

Human Rights as a Tool of Diplomacy in Foreign Policy; A Case Study of USA

Ruqaiya Tabasum

Abstract: *Attention to human rights is important component of the international governance and concerns about the equal value, freedom, and welfare of individuals has influenced many national constitutions and domestic public policy. After the adoption of UDHR in 1948, human rights consciousness has especially been nurtured or cultivated. Since then, the concept of 'Human rights' has entered into the political and constitutional lexicon and oriented political thinkers and constitutional experts to re-adjust their ideological and constitutional schemes inconformity with the imperatives of Human rights. Referring to human rights, one can describe foreign policy as activities by policy makers to influence another state or group of states so that they may improve respect for human rights. It is inseparably difficult to design a sound human rights policy, when it comes to international relations. It needs negotiating immense complexities in order to encourage or pressurize governments across the globe to improve their human rights situation. Sometimes such pressures through might bring some improvement, for example, a given government might release some political activists and human rights advocates from prisons or house arrests. However, more often than not, arbitrary laws and practices remain statutorily intact and invite deeper violations of human rights, such as killings, disappearances, harassments and intimidation, detention, torture, etc. Improvement of human rights scenario in other countries become all the more difficult in view of the fact that such countries are independent and sovereign states guided by their historical and cultural treaties. Through this paper, we look into how United States of America has used the carrot of foreign policy to influence, alter and cause changes in the foreign policies of other nations and whether the military interventions that USA had in many countries have been able to fetch the degree of results with which it was initiated or not, when it comes to human rights.*

Keywords: Human rights, Foreign Policy, Diplomacy, International politics, National interest, Intervention

1. Introduction

The 1948 UDHR is the first intergovernmental statement in world history to approve a set of basic principles on universal human rights in which all western and non-western countries have been regularly affirming faith in and have been pledging commitment to without negative discrimination on such grounds as, nationality, ethnicity, gender, race, creed or color. The 1993 UN conference on human rights at Vienna most eloquently rededicated itself to the up keeping of universal human rights across the globe. While twentieth century has vociferously committed itself to international morality and human rights, it has been the bloodiest century as well [1].

The world saw unleashed violence on innocents, which had never been witnessed before across the recorded history. Now, in this second decade of 21st century, we face fundamental challenges with regard to human rights scenario. The most important challenge is to reduce the enormous gap between commitment of most countries to human rights and their inclinations or compulsions to carry out their foreign policies in keeping with the domestic real politics. It is these compulsions which vitiate human rights situation in African countries, in south Asia, in China and other parts of the globe. Some Asian states, in view of these compulsions, tried to elevate cultural relativism and national particularism over universal human rights at the 1993 Vienna conference [2].

While these discursive justifications of human rights violations can go on in the face of domestic challenges, the most worrisome feature of post-Cold War Scenario is that the world is facing glaring genocide and other crimes against humanity on a massive scale. While there are treaties committing the states to the protections of rights of women and children, the global industry in the sex trade is also

accelerating. While there are treaties outlawing slavery and slave trade, there are daily press reports about defacto-bondage of workers in Africa and Asia. Geneva conventions with its additional protocols for victims of war means nothing to those who killed Red Cross workers in Chechnya, UN officials in Iraq and large number of aid workers in Afghanistan. On one hand, there is growth of liberal principles, while on the other hand, there is no let-up to brutal and murderous power struggle [3].

Presently there are numerous inter-governmental organizations working for the upkeep and stabilization of human rights. Also on the non-governmental level, there are trans-national groups dealing with various problems pertaining to human rights. However, the most important parameter in this regard is the omission and commission of states and their foreign policies. Although Inter-Governmental Organizations such as UN, OAS, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe etc. are extensively involved in human rights program, but it is the nation states who hold the primary responsibility for the implementation of the human rights standards [4].

NGO's like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch although play a very influential role in up-keeping the standards and values of human rights across the globe, however, it is mainly the states who approve treaties and decide on the monitoring mechanisms necessary to implement those treaties. States have the responsibility of bringing the violators of human rights to justice. However, states that at times strongly impact human rights program by manipulation of foreign assistance [5].

States have the primary legal obligation to protect and promote human rights, and ensure that people can realize their rights without discrimination. It is the responsibility of states to implement all human rights, and ensure that all

persons under its jurisdiction are able to enjoy all social, economic, political and other rights and freedoms in practice. States have the obligation to establish the independent institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights, and to publish and make available legislation and other instruments relating to human rights so that everyone can know and exercise their fundamental rights [6]. States have the primary responsibility to provide justice for persons who claim to have been victims of a human rights violation and to conduct prompt and impartial investigations of alleged human rights violations. There should be a mechanism to receive all complaints submitted by human rights defenders and prompt and impartial investigation should be conducted whenever there is a suspicion of violation of human rights or fundamental freedoms [7].

The promotion and protection of human rights by individual states has an internal as well as an external dimension. At the internal level, it is important that states comply with international standards. However, these standards often provide only the minimum safeguards and it is the responsibility of the states to provide higher level of protection. Externally, states can raise their voices whenever human rights are violated.

Implementation of human rights is mainly dependent on the compliance of a state with its human rights obligations. However, establishing and development of a constitutional model in which all human rights are effectively protected is easier said than done. It requires elaborate legislation, effective control over state institutions such as the law enforcement agencies, and continuous efforts on the part of numerous other state organs.

