

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Dissertations and Theses

City College of New York

2013

Failed or Fragile States in International Power Politics

Nussrathullah W. Said

CUNY City College

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cc_etds_theses/171

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Failed or Fragile States in International Power Politics

Nusrathullah W. Said

May 2013

Master's Thesis

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of International Affairs at the City College of New York**

Advisor: Dr. Jean Krasno

This thesis is dedicated to Karl Markl, an important member of my life who supported me throughout my college endeavor.

Thank you Karl Markl

Contents

Part I

Chapter 1 – Introduction: Theoretical Framework.....	1
The importance of the Issue.....	6
Research Design.....	8
Methodology/Direction.....	9
Chapter 2 – Definition and Literature.....	10

Part II

Chapter 3 – What is a Failed State?	22
Chapter 4 – What Causes State Failure?	31

Part III

Chapter 5 – The Case of Somalia.....	41
Chapter 6 – The Case of Yemen.....	50
Chapter 7 – The Case of Afghanistan.....	59
Who are the Taliban?	66

Part IV

Chapter 8 – Analysis.....	79
Chapter 9 – Conclusion.....	89
Policy Recommendations.....	93
Bibliography.....	95

Abstract

The problem of failed states, countries that face chaos and anarchy within their border, is a growing challenge to the international community especially since September 11, 2001. The internal state failure in these states causes civil conflicts, poverty, migration, the spread of manageable diseases, makes this state a breeding ground for terrorism and threatens its neighbors. Both scholars and policymakers associate the formidable challenge of troubled states with their internal governing systems without considering the external causes that impede governability.

My hypothesis is that the role of external interference plays a fundamental role in contributing to state failure. Failures in troubled states and security threats around the world are ultimately caused by external interference in states. The factor of external interference is ignored both by scholars and political pundits in mainstream media. Internal instability and failure do not originally arise in failed states because of the weaknesses in the government system, but by external elements that make the internal system weak, causing it to collapse. I discuss the cases of three countries: first, Somalia, because it is widely regarded as a collapsed state; second, Yemen, because it is considered a failing state especially due to terrorist cases emanating from Yemen; and third, Afghanistan because the US started a campaign to rebuild the country after 9/11, but the expected progress has not been achieved. The US and its allies endeavor to change the situation there, but policies and strategies are failing due to lack of attention to external pressure. This study shows that by dealing with external interference as a policy priority, the so-called “failed states” can be saved and could become promising nations.

Chapter 1

Failed or Fragile States in International Power Politics

Since the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, and subsequent attacks around the world, including those in London and Madrid, writings in political and academic literature have focused on the issue of failed states. Policymakers and the international community have been struggling to change the situation in these states and save them. However, they are still unable to prevail successfully. Afghanistan, Somalia and Yemen are among the prominent cases of failed states. In Afghanistan, the United States and its allies have focused on restoring some form of stability for the past twelve years, but Afghanistan, a strategically important country, remains unstable and a major challenge in its region. Yemen, although it has not encountered foreign invasions and civil wars akin to Afghanistan, is also considered a failing or failed state in the media and by political pundits. It has become unsafe according to mainstream media, because Al-Qaeda and other insurgent groups are prevailing in that country. Somalia is another example of a failed state; the country was considered a failed state twenty years ago, when 300,000 Somalis starved to death, and it is still a failed state in 2013. While Afghanistan, Yemen, and Somalia are among the countries termed “failed states,” the policies implemented for these countries have been unsuccessful to this point. Though policymakers of major powers are well equipped with the knowledge and tools for evaluating such states, they still have been inept to design a successful strategy for stabilizing and rebuilding a non-functioning state. Therefore, there must be a serious flaw

in dealing with the concept of a “failed state.” In this thesis, it is most useful to define a failed state in the following way:

A failed state has been originally a sovereign state, as defined in the Charter of the United Nation (Articles 1, 2 and 76), that was not subject to outside control and interference. The state had a government and a parliament, yet now the internal systems either barely function or do not function at all, which creates political and social insecurity and instability and causes civil war and other problems. Such a state should be designated a failed state.

This thesis will discuss the concept of a failed state and argue that in the international system of states, the role of outside interference accounts for failure, making it a victim state of international power politics – a factor this thesis aims to focus on and address. I argue that it is the external factors that have a pivotal role in creating a state’s internal instability and failure. Policymakers should revise the term failed state and analyze a weak and unstable state from the viewpoint of outside factors that cause instability. My hypothesis is that because the definition of the causes of failed states is flawed, the policy design based on that definition will ultimately be flawed as well. I argue that these states have become victims of external power politics, and the external factors make it almost impossible for the internal government to establish territorial integrity, national identity and loyalty of all the citizens to the state.

Why this issue is important

I discuss this topic for two reasons: first, the fallacious concept of failed state has worsened the already bad situation in countries such as Afghanistan and Yemen. Second, Afghanistan was, is and looks to be in dire condition, in spite of the implemented failed state policies, because the broad “failed state” concept, as presently applied, is flawed. Under the current definitions, “Failed states are tense, deeply conflicted, dangerous, and bitterly contested by warring factions. In most failed states, government military battle armed revolts led by one or more rivals. Official authorities in a failed state sometimes face two or more insurgencies, varieties of civil unrest, different degrees of communal discontent and a plethora of dissent are directed at the state and at groups within the state.”¹ Other sources list terrorism and failed states^{2,3} as threats to international security⁴ and the collapse of state institutions.⁵ This failed state concept is applied across the board to all malfunctioning states, and the concept only focuses on internal factors and totally ignores external factors, especially international power politics.

In addition, malfunctioning states have remained unstable, and an immense challenge to the national security of themselves, their neighbors, the West, including the United States, and international peace and security. Nonfunctioning states are in a vulnerable position because they can become easy incubators of terrorists like al Qaeda to recruit members and establish networks. Yemen, Afghanistan and Somalia have been the

¹. Robert, I. Rotberg, “The New Nature of Nation-State Failure,” *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 3, (2002, Summer): pp. 85-96.

². Ray Takeyh. Gvosdev, K. NiKolas, “Do Terrorists Networks Need a Home?,” *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 3, (2002, summer): pp.97-108

³. Kydd H. Andrew. Walter F. Barbara, “The Strategies of Terrorism,” *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 1, (2006, summer): p. 49-80

⁴. Yoo, John, “Fixing Failed States,” *California Law Review*, Vol. 99, No. 95, (2011, spring): pp. 95-150

⁵. Brooks Ehrenreich, Rosa, “Failed States, or the State as Failure?,” *The University of Chicago Law Review*, Vol. 72, No. 4, (2005, autumn): pp. 1159-1196

obvious examples of it. The territories of nonfunctioning states are used for transshipment of illegal drugs, smuggling, acquiring and disposing of gray market goods, human trafficking, and the possible proliferation of weapons of mass destruction⁶. Many human lives have been lost and many human rights violations have occurred in nonfunctioning states since WWII mostly due to internal wars and lack of security. Poverty and especially the challenge of terrorism demand serious attention to the issue of nonfunctioning states. Powerful countries need new political strategies in dealing with the cases of nonfunctioning states.

This paper argues that what are currently considered failed states should be defined as victim states in many cases. This paper will examine Afghanistan and show that the presently used failed state concept omits the pivotal factor, namely power politics in the international arena, that applies to it. In this thesis, I will further evaluate the cases of two other strategically crucial non-functioning states – Yemen and Somalia. I will investigate the cause for the malfunctioning of the political and social systems of these states and whether the failed state definition applies to either one of these countries. Generally speaking, victim states are situated in locations in the world that are strategically significant for international power politics, and these three countries are of strategic importance in the world.

This paper will demonstrate that states such as Afghanistan, Somalia, and Yemen have been unsuccessful as a result of international power politics and regional power competition. I will attempt to answer some unanswered questions: Why is it important to reevaluate the concept of a failed state? Why the current failed state concepts are still

⁶.Yoo, John. pp. 95-150

consistently used and focused on even when the implemented policies proved unsuccessful? Why political pundits and scholars don't see the need for revision to the concept of failed states? Will the current failed states pose further threats to the stability of their neighbors and the world as a whole? Are failed states offering safe havens to terrorists? Are failed states the result of power politics or ideology, or both? What is the role of religion in a government system, because failed states are mostly religious-centric countries? Why external factors are mainly being excluded or in some cases downplayed? Why policymakers put too much emphasis on the internal factors as opposed to the external factors? Will the new concept of victim state produce any result? Can we turn highly troubled states into successful states in world affairs by changing the approach in our policies?

Research Design

Political perceptions about a state's international relations shape policymakers' belief and attitude towards the state. My hypothesis is that politics based on a wrong perception lead to disastrous consequences and policy failure, as in the cases of Afghanistan and Yemen. I intend to evaluate the perception of a failed state by examining the situations of Yemen and Somalia and then the bleak case of Afghanistan. Though the policymakers believe that their analyses of failed states are correct and valid, there must be a serious flaw in their perception.

Methodology/Direction

Chapter 2 is reviewing definitions of a failed state. I will explore scholarly writers from different sources mainly books, journals and databases that address nonfunctioning states, but ignore external factors, chiefly the international power politics that made the nonfunctioning state a victim. Chapter 3 will discuss a failed state: system failure in a state. Chapter 4 discusses external factors that interfere in the internal affairs of a state. In Chapters 5 and 6, I will discuss the situations and regimes of Yemen and Somalia; the former state is unpredictable and dangerous and the latter state is a complete disaster as a country and as a nation. Chapter 7, will discuss Afghanistan. The case of Afghanistan requires extensive discussion because, unlike Yemen and Somalia, Afghanistan has the support of the international community and is receiving a flow of foreign aid, but still the country is in a state of chaos and failure. Afghanistan was a nonfunctioning state before the American invasion in 2001 and it is still a nonfunctioning state in 2013, despite the support of the 48 countries present on the ground there. In Chapter 8, I will document my findings by analysis and demonstrate that the whole international system is not producing the expected results. Chapter 9 concludes the argument.

Chapter 2

Literature Review: An Overview of Failed States Definitions

The existing and emerging literature about failed states is too vast to accommodate here, still I have tried to summarize a limited number of it for the purpose of this thesis.

One of the leading scholars, Robert Rotberg, discusses the issue of nonfunctioning states quite extensively. In the article, *The New Nature of Nation-State Failure*⁷, Rotberg argues that a nation state becomes a totally failed state, when its government fails to provide political and social stability and security. This state loses its political legitimacy and becomes illegitimate; therefore, he maintains, failed states are heavens for non-state actors, namely warlords and terrorists. Rotberg considers key aspects of failed states to be enduring violence, civil wars, inability to control borders and growth of criminal violence. Countries engulfed in these conditions have been Angola, Burundi and Sudan. According to Rotberg, failed states are generally violent, dangerous places and highly contested by various factions; parties fighting against the government act at different levels, including two or more insurgencies, various civil unrests, and the different factions justify their violence by demanding shared power in government. Rotberg maintains that living standards diminish drastically and gradually life's ordinary infrastructures disappear; civil wars engulf failed states and it is mainly for ethnic, religious, linguistic reasons, among other reasons, that conflict arises between ruling entities and the less favored groups or subordinates for sources and wealth, such as diamond fields and petroleum. In addition, he maintains that there exists no failed state

⁷.Robert I. Rotberg, pp. 85-96

that has harmony between communities. Rotberg further iterates that the main contributors to the cause of state failure are its linguistic, ethnic and religious differences.

Rotberg continues that authorities in failed states are too weak and incompetent to secure borders, and this incompetency results in the loss of authority over a portion of the territory. Moreover, regimes in failed state oppress, extort, and harass their citizens, as Mobutu Sese Seko did in Zaire, the Taliban did in Afghanistan, Siaka Stevens did in Sierra Leone and Hassan al-Turabi's regime did in pre-2001 Sudan. Rotberg maintains that a state is also categorized as a failed state when the central authority severely weakens or totally collapses and criminal violence increases in the oppression of citizens. In other words, the lack of central authority, which results in general lawlessness, creates violent chaos. According to Rotberg, the streets in cities of failed states are mostly controlled by gangs; human trafficking, drugs, and arms sales become basic lucrative businesses; the police system becomes paralyzed; the security of the ordinary citizens is in the hands of warlords and corruption flourishes to its height.

