% yes! I think that it was actually the only reason why the United States invaded to Iraq. That and there was a bit of some family business that had been left unattended for a while [laughing]. I mean the Persian Gulf conflict in 1991 I believe, that was Bush Sr, so it almost seems like Bush Jr was just finishing the job as they say. That is a conspiracy theory too maybe. But yes, I think that oil was definitely involved 100% that was the main reason.

(respondent: Skyland Václav Kobylak, interview given on March 24, 2014)

12.2 Appendix II – Questionnaire 2

Eastern point of view

1. Do you agree with the military intervention in I/A?

I feel the military intervention in both Iraq and Afghanistan was unjust and without viable reason to invade however there were hidden agendas for control and influence in this region of the world. Iraq was considered to have weapons of mass destruction which were never found. Afghanistan was seen as a breeding ground for extremist terrorists that threaten the West and its Allies.

2. Was it a reasonable reaction?

The reasonable reaction was based on the twin tower attacks. These attacks caused mass hysteria to the American population and lead them to believe that it was Osama Bin Laden and the Al Qaeda Moujahideen who were responsible for this tragic terrorist attack. So this was clear motive for invasion.

The Iraq war was also due to Saddam Hussein's threat of terrorism to neighbouring Kuwait and his tyrant ruling.

3. How do you see the contemporary situation?

Right now it is easier for America to go to war as people are used to being at war, at this present America took part in many operations within the Middle East which the civil uprising of Egypt, Libya and right now the problems in Syria cause a major to threat to the possibility of more war.

4. Can you suggest any possible solutions?

After a war as long as this it is very hard come up with a solution and any solution would definitely take time, in the case of Afghanistan for the last 50 years and not just America also the Cold war. But Obama has started to bring home troops.

In the case of Iraq it's also difficult to come with a solution as there is civil unrest within the Iraq population between Shia and Sunni's.

5. Do you have any idea of future development of the situation?

I think that control in this region is very important for America and its allies this is why there is so much focus and media attention in the Middle East. So I think this will lead to more hatred for the west from the Middle Eastern countries and this will create more problems.

6. Can you see any mistakes in the US approach?

I think that the US acted very quickly in the decision to go to war in both Iraq and Afghanistan. They used the excuse of weapons of mass destruction and terrorist plotting to attack the west with no evidence.

7. Is there a chance for western style of democracy?

It is hard for the people of this region to adopt new customs as opposed to old tradition I feel that any form of western democracy in these countries will always take time. I feel like democracy will happen, although the idea of democracy is far-fetched as Americans feel they are democratic but they are not in control of decisions.

8. What differences do you see between the US approach to I/A?

There were many differences. The Afghan war was based on the terrorism and the control of Taliban to its people.

The Iraq war was because of supposed weapons of mass destruction which were never found but the real interest was oil.

9. Do you agree with targeting American citizens in drone attacks if these citizens constitute a threat to national security?

I do not agree with the idea of drones as they are already targeting terrorist with these weapons in Pakistan and Afghanistan, if it was a threat to national security then I believe that it could be used. You

hear about stories where drone attacks have not hit the right target which makes you question this type of technology.

10. Do you believe, at least partially, in any conspiracy theories? If so, which ones?

American CIA was training Mujahideen Taliban to fight against the Soviets with the help of weapons thus leading to the Soviets being driven out of the region.

9/11 was not carried out by Osama Bin Laden but planned by the US government and CIA and also members of MOSSAD.

11. Do you think that oil was involved in Iraq occupation?

Yes I believe strongly that oil was a major reason for occupation. Iraqis' global position in the world puts it in the heart of Mesopotamia which is a source rich in oil.

(respondent: Omar Afzaal, interview given on April 7, 2014)

12.3 Appendix III – FBI records - USL's most wanted photograph

FBI TEN MOST WANTED FUGITIVE

Murder of U.S. Nationals Outside the United States; Conspiracy to Murder U.S. Nationals Outside the United States; Attack on a Federal Facility Resulting in Death

USAMA BIN LADEN



Deceased

Date of Photograph
Unknown

Aliases:

Usama Bin Muhammad Bin Ladin, Shaykh Usama Bin Ladin, the Prince, the Emir, Abu Abdallah, Mujahid Shaykh, Hajj, the Director

DESCRIPTION

Date(s) of Birth Used:	1957	Hair:	Brown
Place of Birth:	Saudi Arabia	Eyes:	Brown
Height:	6' 4" to 6' 6"	Complexion:	Olive
Weight:	Approximately 160 pounds	Sex:	Male
Build:	Thin	Nationality:	Saudi Arabian
Occupation:	Unknown		
Scars and Marks:	None known		
Remarks:	Bin Laden is the leader of a terrorist organization known as Al-Qaeda, "The Base". He is left-handed and walks with a cane.		

CAUTION

Usama Bin Laden is wanted in connection with the August 7, 1998, bombings of the United States Embassies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and Nairobi, Kenya. These attacks killed over 200 people. In addition, Bin Laden is a suspect in other terrorist attacks throughout the world.

REWARD

The Rewards For Justice Program, United States Department of State, is offering a reward of up to \$25 million for information leading directly to the apprehension or conviction of Usama Bin Laden. An additional \$2 million is being offered through a program developed and funded by the Airline Pilots Association and the Air Transport Association.

CONSIDERED ARMED AND EXTREMELY DANGEROUS

If you have any information concerning this person, please contact your local FBI office or the nearest American Embassy or Consulate.

June 1999 Poster Revised November 2001