2. US Foreign Policy and Human Rights

The human rights policies of the United States can be understood through three categories. The first category is the right to demand freedom from torture i.e. inhuman or degrading treatment post imprisonment or pending trial conditions. It also gives the right to demand freedom from prolonged detention in the absence of trial. The second category of human rights emphasize on the demand for economic and social rights that may include, but are not restricted to, education, healthy living conditions, shelter, food and medical facilities. The third set of human rights involve civil and political rights that are given to the American citizens. For example, freedom of speech and press, movement within the territory, free society formation and the right to participate in the government of the country that is built on the foundations of democracy [8].

The foreign policy of the US has always been motivated by the pursuit of ethical principles and upkeep of national interests. There has been a persistent tendency in US foreign policy leaders to assume the identity between the interests of the US and those of the world at large. American political leaders rhetorically take off the 'The fight for freedom', 'The Evil Empire', 'The Axis of Evil', etc. even while defending hardcore national interests of United States. Such an attitude has led to conflicting consequences. At times, the US has adopted a policy of non-engagement, even isolation and

such an attitude has led to hyper engagement in world affairs and in active pursuit of internationalism [9].

To begin with, American foreign policy was anchored on avoidance of entangling alliances. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson advanced this policy, since the very beginning of the US independence. In 1823 the "Monroe Doctrine" stipulated that United States keep its political engagement confined to the American Continent. Such a foreign policy doctrine was re-introduced in 1920's and 1930's by recourse to neo-isolationism. The impulse of active political engagement across the world also motivated American foreign policy. For example, under Woodrow Wilson, the US joined First World War with a view to making the world safe for democracy. Wilson underlined the need for the international arbitration and adjudication with a view to maintaining the world order [10]. However, after the end of WWI, the US could not join the League of Nations in view of its domestic political compulsions. During World War II, President F.D. Roosevelt formulated what are known as Four Freedoms. These are; Freedom of speech and expression, Freedom to worship God, Freedom from want, and Freedom from fear. These freedoms emerged as important human rights and were explicitly pursued as foreign policy goals of America and were adopted also at international level [11].

America has always emphasized human rights to be integral to its domestic policies. The 1776 Declaration of Independence deems Right to Life, Right to Liberty and Right to Happiness as inalienable rights of all human beings. Various amendments to American Constitution specifically covers various fundamental human rights. In the 19th century, leading movements of United States fought for the abolishment of slavery, and in 20th century Civil Rights Movement fought for equal rights for the black population. These movements categorically bring out the human rights orientation of American domestic policy. The significance of these movements is bringing out the ugly truth that slavery and other forms of discriminations were equally embedded in American System [12].

American foreign policy has been driven both by idealistic principles and realistic assessments. It has been moralistic in view of its assumption that the US can contribute to the collective good of the entire world. However, the US never loses the sight of its national interests. American foreign policy has been moralistic in the sense that it wants to establish freedom and democracy in the entire world. Such a moralistic impulse has been represented by American Statesmen such as Woodrow Wilson, John Foster Dalz and Jimmy Carter. On the other hand, the realistic impulse orientation to American national interests has been personified in such persons as George Kenan, HengryKissenger and President Richard Nielson [13].

American foreign policy can be understood with much depth by conducting a deeper analysis of the morals and the realistic approach that the government has taken up until now. The framework of the foreign policies is often seen to be adopted either simultaneously or alternatively. By emphasizing on human rights, US foreign policy acquires a strong moralistic character. President Jimmy Carter's first

two years in office can be cited as an example of moralistic orientation of American foreign policy. The American foreign policy has a strong instrumental character as well. For example, it emphasized on human rights in authoritarian Chile with a view to pressurizing it in keeping with the larger national interests of the US during the second Reagan's administration.

For American foreign policy planners, it is ideal if human rights considerations and American national interests can be taken care of in a given foreign policy response. This was the case during 1950's and 60's when American interests and human rights program were coalesced in Western Europe. America stood for the human rights of Europeans promising them freedom and democracy in the face of possible military intervention by Soviet Union. At the same time, Soviet Union was also largely contained with the help of European Nations. Similarly, Marshal Plan and NATO alliance was also anchored on realist as well as liberal goals. The American foreign policy planners could wax eloquent on human rights and such a discourse was also instrumental in preserving their national interests viz-viz Soviet Union. Various legislations with special reference to human rights have been adopted by the United States Congress. These legislations were adopted with special reference to US Foreign Aid Program. (7, 1992).

Human Rights have always been the precursor of the US Foreign Policy since its inception. Traces of individual liberty, freedom and the rights of the people is the very basis on which the US Constitution had been first formalized. Post World War II era, the United States government formed the central stage for defining the international agendas and the restructuring of the newly independent states. John Kennedy, the President of the US in 1970s highlighted the growing importance of human rights and its dominance in the formulation of the country's foreign policy to be the "central concern".

According to experts, the policies on human rights did not originate with President Carter and their existence in the US foreign policy was inspired by the Congress and other external forces that influenced the working of the government in the early 1970s. These forces included, but not limited to, scientists, church, labor unions, legal firms, independent not for profit groups, academicians and other human rights activists.

Many American citizens witnessed the decreasing appreciation of the basic human rights and liberties in the actions of the government during instances like the Vietnam war, secret bombings in different parts of the world, scandals, and bothersome discoveries about the US military and economic participation in Asia, America and other parts of the world. In the wake of fighting a consistent war against communism, the government was shifting its discourse towards the traditional routes that affected the position of the country on the global mapping. Hence, the need for reestablishment of the spirit of human rights was identified, which ultimately led to the introduction and immersion of Human Rights Policies in the American foreign policy during the 1970s. This primarily assisted in reinstating the importance of ethical considerations and upholding the basic

rights to freedom and spirit. Furthermore, in 1974, a report titled "Human Rights in the World Community: A Call for US Leadership" was published as a result of a subcommittee that focused on offering recommendations to the state on laying focus on human rights in the foreign policy and combating torture exhibited by international governments [14].