Rotberg argues that failed states barely have any institution and if there is one, the legislators are "rubber-stamp machines." And he maintains that the concept of democracy does not exist in any failed state and the legal system has totally collapsed, because a professional responsibility of a bureaucrat does not exist. Rotberg maintains that failed states are mostly in need of urgent international humanitarian relief efforts, because food shortages and widespread hunger to the level of starvation prevail all over; populations in failed states move from place to place to find relief. Rotberg argues that, in a nutshell, failed states fall short of performing the duties of a nation-state in the modern world. A normal state in the modern world has a structural base and provides basic political goods

including security, education, health services, economic opportunity, environmental surveillance, order, a functioning and competent judicial infrastructure which is normally clean of nepotism and high or low level corruption.⁸ Rotberg claims that at the beginning of this century, there were seven failed states, Afghanistan, Angola, Burundi, Cambodia, Zaire/Democratic Republic of the Congo, Chad, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Sudan. And he categorized Somalia as a collapsed state – an extreme version of failed states which has a total vacuum of authority. Rotberg argues that these states have been failed states continuously at least since 1990s. Lebanon, Tajikistan, Nigeria and Bosnia were once in the category of failed states. He maintains that even Russia was once a candidate of a failed state.⁹ Rotberg claims that incompetent leadership and leadership decision destroy a state system, weaken polities and create state failure.¹⁰



Boaz Atzili¹¹ also discusses the problems of nonfunctioning states. Even though Atzili probes the aspects of borders in nonfunctioning states, he still concludes that it is an internal problem; external force and international power politics are simply disregarded. Atzili argues that drawing fixed borders has created a new kind of conflict and instability in world politics; it is the good fences [a reference to borders] that make bad neighbors because failed states lack effective legitimate government institutions.

⁸. Ibid.

⁹. Ibid. p.93

¹⁰.Ibid. p.93

¹¹. Boaz, Atzili, “When Good Fences Make Bad Neighbors Fixed Borders, State Weakness, and International Conflict,” *International Security*, Vol. 31. No. 3, (Winter 2006/07): pp. 139-173

Atzili maintains that borders do not weaken a regular state, rather borders further weaken an already socio-politically weak state and this very aspect makes weak states more prone to internal conflict and civil wars and increases the risks of one group of people being ostracized from the rest. Atzili maintains that these conflicts can spread to neighboring countries. Neighbors, feeling compelled to assist the threatened group within the weak state, often act out of selfish interests. Atzili argues that the flow of refugees from failed and weak states crossing the border into neighboring states makes insurgency a practical tool against the government of the weak state. The weaker the state, the higher is the civil violence within the state. Furthermore, state failure is normally seen by neighbors as an opportunity for economic gains and political influence, including regime change. It is much easier for neighbors to find allies in weak states than make an alliance with a strong state.



Ray Takeyh and Nikolas Gvosdev¹² discuss another aspect of failed states. They argue that terrorist networks have espoused the global business model. Takeyh and Gvosdev maintain that the global terrorist networks communicate, organize, manage, transport, and deliver funds, men, and material from location to location, create subsidiaries similar to international business organizations and multinational corporations. The authors discuss the 2001 trial of Madji Hasan Idris a radial terrorist who confessed in the court. The Egyptian Madji Hasan Idris, a member of the radical Al

¹². Takeyh, Ray and Nikolas Gvosdev. pp. 97-108

Wa'd organization, stated that he would send his recruits to either Pakistan or Kosovo for training. Upon completion of training, the organization would dispatch them to Kashmir, the Philippines or anywhere else where they were required, and their continuous methods of contacts have been cell phones and emails, and couriers have been the facilitators of passports, air plane tickets, advance cash and other necessities.

The authors argue that terrorists never choose strong states to fund and supply their network and organization, but they are always in search of failed states for strong reasons: either authorities in failed states are tolerant of their terrorist activities, or the authorities does not exist at all and these states lack a vibrant civil society to prevent terrorists from their activities. The lack of central authority will allow terrorist organizations to decide on any action, and they will not be liable within that territory for any action they take. Furthermore, terrorist organizations locate failed states all around for their operations, because the every state is entitled to its sovereignty and other powerful states cannot easily interfere in terrorist activities and cannot easily take countermeasures against them. The authors further argue that the U.S invasion of Afghanistan post- September 11, to root out Al Qaeda and its network in that country, was successful; however, it is natural for the terrorist to seek another host country, a failed state, namely, Somalia, Indonesia, Chechnya, the mountains of Central Asia, Bosnia, Lebanon, or Kosovo.

The authors argue that failed states are the hub for terrorists and their networks; in the failed states, terrorist organization can acquire a much larger place to function as opposed to a number of scattered safe houses in well controlled states. The space they can occupy is large enough to accommodate their entire training facilities, arms depots and

communications facilities. The authors maintain that the circumstances in failed states welcome terrorist networks, and terrorist organizations take advantage of the lack of authority and chaotic situations. Terrorist networks gain control over territory in a failed state and bargain with the authorities of the failed state by offering them services in the failed state, especially at the time of conflict. For example, in Bosnia, Kosovo, Chechnya, Sudan, and Afghanistan, militant fighters would come to those already troubled states, offer their service to the authorities and then bring with them their manpower, their required and needed equipment and finances. The terrorists, once on the ground, exploit the chaos which is caused by fighting and then they set up their agenda and operations. During 1990s, civil wars unleashed chaos in states such as Columbia, Sierra Leone, Bosnia and [Afghanistan.] This chaos enabled the terrorists to continue on their agenda without any central authority to look over them and interfere with them.

It is important to mention that the terrorists are not looking to annex a state or control it, but they want control of a specific area, where there is no authority over them to give them the freedom to do what they choose to do. For example, in Bosnia, radical groups occupied a number of districts such as the district of Bocinja Donja. The radicals would operate from those districts without the control of the central authority and they separated themselves from the rest of the society. The authors maintain that control over a specific area can give them the power to construct their institutions and develop businesses like the gum mastic plantation in Sudan and small factories in Albania to generate funds for operations.

The authors claim that the failed states are also mainly used as a transshipment point. For instance, Italian intelligence has been concerned about Albania, because the

state has turned into a hub of primary illicit traffic routes “cross the Balkans, and involve the dispersal of drugs weapons, dirty money and illegal migrants.”¹³ The authors maintain that failed states are used primarily by terrorists and criminals for smuggling, drug trafficking and raising funds for their operations. Turkish intelligence reported that Osama bin Laden “extended logistical support and guerrilla training” to the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU), because the leader of the IMU was closely cooperating with the Islamic radicals in Afghanistan. The terrorists in Afghanistan used the Fergana Valley to transfer weapons and personnel to Central Asia. They also used the valley for shipment of drugs for sale in Europe which were produced in Afghanistan and Al Qaeda and would finance their operations with the income from those shipments. Russian law enforcement officials claim that the opium income produced in Afghanistan is used to arm, train, and support extremist groups, including the IMU and the Chechen resistance. “The “brown zones” represented by offshore banking centers further facilitate the interconnection of terrorist groups with the narcotics trade by allowing terrorist groups to deposit funds and ensure their availability to their operatives.”¹⁴

The authors also maintain that poor economic situations in failed states create a great pool of recruits and the terrorists can use their resources to hire recruits and bribe officials. They can also amass support by using their recourses to fill the vacuum created by the collapse of official state power and civil society. The terrorists then accommodate the recruits into their training facilities within that failed state, like the terrorists used the mountain areas of Afghanistan to create safe havens for training territories. “Islamist groups, particularly in Balkans, found that a useful tool for recruitment was to offer the

¹³. Ibid.

¹⁴. Ibid.

possibility of high paying work to unemployed young men in the Persian Gulf states, with the hope of then diverting them into joining mujahidin units.” By creating an alternative to the failed state, the terrorist organization can win both the support of the general population and government ranks.

The authors maintain that the terrorist organizations continue with a global orientation. In other words, they avoid focusing in one region. For example, Al Qaeda, gains recruits from around the world and “seeks out failed states everywhere to house its own, self-sufficient infrastructure.”¹⁵ So failed states are concrete locations and function as a headquarters for international terrorist organizations by providing solid and substantial places for training, for situating their training facilities, personnel, equipment, factories and using the failed states as storehouses. Failed states are safe havens for terrorist organizations because the breakdown of the central authority makes it possible for them to flourish and conduct their operation without any significant interference. Sudan for instance, became known as “a way station,” for bin Laden’s operatives; they would come together in Sudan, train, and plan in a relatively safe place.

The governments in failed states can issue a legitimate passport which is a vital tool in changing identity and moving around the world rather easily. For example, Bin Laden was holding three passports issued by Sudan, Bosnia and Albania. Abu Zubaydah, Al Qaeda’s chief of staff, had numerous passports which enabled him to move from location to location without any problem, and at the time of his arrest, officials found a number of blank Saudi passports.¹⁶ Furthermore, governments of failed states can legitimately buy weapons on the international market for their military units and these

¹⁵. Ibid.

¹⁶. Ibid.

weapons may easily fall into the hands of terrorist groups simply because failed states are unable to secure them.



In the article, “Failed States, or the State as Failure?”¹⁷ the author Rosa Ehrenreich Brooks focuses on general aspects of failed states, but blames the international system for the failure of some states and rejects the right to statehood to other states. The author maintains that state failure has been a major challenge in the international system and she perceives that the international community has been falling short to effectively turn a failing or failed states into a successful and well-functioning state.

Brooks argues that failed states create humanitarian, security and legal challenges both internally and externally and these factors make failed states very complicated cases to deal with and manage. On the humanitarian side, failed states are engulfed in widespread poverty, diseases, violence, and movement of refugees crossing borders to other states in search of a new life. These challenges prevent the flow of stable philanthropic resources and foreign aid. On the international security side, failed states have become breeding grounds and staging points for extremist and organized terrorist groups, especially since 9/11.

The author argues that the absence of effective central government, or the lack of a government at all, makes a state a violent territory and the economy flourishes through

¹⁷. Rosa. pp. 1159 -1196.

illicit transactions and activities. And terrorists can easily take advantage of such unmanageable situations. The author argues that in addition to humanitarian and security issues, failed state also pose serious legal challenges. The author maintains that in an international system, where order and sovereignty is honored, failed states face a number of problems: they can neither enter into treaties with other nations states, or can they abide by one; failed states cannot take advantage of international trade; failed states cannot maintain human rights and environmental agreements and cannot maintain any significant social institution; and failed states cannot enforce agreements and contracts between citizens and foreigners. The author maintains that these are the principal negative factors of failed states and these factors should seriously concern the international community of states. The author further argues that when we probe the record of the international community, we will find a poor record of the international system in regard to turning a failed state into a successful state. And countries that the international community has tried to make successful are Bosnia, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan and Iraq, all of which are still failed states by modern standards.

The author goes a little deeper in her argument and abnegates a number of states the right to statehood, maintaining that neither Afghanistan was a functioning modern state, nor was Congo, Sierra Leone, Somalia and many other states that have been considered to be failed or failing state by modern standards. She argues that states such as Afghanistan and Sierra Leone could barely be considered failed states; because they had not been functioning states to begin with. The author maintains, “Weak, failing, and failed states are not the exception, in many parts of the world. They are the norm, and

have been since their inception.”¹⁸ The author eventually maintains that failed states or “troubled societies” are perhaps not suited to be or become functioning states in the modern sense. She argues that at the height of civil war in Sierra Leone, the majority of the people would have preferred to return to the British colonial status, if an option had been available.



The concept of failed states seems to be widely accepted by policy writers and other intellectuals in addition to scholars. Stephen Kinzer of the *New York Times*¹⁹ published an article in December of 2001. He reported on the views of influential intellectuals. He writes, “Many scholars, intellectuals and policymakers are considering how to create a broad-based Afghan government, but a handful of experts argue that Afghanistan is a failed state destined to spread instability forever.”²⁰ Kinzer further quotes the then Harvard Associate Professor of Middle Eastern Studies Eden Naby, who argues that Afghanistan should be divided into “allied independent states.”²¹ Naby further argues that an Afghan state should not form, because Afghans have no common language and nothing in common among all ethnic groups. And the Afghans’ weak sense of national identity is further destroyed by continuous war and lack of proper education.

¹⁸. Ibid.

¹⁹. Kinzer Stephen, “Break Up Afghanistan? Why Not?,” *The NY Times*, (Dec. 1. 2001). <<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/01/arts/break-up-afghanistan-why-not.html>> (accessed Feb. 28.2013)

²⁰. Ibid.

²¹. Ibid.

Kinzer quotes Naby who further argues that “a loose coalition of states would work better” in Afghanistan, and “in the long run no one wants a strong Afghanistan.”²²

In this article, Kinzer also quotes, Larry P. Goodson the author of “Afghanistan’s Endless War.” Goodson argues that “strong central governments have been a curse on Afghanistan for more than a generation.



