

War against Terrorism & Crisis of Credibility of United Nations and USA

Dr. Arvinder Singh

Principal, Gujranwala Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Ludhiana (Punjab)

For the last two hundred years, Western world has powerful and developed tremendously in the all spheres of life whereas the Islamic world lag behind and remain underdeveloped at large. In the West, there were appropriate conditions, which created strong ideological foundation for liberalism, individualism, capitalism, secularism and imperialism, which enabled the West to play the role of world leader. West urged to increase her dominance created strong resentment in those countries, which suffer at the hands of Western imperialist nation states. Western intervention in Islamic world with view to exploit the natural resources of Islamic countries, to secularize their traditional social order and to democratize their authoritarian and monarchical political order created several complications for both West and Islamic world. Religious fundamentalists in the Islamic countries consider the Western intervention in their social, political and religious matters as the Western's conspiracy against Islam. They regard Western influence on Islamic world as an assault on Islam. United States of America adopted double standards in dealing with religious terrorism. On the one hand, it gives blind financial support to fundamentalists and sponsors the terrorism and on the other side it create outcry against Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism in the name of Islam.

USA uses the United Nations to seek her foreign policy goals and consequently there emerges a crisis of credibility of USA and United Nations in their war against terrorism. The cause of disagreement between Islam and West is not cultural differences alone as it is publicizing through the clash among civilisations approach. In fact, it is clash between imperialist interests of the West and tendency of Islamic world to retain her lost glory and a quest for Islamic order at the international level. Terrorism in the name Islam is merely the manifestation of frustration in Islamic world against Western intervention and economic exploitation of Islamic countries. International organisations are entrusted a responsibility to resolve the conflicts among different nations on various issue through democratic, peaceful and constitutional methods. These organizations are expected to be neutral and should refrain from playing in the hands of Super powers. The future of religious conflicts much depends upon the role played by socio-religious leaders and

international organizations like United Nations. The gulf between theory and practice of super powers should be minimized at the same time to resolve the issue of religious terrorism.

If America is the world, it does not need the World's institution to run its foreign and economic policies. In general, the US takes little interest in bodies such as the United Nations Development Programme, The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and The United Nations High Commission for Refugees. One institution in which America maintains total control is the world Trade Organization. Indeed, it is has been suggested that the WTO is a major instrument for maintaining American 'neo imperialism'.ⁱ The USA wields its huge power through the institutions like the World Bank, IMF, NATO and the United Nations. If poor countries do not comply with USA's demands, the USA threatens to withhold bank loans, impose tariff barriers or withdraw diplomatic cooperation. At the end of the day, The USA is prepared to use brute force to back up the economic and political threats. That is why the USA fought the 1991 Gulf War. The war was not about peace and democracy, but about protecting the West's oil supplies in the Gulf. Throughout the century, U. S. officials have justified wars and interventions with rhetoric about "protecting democracy", "stopping aggression," or more recently performing "humanitarian" duties. But these merely cover the real aims of USA policy to make the world safe for big business.ⁱⁱ U.S. has always had a powerful voice in the UN. However, with the collapse of the Soviet Union the system of checks and balances, without which any organization can function effectively, has also collapsed. The UN Security Council has become little more than an extension of the U.S. Department of State.ⁱⁱⁱ

The United States has been behaving in an arrogant and hypocritical manner. It has recently brushed aside some good international agreements (for example on nuclear testing, a world criminal court, and landmines) and dismissed some others (the Kyoto Convention on Global Warming) with insouciance in becoming too world's biggest producer of green house gases. Ignoring opposition from many quarters including some European countries, it has insisted on continuing its National Missile Defence programme. Until its towers were attacked, the United States refused to pay its duties to the United Nations.^{iv} The United States constantly urges nations of the world to embrace international human rights standards. And more than other nations, it uses military and

economic leverage to force compliance with these standards. The problem is that the United States does not embrace the international human rights standards that it urges on others. The United States systematically declines to apply international human rights law to its domestic officials. All three branches of the federal government perpetuate this double standard.^v