It was identified that few international states were recorded to violate every aspect of human rights that were identified by the world community across the globe. Taking this into consideration, the basis of the argument was laid on the considerations of factors such as moral values, legal and practical aspects. It directly called for the US interference through private diplomacy, public statements and the regular raising of human rights conceptualization in international bodies like the United Nations. The sub-committee also held the need for placing a restriction on international aid to countries that violated human rights practices. Congress was then noted to have passed legislations that called for the formation of reports on every country that was gaining international aid from the country, and prohibiting the same to countries that violated human rights unless the warranty came from the humanitarian aid groups. This directly led to placement of restrictions on military and economic assistance being rendered to countries such as Chile, Uruguay and South Korea on the grounds of human rights and the establishment of a specific office in the US government [15].

1. United States Foreign Policy – Post-Cold War Period

The diffusion of international human rights was widely recognized in the mid-1990s. The primary drivers of the change were the rise of democracy and the fall of communism worldwide. The establishment of democracy in Asian and Latin American countries led to liberalization and increasing amount of attention towards protection of the individual rights of the people. The second driver of the change in the post-cold war period was the transformation of the non-liberal states into applicants of human rights. In 1993, the increased participation of countries in the Vienna World Conference on Human Rights and the Chinese signature of the ICCPR in 1998 proved to be an important example for the rest of the world to follow. Countries across the globe felt prone to the international public opinion on the treatment of the citizens and the internal policies, which gradually set the stage for an improvement in the human rights of individuals.

The process of socialization started sinking in during the 1990s and its evidence was found in the articles published by a vast number of researchers over the time. Experts suggest that the acceptance and recognition given to human rights was much better in post-coldwar eras compared to the past. The altering nature of governments and countries was recorded as a joint triumph of political ideologies, marketization and the efforts of the US government to make the world a better place to live in [16]. With the advent and intervention of the NATO forces to control the situation in Yugoslavia, there was a clear depiction of the merge of powers and principle to strengthen the stance of human

rights in the minds of the leaders and the people altogether [17]. A closer look at the foreign policy of the US and its varied interventions have been discussed in the following few paragraphs.

Human rights concerns are often subdued in comparison with the national security issues and strategic problems that any government might be facing. In case of the US foreign policy, the examples are enormous especially post the 9/11 attacks. White points out that, “Despite the growing role of the human rights movement, the critical element in “determining American foreign policy is what assets—bases, intelligence and diplomatic leverage—it can bring to bear against Al Qaeda, Iraq, and other states seen as threats to the United States. [18]” This section is dedicated towards deriving a correlation between the national security goals, human rights and competing variables that are expected to work together for a country like the US to function effectively. Few case studies post the Cold War period would assist in understanding the role of the American government in the development of human rights across the globe.

Some of the foremost international conflicts and acts of aggression were identified post the Cold War period. The first act was the invasion of the Iraqi forces in Kuwait in the year 1990. The Iraqi forces’ entrance into Kuwait was a clear breach of territorial integrity of Kuwait and constituted as international aggression. In the six months post that, the Iraqi forces caused a high amount of damage to the people, human rights of the population and the infrastructure of Kuwait. The international pressure and the US military intervention caused Iraqi forces to withdraw from Kuwait. This was equated as a victory for the US.

Although Saddam Hussein viewed Kuwait as a part of Iraq; Kuwait was recognized as an independent state and was given a place in the United Nations. During this time, Iraq was given the worst ratings on the scale of human rights under the Saddam Hussein regime and was categorized as a “not free” state [19]. A report published by the UN in 1990 also claimed that there existed evidences of numerous political killings and cruel punishments of citizens of Iraq. Saddam Hussein was also accused of violating the basic human rights of the people and causing high amount of damage to the humanitarian values [20].

The second dreadful war post-cold war period was civil war in Democratic Republic of Congo during the period of 1998 to 2003. Four states were engaged in a clear military aggression of the Congo territory i.e. Rwanda, Uganda, Burundi and Angola. Each of the four states were found guilty of oppression and exploiting the human rights of Congolese citizens and their own citizens. Studies showcased that all the four states were ranked very high on the scale of violating human rights in their respective states and were recorded to be “not free” states [21]. Insurgents notably killed thousands of citizens in Congo and restricted elections for the establishment of a democratic government largely.

Although the UN has taken several actions of humanitarian intervention since its inception, the case of Rwandan

Genocide was one instance where there existed reports of mass human rights violations and none of the countries took initiative to combat the same. In 1994, over 800,000 people were slaughtered in the battle between Tutsis and moderate Hutu in the region. However, the inability of the UN and the allied forces to intervene made them take a vow to never keep quiet in similar situations in the future. The Rwandan genocide and humanitarian crises proved to be a primary reason for the adoption of the (Responsibility to Protect) R2P doctrine and establishment of other international organizations that devoted themselves to the identification and resolution of human rights violations by governmental authorities in certain parts of the world [22].

The third act of international aggression was between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The tension on the borders of both the countries was evident since a long duration of time; however, an active war erupted in early 1999. UN security council took active notice of the situation at the height of violence being committed, and demanded both the countries to halt the war immediately. Without much significance given to the demand made by the UN security council, throughout 1999, an aggressive war continued between the two countries that eventually led to the millions of casualties and international territorial aggression by each of them.

A large-scale violation of human rights was recorded during this time coupled with the displacement of thousands of civilians in Ethiopia. Over 10,000 individuals were captured under the political criminal laws and many groups identified and reported that torture was committed. The ratings of both the countries on the human rights scale was very poor during that time and the US State Department is noted to have criticized both the countries extensively [23]. The government of Ethiopia and Eritrea were also accused of governmental control on the media channels, jailing people without any charges or trials and violating the human rights of their people to a significant extent [24].