In sharp contrast to most defining aspects of failed states, Charles Call perceives the defining aspects of failed states otherwise. In the article, *The Fallacy of the “Failed State”*²³, Call argues that the term “failed states” became prevalent after the 1990s, and especially the attacks of 9/11 further coined this term by pointing out that an Afghan failed state could not avoid the operation of the Al Qaeda terrorist organization on its territory. Call maintains that the concept of “failing,” “failed,” “fragile,” “stressed,” and “troubled states” are all false, useless and vague because such failed state terms even include states such as Iraq, Haiti, Sudan, North Korea, Indonesia, Colombia, East Timor and Cote d’Ivoire. Call argues that the term failed states should be abandoned and only strictly used for a collapsed state where there is no authority in that state, both internally over the country’s inhabitants and externally toward the international community. According to Call, only one country could be found to fit this term in the late 20th Century: Somalia, from 1991 to 2004.

²². Ibid.

²³. Call T. Charles, “The Fallacy of the ‘Failed State’,” *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 8, (2008): pp. 1491-1507

Chapter 3:

What is a Failed State, or rather a Troubled State?

At the beginning of this thesis, I discussed the definition of a failed state. In this chapter, I examine failed states in general, and describe in what ways they are failing.

Failed or Troubled States:

Countries that are commonly named “failed states” are those deeply engulfed in political upheavals and cannot deliver the essential public and social services that citizens receive in a functioning state. A successful state has an efficiently operating governing system which controls a defined territory and the population within that territory. It has a competent and independent judiciary system and has a well-managed professional military and police force. It provides the basic social goods of national security, political stability, secure and stable economic growth, an accessible health care service, and an affordable educational system to everyone. In addition, a successful state can control any social upheaval in its territory and maintains diplomatic relationships with other states.²⁴

By contrast, failed states cannot deliver basic social goods. The citizens in these states are troubled and live in terrible conditions. The so-called failed states are located in sub-Saharan Africa, in Central Asia, South Asia, and parts of Latin America.²⁵

Troubled states are considered failed states mainly because they cannot sustain themselves as members of the international community. The governments in these states are highly vulnerable and very weak, and they cannot control emerging violence within the state. As a result, violence increases, which creates widespread internal anarchy. Such

²⁴.Rosa, pp. 1159 -1196

²⁵.Ibid.

a condition creates instability, insecurity and random warfare. Insurgencies prevail and challenge the government – some noteworthy examples have been Somalia, Sudan, Zaire and Afghanistan during the 1980s and 1990s.

Whenever governments are challenged within a state, civil conflict ensues, endangering lives of civilians. Social conflicts revive old-rooted clashes. The conflicts become quite fierce when historical and emotional issues are involved, attributable to gender, geographical, religious, ethnic and other differences. Civil conflicts jeopardize the overall state structure, and civilians lose necessary services to be provided by the government. Conflicts destroy food supply sources, break down the healthcare system and interrupt distribution channels. The anarchic conditions bring a troubled state to its knees and its economic system collapses. This situation results in widespread corruption. Criminals replace responsible public officials and worsen the human misery to an unprecedented scale. People cannot depend on the government and become self-centered. This creates disunity among the population, society loses its cohesion and civil war may break out. Civil wars also arise when politically ostracized groups in society end up on the losing side. On one hand, people become the victims of the violence, and on the other hand, the same people are the cause of a new threat. In this situation, the international community criticizes and categorizes a troubled state as a failed state, because the international community sees inability and unwillingness to respond to the needs of the citizens. Civil wars force ordinary citizens to flee to adjacent countries. This state of instability further threatens the neighboring countries by the flow of refugees across the border. “In Somalia and Sudan, natural disasters have compounded the suffering, killing large portions of the populations and forcing many others to migrate to already

overcrowded urban areas or to refugee centers abroad. In Cambodia, 20 years of conflict left the country in ruins, littered with land mines, and still suffering from the Khmer Rouge genocidal rule. Afghanistan's civil war appears stuck in a stalemate and the country may not be able to hold together.”²⁶ The troubled situation of Afghanistan caused about three million Afghan citizens to migrate to Pakistan, about two and half million to Iran and over one million to other parts of the world. Anarchy and violence, of course, create massive abuses of human rights, and failed states have been experiencing serious violations of human rights for years. Moreover, even the basic right to live becomes barely guaranteed: People in failed states are killed for political reasons and/or are systematically impoverished.

Human safety is a public good and everybody should be entitled to it in every society, but in failed states, safety becomes only a privilege for those who defend their interests. Furthermore, safety means the condition of being protected against undesirable events, mainly of a physical, social, spiritual, financial, political, emotional, occupational, psychological and educational nature; safety includes the overall protection of people and their possessions. Failed states continuously fall short of achieving public safety standards. “People need security so as to enjoy the greatest possible degree of freedom and dignity in their lives.”²⁷

According to the Global Human Development Report of 1994, human security is broadly defined as, “safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease, and repression as well as protection from sudden and harmful disruption in the patterns of daily life –

²⁶.Helman B. Gerald. Ratner R. Steven, “Saving Failed States,” *Foreign Policy*, (June 21, 2010) <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/06/21/saving_failed_states?page=full>

²⁷.Ibid.

whether in homes, in jobs or in communities.”²⁸ This report further identifies seven threats that jeopardize human security: economic insecurity, food insecurity, health insecurity, environmental insecurity, personal insecurity, community insecurity and political insecurity.²⁹

Insecurity in failed states becomes a grave problem. It affects people’s physical safety, which includes depriving them or restricting them from accessing social facilities, legal rights, political rights, and social opportunities. Public safety is a key requirement in sovereign territories, and the survival of a state is dependent on security. Lack of a social safety contributes to failures of systems in a state. The authorities of failed states cannot maintain public safety, because they cannot control the emerging violence and the collapse of the overall system in their countries. Insecurity thus becomes inevitable. State security not merely implies the end of a war, but it implies maintaining a functioning social structure. In failed states, people cannot continue their businesses in a safe environment; they cannot have a job and travel or provide for the education of their children and they cannot feel safe that their families will not be harmed in the course of their daily affairs. People in failed states have no guarantee that what they have gained today will not be taken away and destroyed tomorrow. Citizens in failed states cannot make decisions to make choices close to their heart. In other words, people want safety and dignity in their daily lives, and this is lacking in failed states.

Troubled and failed states are not only anarchic, dangerous and engulfed in conflicts and brutal civil wars, but over time these states produce and create problem-causing citizens both internally and externally within nation states. A functioning social

²⁸. UNDP, “National Human Development Report. Security with a Human Face: Challenges and Responsibilities,” (2004) <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/hdi/> (accessed March 4, 2013)

²⁹.Ibid.

structure gives people strength, and this strength derives from political, social, environmental, economic, military and cultural systems. Failed states destroy this strength in people, which in turn destroys the people themselves. Snapshots of human world development present a bleak picture of troubled and failed states. According to the United Nation Development Program³⁰, an estimated 14,000 people per day become infected with HIV/AIDs; a 2013 report indicated that one third of all HIV cases are young people between ages of 15-24,³¹ and about 30,000 children die daily from preventable diseases. The report indicated that a quarter of the world's population lives in extreme poverty, and the world's richest 5 percent has an income of 114 times higher than the income of the poorest 5 percent. In more specific words, the 2012 reports indicated that 397 million workers live in extreme poverty which is living on less than US\$ 1.25 per day, and about 472 million workers cannot address their basic needs on a regular basis which means that they live on between US\$1.25 and \$2.00 a day.³² However, one third of the developing world workforce lived in poverty according to the 2011 report.³³ AUN report³⁴ indicates that 150 million children ages 5-14 are currently engaged in child labors.³⁵

³⁰.Rosa. p.1166

³¹. International Labor Office, "Global Employment Trends January 2013: Recovering from a second Jobs dip," *Geneva*, (2013): pp.3-26. <http://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/global-employment-trends/2013/WCMS_202326/lang--en/index.htm>

³². Ibid. p. 10

³³. Ibid. pp. 32-40

See also on underage-marriage of girls and violence against young girls, United Nations Children's Fund. "Progress for Children: A report card on child protection," UNICEF, no. 8, New York, (2009): pp. 46-47; and Statistical Table 9, p. 120.

³⁴. International Labor Office. (2006), "The End of Child Labor: Within reach – Global report on the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work," *International Labor Conference 95th Session, Report I(B), ILO, Geneva*.

³⁵. See also gender discrimination against girls and boys. International Labor Organization. "Good Practices and Lessons Learned on Child and Adolescent Domestic Labor in Central America and the Dominican Republic: A gender perspective", ILO, San Jose, (2005) p. 10.

In addition, the report indicates that a considerable percentage of the world's population lives in war zones [war zones are mainly in troubled and failed states]. The report states that 40 percent of the world's babies are born without official nationality; 82 children out of every 1,000 children die before they turn five years old. "During the 1990s, more than a third of the world's countries experienced 'serious societal warfare' of one form or another, and one study identified 39 cases of genocide since 1955."³⁶

System failure in a state has grave consequences. According to the United Nations report, one third of global secondary school attendance is lower than primary school participants. The report also adds that many millions of adolescents did not complete a quality primary education which can prepare them to participate in secondary education.³⁷

A 2009 report by International Labor Office (ILO) indicated that young unemployed men constituted 81 million jobseekers³⁸ while the 2012 report found that members of unemployed men grow to 197.3 million jobseekers,³⁹ with 73.8 million of them young men.⁴⁰ The report estimates that this figure will increase to 210.6 million jobseekers within five years. Although this report includes unemployed men in all countries, the report claims that the majority of these unemployed men are in troubled and failed states.⁴¹

³⁶. Rosa. p.1166.

³⁷. International Labor Office, "Global Employment Trends" at 3-26

³⁸. International Labor Office, "Global Employment Trends for Youth August 2010: Special issue on the impact of the global economic crisis on youth," *International Labor Organization*, Geneva, (2010). pp. 3-6.

³⁹. See International Labor Office, "Global Employment Trends" at 16

⁴⁰. Ibid. p. 32

⁴¹. See also, World Bank, "World Development Report 2006: Equity and development," *World Bank*, Washington, D.C. (2005).

The UN human development organization reports⁴² that each year, 48 million children are without proof of existence: they are not registered and do not have birth certificate. Countries that are affected by armed conflicts, mainly troubled and failed states, are severely affected by this, because registration mechanisms such as national birth certificate programs, national census and population based household surveys are threatened, suspended, or totally destroyed.⁴³ “In unstable situations, when a State is weakened by political insecurity or hampered by limited resources or a heavy national debt, there may be no formal system for birth registration in place. This often stems from structural problems existing prior to conflict, but may also affect the nature of the conflict itself.”⁴⁴ Lack of a proper system to provide birth registration destroys the lives of so many citizens. Unregistered and non-existent children become easy targets of sexual slavery, sexual exploitation, militancy and underage recruitment, especially to become suicide bombers.

A report by Innocenti Insight, UNICEF,⁴⁵ states that children are more vulnerable to underage recruitment when they lack documents to prove their legal age. When children cannot provide proof of their age by registration, recruiters establish age by physical appearance or oral confirmation, and the commanders can claim that the enlistment was voluntary. For instance, there was a report of forced underage recruitment by the Taliban in 1999, although they denied the report.⁴⁶ The UN reports show that birth registration provides the basis for accountability and without any registration, children

⁴². UNICEF, “The ‘Rights’ Start to Life: A statistical analysis of birth registration,” *Strategic Information Section, Division of Policy and Planning*, New York, (2004). p. 7.

⁴³. UNICEF, “Innocenti Insight. Birth Registration and Armed Conflict,” *Innocenti Research Centre*, (2007). p.4 <[http://www.unicef.org/protection/birth_registration_and_armed_conflict\(1\).pdf](http://www.unicef.org/protection/birth_registration_and_armed_conflict(1).pdf)> (visited March 12, 2013)

⁴⁴. Ibid.