When it suits the US, it uses the UN to seek legitimacy for its actions, to build coalitions and impose sanctions on 'rogue states'. When world opinion goes against the US, it treats the UN with utter contempt. In the aftermath of World War II, the US was a prime mover in establishing the UN- and such UN initiatives as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights-as an institution to further democracy and freedom on the Western model as a global norm. Throughout the history of UN, America has consistently vetoed any resolution or declaration that did not reflect US priorities or business interests.^{vi} When most people in the world turn to the UN for meaningful solutions to the new threats and challenges of the post-Cold War era, the permanent members of the Security Council continue to stand in the way of allowing the UN to fulfill its original peace and security mission. The new precedent set by the Security Council in the Gulf War is a far cry from what the founding fathers of the UN had in mind; it is not a viable alternative to collective security and it is certainly not of benefit to the international community.^{vii} There is a double standard at the U.N. This conclusion is exemplified in the starkly different methods the U.N. has instituted to address Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and Israel's invasion of Arab Territories. Both Israel and Iraq made legal arguments to justify their military actions in 1967 and 1990, respectively. These justifications are not in accordance with international law. The role of the United States in the two situations is the key. As an ally of the United States, Israel has been permitted to remain in violation of international law. Iraq, on the other hand, was swiftly punished for its actions. Given the action taken against Iraq, there is no reason for the U.N not to meaningfully address the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This conflict is the source of a great deal of unrest in the Middle East.^{viii} The double standards behavior adopted and exercised by the Security Council has had a huge negative impact on the minds and judgments of many nations around the world towards the UN system and its role and credibility in international relations. Such a biased and partial performance by the UN Security Council degraded the role and position of the UN as an independent international institution to an extension of Foreign Ministry of certain members of the

Security Council. If the UN is going to regain its outstanding and positive image across the globe, and if it is going to remain the venue for bringing long lasting dreams of nations across the globe in terms peace, security and justice, it ought to abandon its double standards policy, and take a different stance based on fairness, impartiality and justice.^{ix}

The UN actions in the Gulf contrast sharply with UN inaction on other long-standing disputes such as those over Kashmir, Lebanon, and Palestine, which have been allowed to fester despite the passage of UN resolutions. To an unbiased observer it should be obvious that a double standard is at work where the UN and the United States are concerned.^x The practice of humanitarian intervention is inevitably selective, leading to unavoidable accusations of double standards or worse. The United States, and with it the UN, are accused of being willing to stop ethnic cleansing of the Albanian majority in Kosovo, but failing to act in Rwanda, the West Bank, Tibet, and Chechnya. Humanitarian intervention can easily be seen as just one part of a supposedly systematic pattern of US dominance of the UN.^{xi}

To conclude we can say that the United Nations came in to existence to play the neutral role in resolution of conflicts among various nations. With the passage of time, we have witnessed that United Nations is playing second fiddle role and working under the pressure of USA and her allies' particular on the issue of international terrorism. The members of international community expect from the United Nations to be steadfast, neutral and vigorous in the fight against international terrorism. It is extremely unfortunate that people raise accusing finger on role of United Nations. Unless United Nations plays impartial role in war against terrorism, international community will continue to suffer at the hands of enemies of humanity. United Nations must refrain herself from playing in hands of powerful nations and must be neutral in formulation and execution of the counter terrorism strategies.

Endnotes:

- ⁱ . Ziauddin Sardar and Merryl Wynn Davies. *Why Do People Hate America?* Icon Books, Cambridge, 2002. p.71.
- ⁱⁱ . Lance Selfa. Lance Selfa. "U. S. Imperialism: A Century of Slaughter." *International Socialist Review*, Vol. 7 Spring (1999). < http://isreview.org/issues/07/century_of_slaughter.shtml>
- ⁱⁱⁱ . Enver Masud. *The War on Islam*. The Wisdom Fund, Arlington, 2000. p. 3
- ^{iv} . K. R. Gupta. "Global Terrorism." in K. R. Gupta (ed.). *Global Terrorism*, Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, Delhi, 2004. p. 25.
- ^v . Jack Goldsmith. "International Human Rights Law and the United States Double Standard" *Green Bag*, Vol. 1. No. 4 Summer (1998). p. 366.
- ^{vi} . Ziauddin Sardar and Merryl Wynn Davies. *Op. cit.*, p. 69.
- ^{vii} . Aylin Şeker. "The Fallacy of Multilateralism the United Nations Involvement in the Gulf War and Its Aftermath." *Journal of International Affairs* Vol. 4. No. 2 (1999).
- ^{viii} . Carlos Ortiz "Does a double standard exist at the United Nations?: A Focus on Iraq, Israel and the Influence of the United States on United Nations." *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, Vol. 22. No. 2 (2004). pp. 414-415.
- ^{ix} . Mohammad Hassan Khani. "Double Standards in International Organizations:A Comparative Study of the UN Response to Iraqi Invasions of Iran and Kuwait." *Geopolitics Quarterly*, Vol. 6. No. 4 (2010).
- ^x . Enver Masud. *The War on Islam*. The Wisdom Fund, Arlington, 2000. p. 3
- ^{xi} . Adam Roberts. "The United Nations and Humanitarian Intervention." in Jennifer M. Welsh (ed.). *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*, Oxford University Press Inc., New York, 2004. p. 88.