The fourth example of international aggression that led to the violation of the human rights of the people on a high scale was during war in Kosovo in the year 1999. The intervention was led by the US government. The first war was conducted by the Yugoslav forces on Kosovo and the second war was the NATO intervention to control the situation. According to the US Department of State, there were high number of instances for “extrajudicial killings, disappearances, torture, brutal beatings, rape, arbitrary arrest and detention” as well as a crackdown on the independent media and limits to the rights of assembly in Serbia. [25]”

Serbia was then recorded as a consistent violator of human rights, since the rights of their own people were brutally ignored on numerous accords. The second element of this instance is the intervention that was led by the US and their allies. The war had caused over 4 million people to leave their homes and was characterized as an initiative by free states (at that time) to protect the human rights of the Kosovo people and help them restore normality. A vast number of Kosovo people were killed during the war and the actions of the NATO countries were respected for military

intervention and offering assistance in preserving the human rights.

The last act of international aggression was the US intervention in Iraq in 2003. Some experts believe that although the motive of the US and the UK was to eliminate the human rights violations by the Saddam regime in the region; however, since the intervention was not authorized by the UN, experts categorize it as an internationally aggressive act. Furthermore, during the period of 2002 and 2003, Iraq failed poorly in upholding the rights of the people and committed numerous crimes against humanity which include but not limited to, political killings, extrajudicial criminal activities, torture of the people, limitations on the freedom of speech and press and reports of mass graves. The human rights' protection of the Iraqi citizens and the containment of the weapons of mass destruction was termed as the main reason for the conflict and intervention by the US and its allies [26].

Since the beginning, The United States of America has used the carrot of foreign policy to influence, alter and cause changes in the foreign policies of other nations. Experts highlight case studies recorded by the US government that indicate a successful compelling program on other nations to vote in their favor in international bodies towards democratization or combating violence, and their military intervention in other nation states to pave way for democracy. On the other hand, certain experts are of the opinion that the actions of the US government have had little impact on human rights or democratization and the military intervention has not been able to fetch the degree of results with which it was initiated.

Taking these factors into account, researchers have made an effort to comprehend the motive behind the US interference in the economic and political matters of other nations. It was identified that the US wishes to advance its own foreign policies and economic interests through the exertion of influence on other nations to adopt favorable regimes domestically and internationally. Apart from this, it was also noted that the actions of the government are not locally perceived to be positive with the growing interference by the people and the citizens of the foreign countries.

The political ties of any country tend to affect the economic ties largely. Researchers point out that the excursion of the US is to open markets for its growing economy and its military presence. With this agenda in mind, the US has been using the human rights card to venture into international politics and influence the local markets that are overwhelmed by the largest economy of the world already. Foreign countries, when inviting political or military intervention intake the economic influence that directly benefits the US economy as well [27]. On the brighter side, the US has indeed contributed profusely towards human rights and overall growth of the countries that it is acquainted with.

2. United States Foreign Policy and Iraq Intervention

The American interest in Iraq can be viewed from multiple angles. Iraq is constituted as one of the most critical nations in the Middle Eastern region given the strategic location and the reserves of oil that it possesses which indirectly makes it a significant location for the international economy to function effectively. Under the Saddam Hussein regime, the stability of Iraq was questioned multiple times due to the increasing number of cases coming to light on genocide, extreme dictatorship and worsening conditions of the people. Internal conflicts and violence were synonymous with the name of Iraq. The internal tensions within the Iraq territory were being witnessed by the neighboring countries and also posing a threat to the interests of the American government.

The domestic massacre, internal wars and consistent corruption led to suppression of tribes in Iraq as well. While the Iraq situation was viewed as a strong violation of human rights of its citizens, it was also being criticized for corruption and unequal distribution of the oil reserves with the rest of the world [28]. In accordance with a report published by the Amnesty International, disappearances of people in Iraq was a common phenomenon. Families of the missing people were restricted from asking questions on the whereabouts. The victims usually belonged to people and groups belonging to Kurds, Sunni, Arabs, Shi's, Turcomans, Christians etc. The victims were men, women, children and elderly. Every individual who raised a voice against the political scenarios in the country was noted to be put to rest. The responses of international governments on disappearances and extrajudicial execution was a silence that the Iraqi people detested the most. Although numerous efforts were put in by international human rights groups and religious interest groups to plead the government on putting a halt to it; however, nothing concrete came out of the same and the Saddam regime continued its atrocities on the people. There were several documented videotapes, pictures, audios and films that depicted the same over a large span of time [29].

Finally, the American government found it essential to intervene and help in the establishment of a democratic government along with pressure groups to control the exceedingly worrisome situation in the Middle East from the international perspective. To supplement the intentions of the American Government, some researchers point out that Saddam Hussein was definitely terrorizing people and ignoring their basic human rights before he was held captive. Post the invasion of the American government in Iraq, the government launched numerous campaigns that spoke about the terrorism caused by Saddam Hussein and how his regime disrupted the human rights of the Iraqi citizens.

On the other hand, the American government is criticized for using the human rights card which was played to curtain the real intentions of the US government. The rejection of the disarmament act by Saddam Hussein and his collaborations with Al-Qaeda to manufacture arms was noted to be the primary reason for the intrusion of the American government in the country. There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein had killed hundreds of people who tried to oppose

his rule in the country and rejected the notion of the human rights in the region; however, the agenda of the Bush administration was entirely different which was renamed as the restoration of democracy and human rights in Iraq [30].