⁴⁵. Ibid. pp. 14-20

⁴⁶. Ibid. p. 16

are basically invisible and more prone to exploitation and abuse, which generally goes unnoticed.⁴⁷ “Without a system of registration to provide the basis for tracing identity, in extreme cases, children’s identity may be lost or forgotten. For example, during the decade-long war in Sierra Leone (1991-2002), thousands of children were abducted and forced to fight. Often these children were given combat names, and when they were demobilized after years of combat and captivity, some could not remember their birth names. Children who were abducted as babies or at a very young age had no memories of family life. Many of these children have expressed interest in knowing their original name and identity.”⁴⁸

Human Rights Watch reports that a group of children were abducted from the Democratic Republic of Congo and were then taken for military training to Western Uganda. This group, according to the report, did not know their background and did not have any information about their families and communities.⁴⁹ The report further indicates that during the time of genocide in Rwanda, about 1,000 children under the age of 18 were involved in the genocide.⁵⁰ A UNICEF report also added that during the conflict in Kosovo, children who could not prove their identity faced arbitrary arrests and detention. “Unregistered girls, like boys, are more vulnerable to underage recruitment by armed groups for use as fighters, spies, cooks and porters and for sexual purposes. While sexual crimes are also committed against boys, it is girls who are most often targeted. In northern Uganda, girls abducted by the Lord’s Resistance Army have suffered rape,

⁴⁷. Ibid.

⁴⁸. Ibid.

⁴⁹. Human Rights Watch, “*Stolen Children: Abduction and Recruitment in Northern Uganda*,” Vol.15, No.7, New York, (2003): pp. 20-21.

⁵⁰. See also, “Children Separated by War: Family tracing and reunification”, London, 1995, p. 16.

sexual slavery and early pregnancy, as well as HIV/AIDS infection.”⁵¹ Likewise, in Sierra Leone, thousands of girls were abducted and then they were sexually abused and then they were forced to accompany armed groups, but not officially recognized as soldiers.

The UNDP and UNICEF reports look indeed bleak for failed states. Pragmatic observation can give us a pessimistic view of the future of the world. Terrorists, radicals and militants can continue their conflict in the world, and they can recruit their force from large groups in broken down societies, mainly in troubled and failed states. Global conflicts will continue, and these are the key factor for the instability of the world and insecurity of citizens of all countries around the world.

⁵¹. UNICEF 2007. P. 17

See also, Human Rights Watch. “Stolen Children: Abduction and Recruitment in Northern Uganda”, Vol.15, No.7 New York, (2003).

Chapter 4

What Causes a State to Fail? Internal vs. External Factors

I argue in this thesis that government systems in what are called failed states do not fail because of their own weakness, but fail due to outside interference resulting from international and regional power politics. In Chapter 1, I discussed the definition of a failed state. We can consider a state a failure if the state has been originally a sovereign state, as defined in the Charter of the United Nations (Articles, 1, 2 and 76), and was not subject to outside control and interference. The state had a government, yet now the internal systems either barely function or do not function at all, which creates political and social insecurity and instability and causes civil war and other serious problems endangering its existence. Such a state should certainly be designated a failed state. However, I argue that no fully independent state has become a failure, and the so-called failed states are victims of external power politics.

The Charter of the United Nations, Article 2 paragraph 1, states that, “The [United Nations] Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.” And in paragraph 4 it states that, “All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.” Paragraph 7 states that “Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state...”⁵² Based on the Charter of the United Nations, every member state of the United Nations is sovereign and independent, immune from external

⁵². UN Charters. Articles 1, 2, and 76 <<http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter1.shtml>>

interference. Based on this Charter, international law and international relations prohibit other states to interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign and independent state.

However, as history shows in all the cases of failed states, the Charter has been violated and weak and failed states are engulfed in external power politics working against their domestic politics and domestic jurisdiction.

Scholars define and policymakers understand failed states as states which,

are tense, deeply conflicted, dangerous, and bitterly contested by warring factions. In most failed states, government troops battle armed revolts led by one or more rivals. Official authorities in a failed state sometimes face two or more insurgencies, varieties of civil unrest, different degrees of communal discontent and a plethora of dissent are directed at the state and at groups within the state.⁵³

And because of the lack or collapse of the state institutions in failed states, terrorists establish safe havens there^{54,55} which are threats to international security.^{56,57}

Scholars define and classify failed states at length, but neglect to mention that the system failure in a state comes from outside interference and influence. Policymakers learn to view a state mainly based on the analysis of scholars. The fundamental problem with scholars' approach is that they downplay the role of external interference instead of considering it a pivotal element in causing state failure. For example, Rotberg⁵⁸ writes in his analysis of failed states that,

Preventing state failure is imperative, difficult, and costly. Yet, doing so is profoundly in the interest not only of the inhabitants of the most deprived and ill-governed states of the world, but also of world peace.

Satisfying such lofty goals, however—making the world much safer by strengthening weak states, against failure— is dependent on the political will of

⁵³. Robert, I. Rotberg. p. 85

⁵⁴. Ray Takeyh. Gvosdev, K. NiKolas.

⁵⁵. Kydd H. Andrew. Walter F. Barbara. pp. 49-80

⁵⁶. Yoo, John.

⁵⁷. Rosa. pp. 1159-1196

⁵⁸. Robert, I. Rotberg.

the wealthy big-power arbiters of world security. Perhaps the newly aroused awareness of the dangers of terror will embolden political will in the United States, Europe, and Japan. Otherwise, the common ingredients of zero-sum leadership; ethnic, linguistic, and religious antagonisms and fears; chauvinistic ambition; economic insufficiency; and inherited fragility will continue to propel nation-states from weakness toward failure. In turn, that failure will be costly in term of humanitarian relief and postconflict reconstruction. Ethnic cleansing episodes will recur, as will famines, and in the thin and hospitable soils of newly failed and collapsed states, terrorists groups will take root.⁵⁹

Rotberg is among the scholars who have written extensively on the issue of failed states. However, we can imply from his analysis that failure in governability of a state occurs by default and not by the role of external interference.

If we closely analyze failed states, there is no sovereign failed state immune from some form of external interference. Although the degree of external interference may vary from state to state, in the cases of failed states, external interference has caused the failure and the collapse of the internal system. When outside force interferes in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, it affects the country absolutely, in particular politically. A state's internal institutions are vulnerable to external influence, and they could be provoked against the internal government. For instance, one of the famous strategies of external influence is the support of one ethnic group against another and it was Britain's favorite foreign policy. External forces favoring one ethnic and language group against another can provoke clans and tribes against each other or against the government. For example, Taliban leaders are mainly from the Ghilzai clans. Karzai and his predecessors throughout Afghan history have been from Durrani clans. Saudi Arabia and Pakistan support only the Ghilzais, the Taliban, and no other clans, against the

⁵⁹. Ibid. 96

Durranis, Karzai and other ethnic groups in Afghanistan. This is how Pakistan and its ISI can use the Taliban against the Kabul government which is supported by the US.

External interference damages the country's fundamental institutions, mainly social and economic ones. Such forms of outside interference make it impossible for the internal government to maintain territorial integrity, national identity and the loyalty of all the citizens to the state. This lack of a coherent society creates instability in a state. In other words, external interference is the fundamental cause of the political and social instability, societal conflict, insurgency, insecurity and economic distress in a troubled sovereign state. As we will see in the cases of failed states such as Afghanistan, Yemen and Somalia, outside interference has created its instability and insecurity.

Furthermore, scholars and policymakers assert that the failure and chaos of certain states have been caused by an incompetent ruling system. I argue that this perception and approach is fundamentally flawed. If we examine troubled states, especially the ones with catastrophic internal chaos and failed government systems, they were colonies of imperial powers at some point and are now positioned at the crossroads of regional power politics. Most of the so-called failed states have never had sovereign independence of today's standards and were barely functioning following their creation. Instead of examining the source of the problem in troubled states, political pundits simply categorize them as failed states. For example, Somalia doesn't fit the current definition of a failed state in spite of the lack of a central rule and total chaos in that state. Outside interference has created a failed Somali territory. Somalia has been more a victim state of international and regional power politics from its birth than just a collapsed state. I discuss Somalia in detail in Chapter 5.

Conflict, insurgency, insecurity, warlordism, fierce violence and many other factors destroy a sovereign state. Chaos in a state is created by radical groups, insurgent groups, militants, rebels, jihadists, extremists and terrorists; it is also created by fragmented groups which emerge to claim political legitimacy and are supported by outsiders.

For any group to weaken, destabilize and create insecurity in a sovereign state, three fundamental things are pivotal to its success:

- First, the group needs a shelter to hide, and an outside power can provide the best shelter.
- Second, the group needs personal and material support to function, succeed and survive, and outside supporters are the best because inside support is not enough and will not succeed in the long run.
- Third, the group needs an environment to recruit supporters and spread influence; again, outside support, shelter and control can make this happen successfully. In most cases of failed states, these three elements are provided by outside interferers.

The domestic affairs of any sovereign state are managed by a leader, and the leader's responsibility is usually to create political, economic and societal structures by negotiating legislation, setting budgets, managing national security, and appointing cabinet ministers subject to parliamentary approval. Elected representatives are given the power to initiate, approve or reject legislation and political parties pursue certain objectives. The government has an active military and police force providing security and

a peaceful environment so that its financial and educational system and societal structure can function coherently without being interrupted. External interference attacks all these bases. Damaging any base in the domestic structure of a state can create public protests, which in turn create chaos. External forces against a state, in whatever form or shape, do not allow a state to function and develop in a normal manner.

The internal institutions in a state, such as financial, educational and social organizations are open to the general public in both a strong or weak state and these institutions are vulnerable soft-targets. If a person or organization attempts to inflict any sort of damage in a state by attacking soft-targets, it may succeed to some degree. Less powerful governments are in weaker positions in such situation, and this makes it extremely difficult for a weaker state to defend every soft target, especially if an outside power is working to inflict harm to school children or civilians. By taking advantage of the inability of the weaker state to properly protect its soft targets, outside interferers create chaos to handicap the internal system and create public protests.

Every year, *Foreign Policy Magazine*⁶⁰ publishes an extended list of the so-called “failed states” in the world. The magazine defines failed states as follows:

How do you know a failed state when you see one? Of course, a government that has lost control of its territory or of the monopoly on the legitimate use of force has earned the label. But there can be more subtle attributes of failure. Some regimes, for example, lack the authority to make collective decisions or the capacity to deliver public services. In other countries, the populace may rely entirely on the black market, fail to pay taxes, or engage in large-scale civil disobedience. Outside intervention can be both a symptom of and a trigger for state collapse. A failed state may be subject to involuntary restrictions of its sovereignty, such as political or economic sanctions, the presence of foreign military forces on its soil, or other military constraints, such as a no-fly zone.⁶¹

⁶⁰. Foreign Policy. 2012, “Failed States Index” . *Foreign Policy Magazine*. (Accessed April 1, 2013) <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/failed_states_index_2012_interactive>

⁶¹. Ibid. 57-58

Foreign Policy Magazine writers who are considered experts on the issue of failed states, like other scholars, mainly emphasize the internal inability of states as the cause of state failure. Outside intervention is considered the aftermath factor not the main cause, even to *Foreign Policy Magazine* writers

The 2012 failed state index in *Foreign Policy Magazine* listed the following states at the top among others: Somalia, Yemen, Afghanistan, Congo (D.R.) Sudan, Chad, Zimbabwe, Haiti, Central African Republic, Ivory Coast, Guinea, Iraq, Syria, and North Korea. In the case studies in Chapters, 5, 6, 7, I have discussed in much detail Somalia, Yemen and Afghanistan. I briefly want to discuss the states of Syria, North Korea and Iraq, respectively, because they are prominent cases of a widely-known failed state system.

Syria was a functioning sovereign country. Since the conflict began in Syria in 2011, the government system has been barely functioning. The most significant system is the financial system which is becoming increasingly weaker; entrepreneurs cannot and will not invest under the present chaotic conditions in Syria. The central government system is either weakened or destroyed all together. The main culprits of the failure of the internal system and the government are outside forces against the government. There is so much economic, military, social and psychological pressure on the Syrian government that it is making it impossible for Syria to keep its internal system functioning. Therefore, Syria as a nation is failing because of the external force applied against it and this country was not a failed state just four years ago. (Although Syria is failing due to a civil war brought about by a dictator who is unwilling to give up power and open up the system to

civilian participation, Syria as a nation is struggling now since the outside forces work against it.)

North Korea has consistently been listed at the top of failed countries, although it does not fit the normal definition. North Korea has a strong government based on a family dictatorship, strong army, and domestic stability, but its population is desperately poor. The government practices an old-fashioned style of Communism and is violating UN resolutions by developing nuclear weapons rather than feeding its people. Based on pragmatic observation, one can see the following external interference in the affairs of the North Korea:

Since the Korean War in the 1950s, the country has been supported, first by both the Soviets and Communist China and then mostly by the latter until the present. One family has been ruling N. Korea with the support of China. The UN Security Council - especially the US - is imposing sanctions to prevent it from continuing to develop nuclear weapons. Even though the Security Council sanctions are approved by all members that include China and Russia for certain violations, the regime, in general, still has Chinese government support. In an article in *the New York Times*, Michael Gordon writes that, "Secretary of State John Kerry arrived here [Beijing] on Saturday to seek China's help in defusing the growing tensions with North Korea."⁶² China has a say in the case of N. Korea, although it supports some sanctions by Security Council. "The United States has long sought to enlist China's cooperation in reining in North Korea's nuclear

⁶². Gordon R. Michael, "Kerry Arrives in China Seeking Help on North Korea," *The New York Times*, (April 13, 2013).
<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/14/world/asia/kerry-in-china-seeking-help-on-north-korea.html?hp&_r=0> (accessed April 20, 2013)

aspirations.”⁶³ The Secretary of State, John Kerry went to China on April 13, 2013 to meet with the Chinese officials namely, Foreign Minister Wang Yi, President Xi Jinping, Premier Li Keqiang and State Councilor Yang Jiechi, according to a report in the New York Times.⁶⁴ Gordon, who reported in *the NY Times*, quotes John Kerry as saying, ““China has an enormous ability to help make a difference here.””⁶⁵ Gordon writes, “Mr. Kerry’s strategy for persuading North Korea to cooperate depends heavily on enlisting China’s support.”⁶⁶

The country and the civilians are sandwiched between the ruling family and its supporter. China can compel N. Korea to become a functioning society like China itself or South Korea. China is also capable to force N. Korea not to focus on military buildup threatening the West and its neighbors.

Iraq is an interesting case of external interference. Since the US invasion and the execution of its dictator, Saddam Hussein, it has been impossible for Iraq to create a functioning society and a functioning internal system to save the country from failure. After the 2003 US invasion, Iran has succeeded in influencing the bureaucrats, leaders and all elements of the governing system of Iraq. Turkish policymakers, after failing to become part of the EU, are also endeavoring to spread their influence eastward. Turkey, as a powerful regional power, has the capital to play against any other regional rival to keep Iraq under its influence. Arabs work to save Iraq, an Arab brother nation, particularly from the influence of the Iranians, who are not considered allies. The Israelis work to have friendly relations with Iraq and are trying to reduce particularly the

⁶³. Ibid.

⁶⁴. Ibid.

⁶⁵. Ibid.

⁶⁶. Ibid.

influence of Iran and the Arabs. The West, particularly the US, endeavors to build a democratic and successful Iraq hoping that it may become a model for the rest of the Middle East. In the case of Iraq, at the crossroads of both a regional and international power struggle, it appears impossible to conceive creating a peaceful internal system that will work successfully. The Iraqi government is struggling in spite of ample financial resources to establish such a system. The government is falling short to address the needs of the Iraqis, especially in terms of creating security, because of fierce external interference.

Iraq, North Korea and Syria are called failed states and as in the case of the other failed states, there are no plans to address the source of failure and prevent the pressure of outside elements. This makes it impossible to succeed, no matter how long one may be trying, as the Americans have been with minimum results in the case of Afghanistan and Iraq.

To maintain stability and security, a state requires stable institutions. By attacking functioning institution in a state, external interference affects the whole governing system. For example, economic growth either slows down or stops; poverty prevails; the distribution of social goods becomes scarce; and manageable diseases prevail. The lack of an effective governing system or the absence of a functioning state creates anarchy. To establish orderly conditions, there must be rules to be followed by an independent authority on behalf of its people. When there is anarchy, the governing system collapses, creating a failed state.

Chapter 5

Somalia

Somalia is a good case to demonstrate the negative effects of external interference. Normally when we read an article about Somalia, the content usually implies an aversion toward the country and its dominant governing system, creating the impression that disasters, failure and chaos in Somalia just naturally occur. External aggressive action is usually not blamed for the situation in that country.

Somalia is a sizable territory, slightly smaller than Texas, located in north-east Africa, directly south of the Arabian Peninsula and across the Gulf of Aden. Somalia adjoins Djibouti to the north-west and Ethiopia to the west. It adjoins Kenya along the south-west and its eastern coastline extends along the Indian Ocean. Mogadishu is the capital city of Somalia. The country's population is nine-million, mostly Somalis of the Sunni Muslim religion, which is the state religion. The people are divided into five main clans and many sub-clans. The Somali language is the main language of the country. However, English, Arabic and Italian are also officially spoken. A pastoral life is the dominant mode of life; the people are mainly involved in herding and agriculture. Somalia's chief trading partners are the United Arab Emirates, Djibouti, Yemen, and Oman.⁶⁷

Somalia has been without a permanent government since 1991, when the Mohammed Siad Barre regime was overthrown by opposition forces. In early history, between the 7th and 10th Century, Arabs and Persians controlled Somalia's Gulf of Aden and Indian Ocean coastline as trading routes, making Mogadishu their trading station at

⁶⁷. The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia. Sixth Edition Copyright 2011, Columbia University Press. <<http://www.answers.com/topic/afghanistan>> (accessed April 4, 2013)

the time. By the 15th and 16th Century, Somalia's Muslim Sultanate warriors fought against the Ethiopian Christians.⁶⁸

During 19th century, Egyptian, Italian, French and British powers carved up the territory and shaped the destiny of the present-day Somalia. By the second decade of the 19th century, Egyptian forces occupied the region and remained in much of the Somali region until the 1870s. At that time, Egypt's two armies were massacred by the Mahdist army in the Sudan. In the 1870s, a radical group in Sudan emerged, led the Mahdist War or Sudan Campaign, and became notorious for being ruthless, fanatical and fearless. They overran the Egyptian and the British forces who were controlling the government of the region.⁶⁹ To confront the brutal radicals, Egyptian forces withdrew from Somalia to fight the Mahdi forces in Sudan.

When the Egyptian forces abandoned Somalia in 1884, Great Britain replaced the Egyptians and secured the region, mainly for protecting its trade links with its Aden colony, founded in 1939, which depended on Somalia's mutton. In 1887, Somalia became a British protectorate. In the 1860s, French forces also obtained a foothold in the area. In 1888, England and France signed an agreement and defined their boundaries within Somalia. In 1889, the Italians also penetrated the area to secure a foothold and succeeded in creating a small protectorate in the central zone. In 1936, the Italians combined Somaliland with Somali-speaking districts of Ethiopia to form an Italian East African province.⁷⁰ Until the 1940s, Somalia as a nation did not have any form of government and was under the control of imperial powers that exercised their power in

⁶⁸. Ibid.

⁶⁹. Heritage History. Online. 2013. Mahdist Wars (a.k.a Soudan Campaign) 1883 to 1898 <http://www.heritage-history.com/www/heritage.php?Dir=wars&FileName=wars_soudan.php> (Accessed March 28, 2013)

⁷⁰. Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia

whatever manner they desired. Neither Egypt Britain, France or Italy created a basic functioning government system in Somaliland. They could not do so because of the power struggle among themselves. Therefore, Somalia as a nation did not have any experience with government, bureaucracy and a functioning independent system. Their destiny was in the hands of the foreign imperial powers who exploited them ruthlessly. In addition, by carving out a piece from Somalia and Ethiopia, the Italians initiated a long-lasting conflict in the region among the neighbors that positioned the weaker state on the losing side, which is where Somalia is today.

During WWII, the Italians captured British Somaliland. However, operating from Kenya, the British retook that territory from the Italians and Italian Somaliland in 1941. Until 1950, the British ruled the two territories, but a UN mandate then allowed the Italians to administer Somaliland as its former protectorate.⁷¹

In 1956, the United Nations decided the fate of Somalia. Italian Somaliland was renamed Somalia and was granted internal autonomy. In 1960, Somalia gained its independence and in the same year the British also announced the end of their protectorate. Eventually, the United Republic of Somalia was created out of the British and Italian territories.⁷²

When the United Republic of Somalia was created, the newly independent state was in a dire condition: it lacked any well-developed and functioning economic, political or social infrastructure, and the government of Somalia encountered a severely underdeveloped economy. At the same time, the colonial powers ill-defined Somali frontiers, which makes territorial conflict a daily incident between Somali people and

⁷¹. Ibid.

⁷². Ibid.

their neighbors. The colonial powers kept Somalia for so many years without ever developing any major administrative institutions in Somalia. Instead, what they left behind was conflict among the Somali people.

At its independence, the Somalis and their government initiated a movement to create a greater Somalia encompassing French Somaliland, now Djibouti, eastern Ethiopia and northern Kenya.⁷³ When the international colonial power struggle ended, it was followed by a regional power struggle against Somalia, which continues in the formerly divided Somalia. The Ethiopian government commenced its hostile relations with Somalia in 1964 and the Kenyan government also became involved in this hostility against Somalia. The people in French Somaliland, Djibouti, declared that they favored their association with the French and opposed Somalia. By 1967, an agreement was reached between the government of Somalia and its neighbors. But internal instability and external interference continued. In 1969, Somalia's leader was assassinated and was replaced by a military dictator, Major General Mohammed Siad Barre. He abolished the national assembly, banned political parties, and changed the name of the country to Somali Democratic Republic, among his other policies. Siad Barre tried to be neutral during the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the West, but that did not work for him. It is important to note that Siad Barre abolished certain policies and created new ones because Somalia is a tribal and clan-based country. But clannism was increased during the colonial period. Within the British and Italian Somaliland, the colonial authorities were appointing clan chiefs; they would favor and elevate one clan over the other and this practice created animosity among the clans and their relations became

⁷³. Hesse J. Brian, "Introduction: the myth of "Somalia"", *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 3, July 2010, p. 247

aggravated. What the Somalis customarily practiced was assembly which obliged every adult male of the clan to contribute to a political or social decision, but the colonial masters created a chief clan and sub-chief clans. This resulted in conflict among the clans and eventually contributed to the failure of the Somali state at its independence in 1960.⁷⁴

Under the leadership of Barre, in 1977, Somalia invaded the disputed territory in Ethiopia; Somalia's invasion was supported by the United States and Saudi Arabia while the Ethiopians were supported by the Soviet Union. The invasion was a failure and the Ethiopian forces drove out the Somali forces from the Ogaden territory of Ethiopia.⁷⁵

When Somalia sought aid from the United States to invade Ethiopia to reclaim its territory, Ethiopia and Kenya in return created rival factions and nationalist guerrillas in the country to fight the Somali government. In 1991, the nationalist guerrilla faction ousted the Barre government, and they then fought with other rival factions in the north of Somalia who claimed secession from the country. A civil war which combined with drought erupted and created a devastating famine that took the lives of 300,000 Somalis in 1992.⁷⁶

During this time, the UN peacekeepers and the United States troops went to control the situation in the country. They worked to establish food aid routes for Somali civilians by guarding ports, airports, and main roads. However, it is hard to believe that in spite of the American forces and the United Nations peacekeeper forces, local warlords fought against relief efforts, inflicted casualties to the Americans and UN peacekeepers and food distributions were widely looted. A report in the *NY Times* by Eric Schmitt described the incident as follows: "Indeed, a 12-hour battle in the streets of Mogadishu

⁷⁴. Ibid. p. 250

⁷⁵. Ibid.