Considering the war that was held between the American military forces, its allies and Iraq; there were far worse implications on the human rights of the people as compared to the disruptions caused by the Saddam regime. The US forces are criticized to have left a gap for other extremist groups to take over Iraq and cause further atrocities on the people in the Middle Eastern Region. The invasion of the American government in Iraq hasn't changed the human rights issues that the people have been facing during the Saddam regime as well. In addition, the presence of mass destructive weapons is still questionable as the traces of the same haven't been discovered as yet [31].

In fact, according to a report published by the UK government, who was a US ally in the war against Iraq quoted that, "the [US] Intelligence Community was dead wrong in almost all of its pre-war judgments about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. This was a major intelligence failure." The UK government admitted being ashamed of taking a spontaneous decision to support the US intervention in Iraq without doing a careful evaluation of the evidence that was collected by the US intelligence. The UK government was confident on finding weapons of mass destruction post the war or when the Iraqi government was removed. The failure to find weapons of mass destruction continued during and after the Iraq war, which led to a number of questions being laid on the intentions of the UK government about the legitimacy of the war and public opinion was consecutively against the government as a whole [32].

According to the US Human Rights Council, the Iraq war has had more extensive effects on the people other than what meets the eye. Apart from the recorded death of over half million Iraqis from between 2003 and 2011, the reports indicate the violation of Human Rights on many more accords. For example, attacks on civilian population, denial of permission to access hospitals to civilians, use of toxic weapons that were harmful for the civilians and the environment and inability to take care of civilian deaths even after the war was over. Abusive treatment by US military personnel against the detainees is among the foremost violations of humanitarian laws that were encompassed by the government.

Torture, inhumane treatment and varied types of abuses were used to humiliate the detainees and make them suffer without any trials or charges for a long time. The UN alleged that the American domestic authorities contributed little towards the investigation of the claims or about arresting the people responsible for the heinous crimes committed against humanity. It was also highlighted that the UN independent authorities also ignored the issue and preferred to keep quiet despite repeated instances coming to light on the atrocities committed by the US military forces [33].

Another perspective to the breach of human rights in the Iraq war was the aftermath of the use of toxic weapons

knowingly and their concurrent effects on the future generations. Experts offer statistics revealing that there exists an epidemic of congenital birth defects in children born after the war in majority of the Iraq cities [34]. Iraqi doctors have put in complaints of the serious birth defects that range from children being born with two heads and paralysis of limbs. There are even traces of wide spread cancer cases coming to light post the ending of the Iraq war primarily in the Fallujah region. Physicians point out that over 15% congenital birth defects in births in the region which has raised alarms and increasing number of questions on the health of children and the civilians in the Iraq region. The disturbing part is the muteness of the US government on the issue despite their rigorous claims on human rights policies and their continuous efforts to establish a health society across the globe [35].

The case study of US Intervention in Iraq gives highlights the motive of US military interventions and sets an example to explore the motive behind other similar interventions that have caused short term and long-term damage to the host country. The Afghanistan intervention of the US is an ideal case study to consider with respect to the objectives of this study.

3. United States Foreign Policy and Afghanistan Intervention

The US led an international military intervention in Afghanistan immediately after 9/11. The war of US efforts to dismantle Taliban lasted over 6 years and was recorded the longest battle ever held [36].

The invasion was in part billed as a fight for women's rights and their dignity in Afghanistan. During the Taliban era from 1996 to 2001, women were denied of their rights, and were invisible in public life, barred from going to school or working. Following the 2001 invasion of Afghanistan, world leaders, including those from the UK and USA, regularly cited the need to improve Afghan women's rights as justification for the intervention. In November 2001, first lady Laura Bush delivered the president's weekly radio address on the plight of Afghan women--marking the first time a first lady had delivered the president's weekly address on her own. First Lady urged Americans to "join our family in working to ensure that dignity and opportunity will be secured for all the women and children of Afghanistan. [37]

Following the invasion, Afghan women emerged as a high-profile focus of U.S. policy. Women's progress was promoted as a powerful, positive product of the international presence in the war-scarred country. In the years following the military intervention, schools opened doors to girls, and women went back to work. The new constitution in 2003 enshrined women's rights in it, and in 2009 Afghanistan adopted the Elimination of Violence Against Women (EVAW) law [38].

Seventeen years since invasion and almost \$2 trillion later, the country is still in turmoil as the Taliban maintains its grip on almost 60 percent of the country and violence and discrimination against women and girls continues all over

Afghanistan. Attention to the cause of Afghan women's rights has also plummeted. Though the constitution guarantees equal rights for women and men, women continue to face formidable cultural barriers. Figures show a dire situation. Afghanistan has one of the world's highest maternal mortality ratios. Female literacy is below 20% and Afghanistan is still considered the worst place in the world to be a woman. Negotiations and reconciliation with Taliban being viewed only options to end war, it seems Afghan women's rights are forgotten. [39]

However, since 2001, the United States and its allies are known to have recorded a considerable amount of progress in the reconstruction of the national economy, reinforcement of the Afghani security forces and consistent development towards the development of the human rights in the region. The US choice of external involvement in assisting the Afghan government in restoring peace and resolving conflict is considered as the most significant example of human rights diplomacy on the international level. The breach of human rights on the international level, in this instance, is within the scope of the study. It is crucial to understand the relationship between the American Government, its diplomatic policies and the Afghanistan government before we proceed to the reasons for intervention and the outcomes. The below section is devoted on shedding a light on the diplomatic arrangements, the interference of the Soviet Union and Chinese government and the proceedings that eventually forced the American government to militarily intervene in the political and military matters to support Afghanistan [40].