⁷⁶. Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia

that left 18 Army soldiers dead in October 1993 -- one that involved only a few hundred combatants on all sides -- has in many respects had a bigger impact on military thinking than the entire 1991 Persian Gulf war.”⁷⁷ In other words, international forces failed to help establish a central government, and a group of loose militants overpowered and killed many peacekeepers, including the American soldiers. One of the most widely reported incidents was the downing of a Blackhawk helicopter and killing of the eighteen U.S. Army Rangers.⁷⁸

In 1994, the UN peacekeepers and the Americans left the country.⁷⁹ The Times article also quoted Mr. Warren Christopher the then Secretary of State stating to House subcommittee that the country was in better shape after the Americans left than it was when they first went in. “Within the Administration, the Somalia operation is not considered a complete failure. The operation is estimated to have saved at least 110,000 lives -- by some estimates up to 250,000 -- by distributing food in an East African nation devastated by famine and strife.”⁸⁰

Upon departure of the foreign forces and in the absence of a central government, civil war and violence devastated the country and civilian population. During this chaos and absence of a government, some parts of the country seceded by claiming independence from Somalia, like the Somaliland Republic in the north and Puntland in the south, although not recognized internationally. Since its secession, the Somaliland Republic has been rather stable, with notable economic progress, and has been able to

⁷⁷. Schmitt Eric. “Somalia's First Lesson For Military Is Caution”. *The NY Times*. March 05, 1995 <<http://www.nytimes.com/1995/03/05/world/somalia-s-first-lesson-for-military-is-caution.html>> (Accessed: March 6, 2013)

⁷⁸. Griswold Eliza, “The Tenth Parallel: Dispatches from the Fault Line Between Christianity and Islam,” 1st ed. (Library of Congress-in-Publication Data, 2010). P. 131

⁷⁹. Schmitt Eric

⁸⁰. Ibid.

attract aid from the European Union. By contrast, some people from Puntland in the south have been committing piracy and the leadership of Puntland is accused of supporting and protecting the piracy in the area. These incidents of piracy have especially raised international concern.⁸¹

Political turmoil and instability continue in mainland Somalia today, and external powers are actively involved in the internal affairs of Somalia. Attempts to end the conflict and create a central government have ended in failure, although a transitional government was proclaimed in 2004. Its neighbors have caused great damage to the Somali people. In 2005, when the Somali government wanted to create a cabinet, the Kenyan government started a fierce dispute over which of the two groups of warlords could control Baidoa – the proposed temporary new capital. Kenya has been involved directly in all internal affairs of Somalia even in supporting and arming the Somali militia. Although denying it publicly, in 2009, the Kenyan government established a militia training camp in a Kenyan wildlife reserve to operate in Somalia.⁸²

Since 2005, external interference and aggression into Somalia became a pivotal policy for the Somali neighbors and the international powers, especially the United States. In 2006, the Ethiopian army invaded Somalia, supported by the United States. Al-Shabab, an extremist militia linked with Al Qaeda, coupled with Kenyan Somali youth, rebelled against the Ethiopian army.⁸³ Of course, this happened when there was no central government, criminals and thieves took over. The conflict became a struggle between the United States supporting the Ethiopians to dismantle the extremists and the

⁸¹. Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia

⁸². Chau C. Donovan, “The fourth point: An examination of the influence of Kenyan Somalis in Somalia,” *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 3, July 2010, p.307

⁸³. Ibid. p.306

al Qaeda fighting in Somalia against the Ethiopian army. Both the US and al Qaeda considered the war between Somalia and Ethiopia “a struggle for an ideological and logistical foothold in Africa.”⁸⁴

After the invasion, the Ethiopian army left behind an unforgettable scar within society. In fact, the Ethiopians went to Somalia and acted like criminals. Very specific cases of acts against civilians were described by eyewitness in the book by Eliza Griswold who talked to victims, especially in the hospital. (In one report she states that a teacher was shot in the stomach and left on the street to die while the Ethiopians stole his \$1,000 in savings; she met with an eighteen-year-old rape victim bleeding from his rectum who was in helpless condition and she also writes about a woman who was shot in the knee by the Ethiopian sniper. In addition, a Somali citizen told her that Ethiopians go “into our Mosques and shit and pee there”⁸⁵)— Ethiopia, governed by Orthodox Christians since the fourth century, has an 85 million population with a small number of Muslims, mainly Somalis, in contrast to the 9 million Muslim population of Somalia.

The present government in Somalia is pro-Ethiopian. The opposition groups to the government are supported and supplied with arms from Eritrea, which opposes Ethiopia. By being involved in Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea have created a battleground there. Eritrea which gained its independence from Ethiopia in 1993 has been fighting with Ethiopia since then over border disputes. These two countries use Somalis in their proxy wars against each other. To undermine Ethiopia’s position in the region, Eritrea uses members of Somali opposition to government to damage Ethiopia.⁸⁶ The Ethiopian government sends troops to the Somalia and never admits the presence of its troops.

⁸⁴. Griswold. p.127

⁸⁵. Ibid. 129-132

⁸⁶. Ibid. 143

When the opposition factions increase their pressure on the Ethiopian government, the Ethiopians claim that the troops are in Somalia for training the government troops. In 2007, United States forces conducted operations and launched air strikes targeting suspected Al Qaeda allies of the opposition to the Somali government.

It is impossible to establish a functioning domestic system in Somalia because of the interference by external aggression.

Warlords continue to be the main problem in the country till now. These warlords are the same people who are trained and supported by both the Kenyan and Ethiopian governments to overthrow the Siad Barre regime. They now organized Islamist extremists that joined pockets of al Qaeda and Ethiopian rebel groups. The fighting and insurgency continues between the weak government and the Islamist extremists. In January 2009, Ethiopian forces withdrew from Somalia. Hardliner Islamists continue their fight against the government. African Union peacekeepers are trying to defend the Somali government. It is estimated that about 1.2 million people are displaced within Somalia and 300,000 refugees reside in Kenya.⁸⁷

In the course of Somalia's history, there have been continuous incursions, interference and attempts by external forces to destabilize, control and gain influence in the country. In return, everyone gets insecurity and chaos, and no one sees it.

⁸⁷. Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia

Chapter 6

Yemen

Yemen is a small country, twice the size of Wyoming, located at the southern tip of the Arabian Peninsula in Southwest Asia.⁸⁸ The state of Yemen has been divided into Northern and Southern Yemen. The Republic of Yemen was formed in 1990 from former Yemen or Northern Yemen and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen from former Southern Yemen. Yemen has two neighbors: on the north side, Yemen shares a border with Saudi Arabia and on the east side, Yemen shares a border with Oman; on the south side, Yemen adjoins the Gulf of Aden and on the west side, Yemen adjoins the Red Sea. Aden serves as the commercial capital of Yemen.

In the course of its history, Yemen was ruled by different types of people, including Sabaeans, Himyarites, Romans, Ethiopians and Persians in ancient times. Muslim Arabs conquered Yemen in the 7th century A.D, and by the 16th century Yemen became part of the Ottoman Empire after being ruled by Egyptians for 175 years.

Yemen is considered the most populous country in the Arabian Peninsula; the people are predominantly Arabs. In the north, they are 100% Muslim – a blend of Sunnis and Shiites. The southern part of the country has a blend of Muslims, Christians, and Hindus. The Yemeni Jews emigrated to Israel at the country's birth. Yemen still has the culture of a tribal social structure, although it is diminishing in the coastal areas due to more foreign contact. (When the British dominated that area, the tribal social structure was at its peak; since then, the tribal social structure has been fading.)

⁸⁸. Britannica Concise Electronic Encyclopedia; Yemen; at: <<http://www.answers.com/topic/yemen>> (accessed April 4, 2013)

Regional and international power politics divided Yemen into north and south throughout its history. After gaining independence from the Ottoman Empire in 1918, only the northern part of Yemen became an independent kingdom and then a republic in 1962. But the southern part of Yemen remained a British colony for years to come. The British forces of the East India Company occupied Aden in 1839; Southern Yemen and the southern port of Aden remained under British control until 1967. During this period, sporadic clashes continued on the Aden border.⁸⁹ When British withdrew from the area in 1967, they did not lay the foundation for joining the south Yemen with the north; instead the southern part of the Yemen became independent and is still the poorest area of the Arabian Peninsula.⁹⁰



During their occupation of the south Yemen, the British created a federation in southern Yemen in spite of the opposition from nationalist groups in Aden. In later years, the nationalist groups began a terrorist campaign against the British. By 1965, two rival nationalist groups emerged: the National Liberation Front (NLF) and the Front for the Liberation of Occupied South Yemen (FLOSY). NLF forces organized a forceful campaign against the British presence which resulted in the withdrawal of the British forces in 1967 and the collapse of the British- backed federation in southern Yemen. Immediately after the British withdrawal, southern Yemen claimed independence in the same year. In 1970, the southern Yemen government created a new constitution and renamed the southern part as the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. The southern

⁸⁹. CIA – The World Factbook

⁹⁰. Albert Micah, “Yemen: Life on the Edge,” *World Policy Journal*, Vol. 26. No. 3 (Fall, 2009): pp. 72-80

government in Yemen adopted a Marxist orientation which caused hundreds of thousands of people to move from the south to the north. This escalated the already existing hostilities between north and south Yemen.⁹¹

After its independence, Oman and north Yemen disputed borders with the south which led to armed clashes. Southern Yemen signed an accord with the North for ending the fighting and merging the two countries. The accord was not implemented for many years to follow. In 1978, the leader of southern Yemen was overthrown by a radical, Abdul-Fattah Ismail. In 1979, Ismail signed a 20-year treaty with the Soviet Union, which gained influence and established naval bases in southern Yemen. Yemen became the only Marxist state in the Arab World. Instability and power struggle continued in southern Yemen until 1989.



North Yemen, throughout its history, has also been suffering from external aggression and regional power struggle. The external interference has been the main cause of failures in the domestic governing system of the north. In 1934, Saudi Arabia invaded Yemen and the then Protectorate of Aden, Great Britain, confronted the Saudis.⁹² The Saudis and Great Britain fixed Yemen's north and south borders and the destiny of the Yemenis was controlled by the Saudis and British.

After WWII, Yemen became active in foreign policy, even though the southern part of the country remained isolated. The Yemeni government joined the Arab League in 1945 and in 1947, it joined the United Nations. It joined with the United Arab Republic (Egypt and Syria) from 1958-1961. During this time, Yemeni rulers received technical

⁹¹. The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia

⁹². Ibid.

and economic assistance from both the West and the Communist bloc. The king and the spiritual leader was the imam and he ruled theocratically. (In Sunni Islam, imam refers to caliph – a leader of an Islamic polity, regarded as a successor of Muhammad and by tradition always male – designating the political successor of Muhammad.)⁹³

In 1962, the Kingdom of North Yemen adopted a neutralist foreign policy. However, the Yemeni government had not realized that the state of Yemen was not an independent state because regional powers did not allow the Yemeni government to act independently. In addition, regional power politics has torn Yemen apart for centuries and since 1962, it brought Yemen to the brink of absolute dysfunction.

In 1962, Egypt and Saudi Arabia intervened in northern Yemen militarily. Egypt sent forces to north Yemen to oust the royalist government and replace it with a republican government; the Saudis sent forces to protect the ruling government of the royalists.⁹⁴ The pro-Egyptian armed forces of Yemen succeeded in overthrowing the royalist government of the North. North Yemen became a republic, ruled by Colonel Abdullah al-Salal.

The power transition in north Yemen created a prolonged civil war. During this period, north Yemen became an “international battleground”⁹⁵ because “both Egypt and Saudi Arabia attempted to internationalize the conflict by seeking external support and by urging their great power patrons to get actively engaged on their behalf.”⁹⁶ The Egyptians committed to support the republicans while the Saudi Arabia and Jordan endeavored to keep the royalists in power.

⁹³. Britannica Concise Electronic Encyclopedia.

⁹⁴. Gerjes A. Fawaz, “The Kennedy Administration and the Egyptian-Saudi Conflict in Yemen: Co-Opting Arab Nationalism”, *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (Spring 1995) p. 292-93

⁹⁵. The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia

⁹⁶. Gerjes A. Fawaz. P. 292-293

This 1962 external aggression in Yemen was motivated by regional powers – mainly Saudi Arabia and Egypt – and international consideration in that region of the Arab world.⁹⁷ The 1962 aggression against Yemen became fierce and led to five years of dominant Arab political conflict from 1962 to 1967. The regional conflict became so heated that the inter-Arab state system came under the influence of great powers, mainly for their economic, military and political supports from the great powers.⁹⁸ During this time, the life of civilians in Yemen and the structure of the domestic government were exclusively in the hands of regional and foreign powers.

Saudi rulers have always considered Yemen a strategically crucial neighbor with regard to their national security. When the Nasser government in Egypt sent troops to Yemen in 1962 to overthrow the royalists from power and replace them with a republican government, the Saudi leaders sensed a great menace by Egypt's aggression and became worried. Saudi rulers argued that the spillover effect of the coup in Yemen could affect Saudi's stability as a kingdom. They considered Egypt's military aggression a calculated plan to overthrow the kingdom in Saudi Arabia and control Saudi's vast oil resources. The Egyptian forces in Yemen were seen as the extension of Egypt's power and influence in the Arabian Peninsula, coupled with the support of Soviet and Communist influence.⁹⁹

The Saudis were unprepared when Egypt intervened in Yemen militarily. Evaluating the balance of power in the region, the Saudi leaders found it directed against them. The Saudis had difficult time to recruit other Arab states on their side, except Jordan. To compensate for their regional weakness, they sought outside help and turned to the United States for support to counter the Egyptian aggression. In response, the

⁹⁷. Ibid. p. 293

⁹⁸. Ibid.

⁹⁹. Ibid. p. 299

Kennedy Administration argued that Nasser was in a strong position in Egypt and by provoking him, the US would jeopardize its interest in the region; therefore, the US chose to accommodate Egypt's policies and did not oppose Nasser's aggression in Yemen. "The result was an escalation of the Yemeni conflict and a heightening of the role of external powers. Regional actors perceived their involvement in Yemen as of vital national interest."¹⁰⁰

The Kennedy administration took one step further and established a closer relation with Egypt under Gamal Abdel Nasser. Although Saudi Arabia had been pro-Western and pro-US, Fawaz Gerges¹⁰¹ documents in his research that the Kennedy administration viewed Egypt as a competent regional power and did not choose to antagonize Egypt over Saudi Arabia because that would damage the United States interests in the region. Therefore, the Kennedy administration extended to Nasser economic development agreements. Saudi Arabia and Jordan interpreted the Kennedy administration's move as using Egypt as their "main instrument of influence in the region at the expense of pro-Western, conservative Arab friends."¹⁰² Nasser interpreted it to mean that the US wanted Egypt to pacify the internal resistance in Yemen, and should Saudi Arabia continue its support for the royalists, Egypt should further increase the military confrontation against Saudi Arabia to halt the Saudis.¹⁰³

To find an alternative power instead of the US, the Saudis turned to the British, and the British were willing to cooperate with the Saudis against the radical forces that

¹⁰⁰. Ibid. p. 307

¹⁰¹. Ibid. p. 292-311

¹⁰². Ibid. p. 294

¹⁰³. Ibid.

challenged their security, because their strategic-base in Aden was threatened by the Egyptian force in the Arabian Peninsula.¹⁰⁴

In 1966, acting as an independent government, Premier Hassan al-Amri of North Yemen reorganized the administration system, but he was overthrown by a pro-Egyptian regime and al-Amri supporters were arrested and removed from office. After an agreement with North Yemen, Egypt withdrew its troops from the north in 1967 and the Saudis halted their assistance to the royalists.

In late 1967, royalists overthrew the Colonel Abdullah al-Salal government when he was out of the country. A three-man republican council was formed with al-Amri assuming the premiership. North Yemen remained a battle ground between the republican faction and the royalist faction until 1970. Eventually, Saudi Arabia formally recognized the republicans and stopped its aid to the royalists.

From 1967 to 1972, border clashes continued between Northern Yemen and Southern Yemen until an accord was signed in 1972 to merge the north and south. The agreement was not implemented and the fighting continued. In 1974, the then Northern Yemen's Chairman, Abdul Karim Ali Al-Iryani, resigned because of internal political tensions and the next day a nonviolent coup led by Lieutenant-Colonel Ibrahim al Hamidi usurped power in northern Yemen. Al Hamidi suspended the constitution and reestablished civilian rule. Al Hamidi was assassinated in 1977 and was succeeded by Lieutenant-Colonel Ahmad al-Ghashmi, who was also assassinated in 1978. Lieutenant-Col. Ali Abdullah Saleh assumed power in 1978 and remained in power for 33 years.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴. Ibid. p. 307

¹⁰⁵. The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia.

The leaders of Northern and Southern Yemen met in December of 1989 and signed a unification agreement. The borders were opened in February 1990 and the Yemenis became united. President Saleh of the North Yemen became the leader of the united Yemen. However, the relation between the northern and southern Yemen grew tense in 1993 and civil war erupted in 1994 between the northern-based government and the southern secessionists. The war lasted only for 63 days and was won by the northern forces. After the civil war, a coalition government was established, from which the main southern party was excluded. During this time, Muslim extremists emerged in the south and committed random violence, including arming tribal people and kidnapping tourists. In October of 2000, a suicide bombing attack damaged the U.S.S. Cole in Aden and the extremists bombed the British embassy.

In 2000, Saudi Arabia signed a treaty to end its border dispute with Yemen, which dated back to 1930. When the US declared the War on Terror in 2001, the Yemeni government supported the war and this brought Yemen to America's attention. Yemen started receiving aid from the US and the government also campaigned against the extremists and terrorists in Yemen. The Muslim extremists, linked to Al-Qaeda, opposed the government because of its pro-American policies and the conflict between the government and the extremists continues until this day. In 2004, the Huthi group rebelled against the Yemeni government in northern Yemen to help Zaydi Islam prevail – Zaydi Islam is a sect of Shia Islam which has some similarity with the Sunni Islam school of thought. The conflict between the government and the extremists sometimes intensifies. For example, the 2009 conflict between the government and the extremists displaced

about 100,000. The rebels and the government fought six times before they agreed to a ceasefire in 2010 and the ceasefire continues till now.¹⁰⁶

Historical analysis of Yemen demonstrates that Egypt is the main aggressor in the region. By using its regional power status, Egypt destabilizes and interferes in the domestic affairs of Yemen and competes and fights for regional dominance against a powerful state, Saudi Arabia. The Saudis and Egyptians are mainly taking decisions for the Yemeni government and people. These regional aggressors have been destroying the governing system and the lives of civilians in that state for reasons of their own interests. And based on recent history, the British, Jordanians and Saudis interfere in Yemen against the Egyptians, Russians and the United States.

The behavior of Egypt and Saudi Arabia demonstrates the regional power struggle between powerful states to dominate the weak state of Yemen, and the Yemeni state is sacrificed by becoming dysfunctional in this struggle. Within the Arab state system, Saudi Arabia and Egypt seek to maintain significant positions for regional dominance. Their power struggle is destroying Yemen.

¹⁰⁶. Britannica Concise Encyclopedia.

Chapter 7

Afghanistan

The Afghanistan case is quite different, both historically and politically, from Yemen and Somalia. Although Afghanistan was not colonized by any superpowers, external aggression and interference continually crushed the governing system and the people.

Afghanistan is a landlocked country, about the size of France, located in the center of Asia; it is often called the heart of Asia, comparing it to a body's pivotal organ. Afghanistan's neighboring country to the west is Iran, a regional power which has a long border with Russia, shares both language and religion with Afghanistan and is involved in a fierce conflict with the US. In the east and south, Afghanistan shares a border with Pakistan, a country with nuclear weapons. Pakistan and Afghanistan share an ethnic group, the Pashtuns, whose language is Pashto and whose religion is also Islam. Beyond the northern border of Afghanistan are the former Soviet Union's satellite countries of Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan. In other words, one of Afghanistan's immediate neighbors was a world superpower, the Soviet Union. The US has been competing against the then Soviet Union and now Russia as its successor. Afghanistan is bordered in the northeast by the Xinjiang Uygur Province of China, a country that competes with the Soviet Union in regional power politics. China has been a regional power and is now emerging as a potential archrival of the United States. Another immediate neighbor of Afghanistan is India, a regional power and rising world power which has been in competition with both China and Pakistan, while Afghanistan serves as

its natural ally.¹⁰⁷ In a nutshell, Afghanistan is surrounded by China, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Iran, Pakistan, India and Russia, while being monitored by the US and the British. Its capital and the largest city is Kabul.

Afghanistan has been crisscrossed by many invaders, namely Persians, Macedonians, Arabs, Turks, Mongols, forces of the British Empire and more recently of the Soviet Union. Throughout history they invaded Afghanistan mainly because it is located along the land routes between the Indian subcontinent, Iran and Central Asia.¹⁰⁸ “Throughout its history, Afghanistan has been the object of a geostrategic game between the political powers of Southwest Asia.”¹⁰⁹

Invading and controlling Afghanistan has been the desire of world powers throughout the course of history because of its utmost strategic importance and location. More specifically, during the 19th and 20th centuries, Afghanistan served as a battlefield for the “Great Games” of the British and Russians. In the course of that period, Afghanistan was invaded numerous times from the south by the forces of the British Empire stationed in India and from the north once by the Russian Army. When the British invaded Afghanistan, the excuse was their concern that the Russian Empire intended to expand its reach to the shores of the Indian Ocean. In order to prevent this, the British needed to establish a defense zone which naturally included parts of Afghanistan. The Russians were concerned that the British would conquer the entire South Asia; therefore, the Russians needed a major military presence around Northern

¹⁰⁷. The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia.

¹⁰⁸. Ibid.

¹⁰⁹. Galster R. Steven, “Rivalry and Reconciliation in Afghanistan: What Prospects for the Accords?,” *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 4, (October 1998): pp. 1505-1541

Afghanistan and Persia (Iran).¹¹⁰ The geostrategic position of Afghanistan compelled the imperial powers of the time to invade the country even though the country was poverty-stricken and politically neutral.

Present-day Afghanistan was created in 1747 by Ahmad Shah who was a lieutenant in the empire of the Persian king Nadir Shah. Ahmad Shah was an Afghan tribal leader in the Persian army. After the death of Nadir Shah in 1747, Ahmad Shah created an empire and gave it the Afghan name, Durrani, which means “pearl of the age.” Ahmad Shah conquered most of India and Persia and established the united states of the present-day Afghanistan.¹¹¹

The Durrani reign continued until 1826. However, at that time the status of Afghanistan became a problem for the world hegemony, the British and Russians, which needed central Asia for their sphere of influence. The British wanted to control the northern approaches to India and introduced a force to Afghanistan to replace the Afghan emir. The British policy led to the Afghan resistance, and the British Army suffered a humiliating defeat in the Afghan War of 1838-42. Even after the defeat, the British continued their policies to control Afghanistan. In 1857, the Afghans signed an alliance with the British. When the Russians saw the Afghans allied with the British, they provoked the Afghans against the British, which led to the second Afghan-British War in 1878, inflicting another heavy loss on the British force. The British then attacked Kabul and occupied it in 1880 and appointed a pro-Britain emir, Abd ar-Rahman Khan.

After the humiliating defeat of the British Army in 1842, the British controlled Afghanistan's foreign affairs and made sure to block Afghanistan's political overture

¹¹⁰. Ibid.

¹¹¹. The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia

where the British had influence – basically, the British government blocked Afghanistan from the outside world.¹¹²

In 1893, British India signed an agreement with the Afghan government, the Durand Agreement, under which British India took part of Afghan territory for the next hundred years in return for economic assistance. In 1947, when Pakistan was created, the British made that territory part of the Pakistan State, and the territory became Pakistan's Northern Frontiers and Peshawar areas. (The area of Pakistan where the US uses drones was originally part of Afghan territory.)

In 1907, an Anglo-Russian agreement was signed which guaranteed Afghanistan independence from British influence in its foreign affairs. During WWI, Afghanistan remained neutral, in spite of Britain's pressure to become an ally. However, the British continued blocking and tightly controlling the foreign affairs of Afghanistan. In 1919, the Afghan King Amanullah invaded British India to free the Afghan government from British influence. The third Afghan-Britain War ended with the Treaty of Rawalpindi. That treaty granted Afghanistan full control over its foreign relations.¹¹³ (Although the treaty was signed, it was not implemented in practice.)

Afghanistan remained neutral during WWII and joined the United Nations in 1946. In 1947 when the British created Pakistan, Afghanistan wanted to incorporate its Pathan people who were separated from Afghanistan by the Durand Agreement of 1893, in the North-West Frontier Province – now Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan – but was not successful. The issue was raised in 1955, 1960 and 1972, but did not go anywhere because the British would not support the issue.

¹¹². Ibid.

¹¹³. The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia.

During the great power struggle, Afghanistan kept its neutrality, but the pressure from the north, the Soviet Union, and the south, the Western powers, did not allow the governing system in Afghanistan to develop. At the end of the 1970s, Afghanistan decided to side with the West, but since the Soviets were the dominant power in the area, they did not allow that to happen and sent troops into Afghanistan in December of 1979. The then Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) miscalculated its foreign policy for Afghanistan at the height of the Cold War and did not perceive the great value of the geopolitical position of Afghanistan for other powers, nor did the Soviets expect the strong resistance to their invasion of Afghanistan, particularly from the West. Studies show that the Soviet Union planned to invade Afghanistan and then withdraw from it several months after changing the government. The Soviets did not anticipate that they would not be able to withdraw for years, even though they desperately wanted to withdraw. The fierce opposition of the West pushed the Soviets to the edge of military defeat in Afghanistan and turned Soviet foreign policy into a disaster. During this period, the Soviet Union sought to save face and began negotiations with the opposition groups to withdraw from Afghanistan safely, but the West wanted the Soviets to withdraw politically defeated as did so many other invaders throughout history. The enduring political and economic cost of the invasion turned out to be disastrous for the Soviet Union's leaders and policymakers. Those chaotic circumstances forced the Soviets to negotiate in 1988 on the terms of their opponents who were supported by Pakistan, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Israel, China, Libya, Britain and the United States among others. But the Soviets faced a stalemate and the stalemate in the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union about Afghanistan resulted in the one-sided weak Geneva Accords

which destroyed Afghanistan as country politically, economically, culturally and historically. What ensued did irreparable damage to Afghan destiny to this day. The previous Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze once said that the USSR has done so much damage to Afghanistan that, “there is not a family or village that has not suffered as a result of our presence.”¹¹⁴

When the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, its objective was:

...the pursuit of economic and political opportunities and, most importantly, ensuring the security of its southern border. Economically, Afghanistan provided a market for Soviet and East European goods and served as a possible ‘doorway’ to other markets and resources. Although very poor in terms of its own purchasing power, Afghanistan’s economic importance lay in its natural gas reserves and its need for military equipment and other goods.¹¹⁵

Furthermore, politically Afghanistan was serving as a bridge between the Soviet Union and the Muslim and non-allied countries in the Third World.