4.2 Public Diplomacy in the 21st Century: US and Afghanistan

The diplomatic relationship between US and Afghanistan is primarily based on education, communication and training in the 21st century. The varied programs sponsored by the United States are targeted towards educating young diplomats and improving their capabilities in terms of administration, policy initiation and communication skills. The USAID has played a concrete role in the initiatives of US government towards public diplomacy in the Afghanistan region. Support for education, work towards training women journalists, sponsorship of independent media and formation of radio and television channels are some of the leading contributions that has spread the spirit of human rights and freedom of speech among the men and women citizens alike. The intervention of US military in an effort to resist Taliban occupancy in Afghanistan since 2001 is another promising benchmark progress in the joint effort of civil and military instruments to achieve military goals that were set in. This was known as the "Comprehensive Approach" in which civil and military cooperation was evident wherein the military engaged in non-military activities and participated in the reestablishment of healthy civil environment for the citizens. However, the American intervention also caused a large number of civil casualties that were used by the Taliban to win the people of Afghan and support them instead.

While considering the positive efforts of the American government with military participation to assist the Afghans,

there are a wide variety of counter narratives made available that reject the positive intention of the American government. These narratives lay focus on the ideology that the US had not taken enough time to build trust among the people before the military strategy was brought into the picture. The American authorities also claim that the US public diplomacy and efforts in the direction of building intercultural ties, communication and educational institutions was completely overshadowed by the overbearing military intervention, communication and information structures that led to a negative image of the American government in the hearts and minds of the Afghan citizens. There was a dire need for releasing the military and security ties of the American government in Afghanistan from the public diplomacy actions that the government actually aspired to accomplish [41].

There exists little doubt that the American government has invested largely in the development of the Afghanistan government and economy over the years. The economy has grown considerably with 1% increase in GDP in 2015 and a suspected improvement to be witnessed by 3% at the end of the year 2019. However, the instability from the political and security perspective may prove to be a roadblock in the overall growth of the Afghanistan economy. Nonetheless, the international community, primarily America, has invested largely to reduce the amount of debt and assisted the government in improving its infrastructure, economy, education system and social structures. Regional trade and long-term participation of mining industry is expected to yield some results for the evolution of the economy as a whole. The US objectives and interests in Afghanistan are often being termed as a spontaneous action taken by the government post the trauma it faced in September 11 attacks on the Twin Towers. The objective as stated by the American government, "in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons."

The consistent efforts of the US government in vanquishing Al-Qaeda from its roots is definitely a successful one; however, the fear of the basic ideology being retained by Taliban was the absolute fear that caused the interference of the American government in the security threats residing in Afghanistan. In 2011, it was concluded that the Americans were unsuccessful in getting rid of Taliban entirely and thus they transferred the entire responsibility to the Afghanistan government and backed out. The aim of stabilizing Afghanistan with improved governing ideologies and economic development was observed as unfeasible by the Obama government in its second term [42].

According to a recent article published, the Trump government is noted to taking the Afghanistan issue one step forward by accepting the failure of the military forces to secure fort and venture into diplomatic agreements with the Taliban. Although there is little evidence on the communication held between American diplomats and the Taliban heads; however, the human rights of the people of Afghanistan are recorded to have taken a major setback with the death of thousands of civilians and their inability to live a peaceful life in any town in the country today. The American government's foreign policy and diplomatic ways

have indeed produced some fruitful results; however, they haven't been able to conclude the war or strengthen the Afghanistan government to hold the fort without the Western intervention and support.

The US government has already spent trillions of dollars in this longest war possible and hasn't been able to live up to the commitments it had made years ago to support governments that offer agreement and improvement towards upholding the basic human rights of its people [43]. With the return of the Western troops to their homeland, it is for the Afghanistan government to dictate their future and fight the Taliban themselves. The United States of America needs to formulate new strategies to tackle the Afghanistan problem which may include diplomatic talks, economic support or international pressure from other countries surrounding Afghanistan.

The recent developments in the proposition of negotiations with the Taliban and an offering to give them a status of a legitimate political party have given a ray hope to the Afghanistan civilians for peace and harmony in their country [44]. The problem at hand is the reservation against the involvement of women in the peace talks and the inability to recognize their previous capabilities or victories in leading peaceful negotiations in the past in countries such as Liberia and Colombia etc. The women rights in Afghanistan have taken a backseat since the rise of Taliban. With several restrictions being placed on the movement of women and their education, the need for highlighting the issue of women's human rights have also come into light. It is imperative for Afghan leaders to improve the participation of women in the decision making and peace negotiations of the country in order to secure peace at the ground level as well [45].

According to reports, despite the oppression of the Afghanistan women and their rights over time, they have contributed largely in the form of direct discussions with the leaders of the insurgents, support for the Taliban fighters to reintegrate in the community, easing the hostage release processes and encouraging an increasing number of insurgents to participate in discussions. Women in Afghanistan have also been able to get acquainted with the minute details in the region due to their presence at the lowest level. Furthermore, Afghanistan women have notably driven public support, worked in all sections of the society, educated individuals in the extremist groups and even brought in more attention towards the humanitarian concerns that lay at hand in the country today. Therefore, the fight for the women's human rights in the country is another agenda that should be fought for. The ignorance of women on the peace tables is yet another example of the denial of their basic human rights in the country in spite of their capability to contribute largely, given the connection with the grass root levels that they possess, as highlighted earlier [46].

Afghan women are afraid that peace negotiators with the Taliban would trade away women's rights. According to The Asia Foundation's latest Survey of the Afghan People, fear for personal safety and security has increased significantly among Afghan women over the last four years: from 65 percent in 2013 to 74 percent in 2017. Women who reported

they always fear for their safety and security are more likely to report that peace with Taliban is impossible (55%) compared to those who reported they never experience fear (43%) [47]. Therefore, the process needs to involve women and due consideration needs to be given to women's concerns while negotiating with Taliban.

Although the insurgents in the region still hold a large part of the territory under their control, the US counterterrorism forces and their allies are consistently working towards training soldiers, advertising and offering assisting to the Afghanistan government through diverse aid programs and work towards sustenance of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) under the "Resolute Support Mission". Talking in terms of the 2018 scenario and the 2019 political and economic environment in Afghanistan, the battle for the establishment of human rights in the Afghan state is not over still. The Afghanistan government is consistently being criticized for its inability to manage corruption, offer security to civilians, reduce ethnic tensions and work towards economic development of the country as a whole.

The upcoming elections in April 2019 in Afghanistan are speculated to create a political tension in the region. The US government is working hard towards the adoption of peace talks as a significant channel for maintaining a peaceful environment [48]. A new strategy is formed by the Trump administration where in a larger amount of focus is being laid on fighting to win rather than nation building. The role of the Indian government in assisting in the direction towards the fight to combat terrorism was brought to light as well. The new strategy however does not have a stringent timeline and includes an expansion of the US troops assignment in the region today [49].

Given the amount of efforts laid by the American governments since the past few decades to reestablish human rights and support a developing nation with political, military and economic intervention, there is a strong need to discuss similar efforts carried out by the US to support other nations across the globe. Keeping this in view, the next section includes a thorough analysis of the challenges faced by the US government in the past, its repercussions and the causes of the same.

Conclusion

International human rights regulations are implemented in the same way like any other law; however, human rights laws are subject to have their own bindings and ways of functioning. It is bound to be different since it needs the agreement of the states involved, and demands foreign aid from the super powers that influence the world politics primarily, in this case, the United States of America. The effectiveness of the human rights laws is not required to be witnessed in the region of the Western countries but in countries that reside in other parts of the world. The integration of human rights is required to be done before the whole agenda of human rights is corrupted by the strategic interests of the western countries, which may or may not be aligned with human rights, and is overshadowed by the

foreign aid requirements that lesser developed countries demand from time to time.

The practices adopted by the Western countries definitely have a strong influence on the rest of the world. The history of different dimensions of aid is predicted to offer security to developing and underdeveloped countries in the form of order and wealth. The current need of the world is to promote the social well being of the people rather than focusing on converting a poor nation into a rich one or establishing corruption free institutions. Foreign aid is expected to only assist a nation in improving the living conditions; however, it cannot alter the society as a whole. Thus, the 21st century demands an altering outlook of international politics and a larger focus on what is the actual need of the society to bring about considerable amount of change in the thought process of people and the way they function [50].

References

- [1] Bas De GaayFortman, "Human Rights in the Context of International Relations", E-International Relations, (2011), Available at: <https://www.e-ir.info/2011/07/30/human-rights-in-the-context-of-international-relations-a-critical-appraisal/undefined>.
- [2] David P. Forsythe, *Human Rights in International Relations*, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), 152.
- [3] David P. Forsythe, *Human Rights in International Relations*, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), 153.
- [4] Peter R. Baehr and Monique Castermans-Holleman, *The Role of Human Rights in Foreign Policy*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, 3rd ed.), 69.
- [5] Peter R. Baehr, "Human Rights and International Relations", *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems*, (2001), 1-3.
- [6] Wolfgang Wagner, "Chapter 7: International Relations Theories and Human rights", *The Sage Handbook of Human Rights*, (2014), 105-122.
- [7] Compare Jan Egeland, "Focus on Human Rights: Ineffective Big States, Potent Small States," *Journal of Peace Research*, 21, 3 (1984), and his Impotent Superpower – Potent Small State: Potentialities and Limitations of Human Rights Objectives in the Foreign Policies of the United States and Norway (Oslo: Norwegian University Press, 1988)
- [8] Patricia M. Derian, *Human Rights and American Foreign Policy*, (The John Hopkins University Press, 1979), 1, No. 1, 3-9.
- [9] David Forsythe, "US Foreign Policy and Human Rights," *Journal of Human Rights*, (2010), 501-521.
- [10] Roberta Cohen, "Integrating Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Policy: The History, The Challenges, and the Criteria for an Effective Policy", *Brookings*, (2008).
- [11] David Weissbrodt, "United States Foreign Policy and Human Rights: An Overview", *University of Minnesota Law School and Whitter Law Review*, (1985), 697 – 705.
- [12] David P. Forsythe, *American Exceptionalism and Global Human Rights*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Distinguished Lecture Series, 1999). And David P. Forsythe, "Human Rights and US Foreign Policy: Two Levels, Two Worlds," in David Beetham, ed., *Politics and Human Rights* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 111–130.
- [13] Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 88.
- [14] Ole Holsti, "Public Opinion on Human Rights in American Foreign Policy," in David P. Forsythe, ed., *The United States and Human Rights: Looking Inward and Outward*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000) 57-63.
- [15] Roberta Cohen, "Integrating Human Rights in US Foreign Policy: The History, The Challenges, and the Criteria for an Effective Policy", *The Brookings Institution – University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement*, (2008), 4-5
- [16] John Ikenberry, *Power and Liberal Order: America's Postwar World Order in Transition*, International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, (Oxford University Press and the Japan Association of International Relations, 2005), Vol 5, 2, 133-152.
- [17] Marianne Hanson and Time Dunne, "Human Rights in International Relations", The University of Queensland, (2009), 67-68.
- [18] William W. Burke White, "Human Rights and National Security: The Strategic Correlation". *Harvard Human Rights Journal*. (2004), 17, 253.
- [19] Freedom House, Freedom House Country Ratings: Annual Survey of Freedom, Country Scores 1972-73 to 1999-2000: Iraq, <http://www.freedomhouse.org/ratings/iceland.htm>
- [20] Human Rights Questions: Human Rights Situations and Reports of Special Rapporteurs and Representatives, U.N. GAOR, 49th Sess., Agenda Item 100, at 12–22, U.N. Doc A/49/651 (1994).
- [21] Human Rights Watch, Human Rights World Report (1999: Rwanda), <http://www.hrw.org/worldreport99/africa/rwanda.html>
- [22] Fred Aja Agwu, "The Challenge of Humanitarian Intervention Since Rwanda", *Council on Foreign Relations*, (2014), Available at: https://www.cfr.org/councilofcouncils/global_memos/p33324, Accessed: 15th January 2019.
- [23] Human Rights Watch, Human Rights World Report 1999: Ethiopia, at <http://www.hrw.org/worldreport99/africa/ethiopia.html>
- [24] U.S. Dep't of State, Country Reports on Human Rights Practices—2000: Eritrea, at <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2000/af/782.htm>
- [25] U.S. Dep't of State, Country Reports on Human Rights Practices—1999: Serbia Montenegro, at <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/1999/358.htm>
- [26] William W. Burke White, "Human Rights and National Security: The Strategic Correlation". *Harvard Human Rights Journal*. (2004), 17, 263-264.
- [27] James Meernik, "U.S. Foreign Policy and Regime Instability", *Strategic Studies Institute*, (2008), 1-8.
- [28] Ian Johnstone, "US-UN Relations After Iraq: The End of the World (Order) As We Know It?", *EJIL*, (2004), 830.
- [29] Amnesty International, "Disappearances and Political Killings: Human Rights Crises of the 1990s", *Amnesty International*, (1993), 3-5.
- [30] Kabelo Phofong Phamotse, Wang Yonghui, and Zhang Xian. "The Use and Abuse of Human Rights in

- International Relations: A Case of the United States Foreign Interventions”, *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, (2017), 22, 21.
- [31] *Ibid*, 22
- [32] Sir John Chilcot, “The Report of the Iraq Inquiry: Executive Summary”, *House of Commons: United Kingdom*, (2016), 69-77.
- [33] UN Human Rights Council, “Iraq: Grave Human Rights Violations During the War and Occupation in Iraq”, *UN Human Rights Council*, (2013), 1-2.
- [34] Jeena Shah at The Center for Constitutional Rights, “Iraqi Birth Defects Covered Up?”, *Huffingtonpost.com*, (2013), [online], Available at: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/the-center-for-constitutional-rights/iraqi-birth-defects-cover_b_4046442.html. Accessed: 28th November 2018.
- [35] Mozghan Savabieasfahani, “Epidemic of Birth Defects in Iraq and Our Duty as Public Health Researchers”, *Aljazeera.com*, (2013), [online]. Available at: <https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/03/2013312175857532741.html>. Accessed: 28th November 2018
- [36] Ashley J. Tellis and Jeff Eggers, “U.S. Policy in Afghanistan: Changing Strategies, Preserving Gains”, *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, (2017), 3-4.
- [37] Lauren Bohn, “We’re All Handcuffed in This Country.’ Why Afghanistan is Still the Worst Place in the World to be a Woman,” *Time.com*, (2018).
- [38] Amnesty International UK, “Women in Afghanistan: The Back Story,” *Amnesty International UK*, (2014).
- [39] Gayle Tzemach Lemmon, “Looming Threat to Afghan Women’s Rights”, *Council on Foreign Relations*, (2011).
- [40] Kim Berry, “The Symbolic Use of Afghan Women in the War on Terror”, *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, (2003), Vol 27, No 2, 137-160.
- [41] *Ibid*, 10-11
- [42] Ashley J. Tellis and Jeff Eggers, “U.S. Policy in Afghanistan: Changing Strategies, Preserving Gains” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, (2017), 5-8.,
- [43] The Economist, “Donald Trump is Doing Better on Afghanistan than His Predecessor”, *The Economist*, (2018).
- [44] FES Editorial Team, “Women’s Experience of the Afghan Conflict are Muted, Sidelined and Ignored, According to Female Expert Researchers”, *Friedrich Ebert Stiftung*, (2018), [online], Available at: <https://www.fes-connect.org/popular-posts/detail/womens-experiences-of-the-afghan-conflict-are-muted-sidelined-and-ignored-according-to-female-expert-researcher/>. [Accessed: 28th November 2018]
- [45] Jamille Bigio and Rachel Vogelstein, “Afghanistan-Taliban Peace Talks Must Include Women Negotiators Defending their Rights”, *USA Today*, (March 21, 2018), [online], Available at: <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2018/03/21/afghanistan-taliban-peace-talks-must-include-women-column/437628002/>. [Accessed: 28th November 2018]
- [46] *Ibid*
- [47] Mohammad Shoaib Haidary, “Afghan Women Pessimistic on Peace Talks with Taliban”, *The Asia Foundation*, [online], Available at: <https://asiafoundation.org/2018/02/14/afghan-women-pessimistic-peace-talks-taliban/>.
- [48] Clayton Thomas, “Afghanistan: Background and U.S. Policy: In Brief”, *Congressional Research Service: Informing the Legislative Debate Since 1914*, (2018), 1.
- [49] *Ibid*, 2.
- [50] Eric Posner, “The Case Against Human Rights”, *The Guardian*, (2014), [online], Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2014/dec/04/sp-case-against-human-rights>. [Accessed: 29th November 2018]