When Afghanistan was attacked at various times in history, the invaders had specific purposes for doing so, certainly economic and political intentions and so did the Soviet Union. Afghanistan had an 800-mile long border with the Soviet Union, and Russia traditionally considered any instability in Afghanistan as a threat to its own security. Afghanistan became a matter of regional security. In 1979, a contribution to the physical security of the Soviet Union was the fundamental concern of the Soviet policymakers when invading Afghanistan. But the Soviet Union failed to keep a grip on the country. Instead, Soviet policymakers devastated Afghanistan with their misguided foreign policy.

¹¹⁴.Kalinovsky Artemy. “Old politics, new diplomacy: the Geneva accords and the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan”. *Cold War History*. Vol.8, No.3, (August 2008) p. 381-404

¹¹⁵. Galster R. Steven. Pp. 1505-1541

When the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, Afghans had to support either the pro-Soviet government side or the resistance side. When the government failed to bring uncommitted Afghans to its side, Soviet bombers would force them either to change their commitment or leave the country. Those who were forced to leave the country took refuge in Pakistan. In order to receive refugee assistance in Pakistan, the Pakistani government would force these Afghans to register with one of the US- and Pakistan-supported resistance groups.¹¹⁶

Pakistan would recruit and train guerrilla opposition forces, popularly called mujahidin, (holy warriors) from the refugee camps and would send them back to Afghanistan to fight around the country. These mujahidin were fighting both the Soviet forces and the Afghan forces that were supported by the Soviet Union. The opposing forces ruined the social, cultural, political, economic and military infrastructure of Afghanistan, and Afghanistan ceased functioning as a state for the next 23 years.

After the withdrawal of the Soviets from Afghanistan in 1989, the Soviet-friendly government headed by Dr. Najibullah continued until 1992 and then collapsed. The mujahidin, who were stationed in Pakistan, consisted of different resistance groups, eventually captured Kabul in 1992. From 1992 to 1994 these factions located in different parts of the country, looted the country and involved it a violent civil war. In 1994, a new militia, Pakistani proxy warriors under the name of Afghan Taliban entered Afghanistan. By 2000, the Taliban controlled 90% of Afghanistan, but they were not recognized by the international community.

¹¹⁶. Ibid.

Who are the Taliban?

The word Talib derives from the Arabic singular word meaning student or learner, and Taliban is its plural. The Taliban allied with rogue terrorists like al-Qaeda who attacked the United States on September 11, 2001.¹¹⁷ In reality, the Taliban are Pakistan's ISI trained and equipped proxy warriors fighting in the region of Central Asia, mainly in Afghanistan and Kashmir. The Taliban leadership and their leader Mullah Omar were helped, organized and provided with logistics by the powerful Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence agency (ISI), the extremist Pakistani religious party Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Islam, and radical Arab Muslims, including members of Osama bin Ladin's terrorist network. The ISI, the Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Islam and the Taliban leadership all cooperate very closely.¹¹⁸

On April 22, 1994, the American embassy in Islamabad sent a secret telegram to Washington reporting that the Taliban initiated the attack on Spin Boldak, Afghanistan. The Taliban's attack "was preceded by artillery shelling of the base from Pakistani Frontier Corps positions inside Pakistan."¹¹⁹ Furthermore, the telegram stated that coordination was provided by Pakistani officers on the scene, and "The Taliban's military competence... and their use of tanks and helicopters strongly suggested Pakistani tutelage or direct control"¹²⁰ "After the Spin Boldak victory, inside Pakistan ISI and General Babar rolled Afghan, Pakistani, and Arab jihadi elements into the Taliban army,"¹²¹

¹¹⁷. Jones, G. Seth. "The Rise of Afghanistan's Insurgency: State Failure and Jihad." *International Security*. Vol. 32, No. 4, (Spring 2008): pp. 7-40

¹¹⁸. Tomsen, Peter. "A Chance for Peace in Afghanistan: The Taliban's Days are Numbered." *Foreign Affairs*, (Jan., Feb. 2000)

¹¹⁹. Tomsen, Peter. "The Wars of Afghanistan: Messianic Terrorism, Tribal Conflicts, And the Failures of Great Powers," *Public Affairs*, 2011. P.535

¹²⁰.Ibid.

¹²¹.Ibid.

which became the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. After that, the Taliban's military operations and logistics were handled by the ISI officers. Rahman, Masood Azhar, and other ISI religious leaders compelled the madrassa student in Pakistan to leave their studies and join offenses in Afghanistan and Arab extremist fanatical groups further expanded the commitment.¹²²

Pakistan has been involved in the internal affairs of Afghanistan from its birth, but this interference increased since 1975. In early 1970s, Pakistan's military dictator, General Zai ul Haq envisioned Afghan-Islamization: by developing a strategic depth against India, Pakistan envisioned hegemony in Afghanistan and an Islamic holy war in Kashmir and elsewhere. Therefore, Pakistan initiated its first proxy war against the Afghan government in 1975 before the Soviet invasion.

Pakistan's second and much bolder proxy war against Afghanistan began in 1979 and continued to 1992: during this time, Pakistan which was supported by the West, felt compelled to fight in Afghanistan to protect Pakistan from the Soviets.

Pakistan's third proxy war in Afghanistan began in 1992 and continued until 9/11, targeting Afghan's northern coalition force leader, Ahmad Shah Masood.¹²³ After Dr. Najibullah's government collapsed in 1992, Pakistani ISI expanded and strengthened its unholy alliance on Pakistan's Frontier. This alliance was composed of ISI personnel; Afghan extremists, most notably Gulbuddin Hekmatyar and later the Taliban; al-Qaeda; the two Pakistani religio-political parties, Jamaat-i-Islami and Jamiat-i Ulema-i-Islam; and thousands of international jihadis from Arab countries, Uzbekistan, China's Xinjiang Province, Burma, the Philippines, and the West. With the help of the Jamaat-i-Islami and

¹²².Ibid.

¹²³.Ibid. 589

Jamiat-i Ulema-i-Islam paramilitary militia, ISI created dozens of jihadi military training camps inside Pakistan and just across the Afghan border in Konar, Nangarhar, and Paktiya provinces. “Pakistan’s generals considered the unholy alliance a strategic asset.”¹²⁴ They wanted to accomplish the Islamization vision initiated by Zai ul Haq.

The unholy alliance was coordinated by the ISI director Javad Nasir and retired ISI chief Hamid Gul^{125,126} and General Asad Durrani and Afzal Janjua among others since 1992. They were known as the “Jihadi Generals” because they glued together the unholy alliance, Pakistani, Afghan, and foreign components operating in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Kashmir, the Middle East, and Europe. Gul who was operating as part of ISI was at the forefront. He often went into Afghanistan. Gul met Osama bin Laden in Sudan in December of 1993 and again at a 1994 conference in the Middle East.¹²⁷

ISI developed its strong connections with al-Qaeda affiliates, mainly Osama bin Laden during the late 1980s, when Osama bin Laden and other senior Arab terrorists were fighting in Afghanistan. ISI and al-Qaeda created the largest paramilitary group,

¹²⁴.Ibid. 519

¹²⁵. Hamid Gul, former ISI Chief is anti-America. In an interview with Rediff in 2004, he stated, “We were caught on the wrong foot. We had been supporting the Taliban and the Americans were quiet about it because the (*American oil and gas major*) UNOCAL lobby was working. I have been saying that 9/11 is the creation of America. To slap sanctions on Afghanistan they started spreading baseless allegations against Osama (*bin Laden*).” And this what he believed: “Given the situation in Iraq, Osama's cadre must be swelling rather than diminishing in stature, in confidence and in organization. These Arab mujahideen who were in the resistance movement against America are not products of *madarssas*. They are highly educated and belong to rich families. They are going for jihad in far off places like Bosnia, Chechnya and Afghanistan. In these places they were aliens -- culturally and linguistically and in many other ways. But now, Iraq is a God-sent for them.”

<<http://www.rediff.com/news/2004/feb/12inter.htm>> (Accessed April 20, 2013)

¹²⁶. Check also an important article by DOUGLAS FRANTZ about Pakistan: Frantz also writes about Gul, “General Gul remains a supporter of the Taliban and he denounced the Americans for condemning them and Osama bin Laden without providing any proof of guilt.” “Osama bin Laden is a sensitive man and he had nothing to do with the attacks on America,” he said. “You Americans will have to support the Taliban one day. They are not going to go away. They are integral, organic, historic.”

Frantz Douglas, “Pakistan Ended Aid to Taliban Only Hesitantly,” *New York Times*, December 8, 2001,1 <<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/08/international/asia/08STAN.html?pagewanted=2>> (Accessed April 20,2013)

¹²⁷. “The Rediff Interview: Former ISI Chief Hamid Gul,” February 12, 2004, <<http://www.rediff.com/news/2004/feb/12inter.htm>> (Accessed April 20, 2013)

Lashkar-i-Taiba which is still close to and supported by al-Qaeda. “In March 2002, one of bin Laden’s top lieutenants, Abu Zubaydah, was captured at a Lashkar-i-Taiba safehouse in Faizabad in the Punjab [Pakistan]”¹²⁸ Pakistani ISI together with al-Qaeda had created bases for the Lashkar-i-Taiba in Pakistan and eastern province of Afghanistan, Konar. By 1993, Lashkar-i-Taiba with other terrorist organizations operated in Afghanistan, Bosnia, the Caucasus, western China’s mainly Muslim Xinjiang Province, North Africa, and other parts of the Muslim world, often with guidance of the al-Qaeda’s operatives. Lashkar-i-Taiba belongs to Fazlur Rahman and Rahman was part of Benazir Bhutto’s political coalition.¹²⁹

“Al-Qaeda and Muslim Brotherhood operatives sought to transform Afghanistan into a holy-war bastion, and unassailable base from which terrorists could strike the West and pro- Western Arab governments in the Gulf and the Middle East.”¹³⁰ Southwest of Kabul, at Rishkhor Camp, al-Qaeda trained thousands of jihadi warriors a month, according to the Julius Strauss report in the *Daily Telegraph*.¹³¹ About 1,500 foreign soldiers would attend training courses for six weeks in Rishkhor. Strauss further reports that the Al-Qaeda graduates were then organized and sent to fight alongside the Taliban. She quoted a shepherd as saying, “There were hundreds of Pakistanis and other foreigners here.” And “A memo sent by Russia to the United Nations in March, which was later leaked, singled out Rishkhor as Osama bin Laden's largest camp in Afghanistan.

¹²⁸. Tomsen. (2011) p. 520

¹²⁹. Ibid.

¹³⁰. Ibid. 484

¹³¹. Strauss Julius, “Camp Where They Hanged Abdul Haq,” *Daily Telegraph*, December 6, 2001 <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/1364518/Camp-where-they-hanged-Abdul-Haq.html>> (Accessed April 20, 2013)

The memo claimed that 7,000 fighters were based there at any one time, including an entire Pakistani army regiment.”¹³²

The ISI and its unholy alliances changed the indigenous Islamic order of the Afghans and exported to Afghanistan a very extreme version of Islam. Afghans follow the Hanafi Islam school of thought, which is much more liberal and more lenient in world views. However, the Pakistani ISI and Arabs exported to Afghanistan the extremist version of Islam, the Wahhabi Islam, to compete against the softer version of the Afghan’s indigenous Hanafi order. Saudi Arabia’s General Intelligence Director aided the ISI’s extremist-centered Afghan strategy. The ISI’s Saudi-financed Islamist infrastructure trained holy warriors for combat inside Afghanistan and Kashmir on the Pakistani Frontier and across the border in the Afghan Pashtun areas.¹³³

After the Soviet invasion, Pakistan invaded Afghanistan through its unholy alliance, although it is not noticed officially because Pakistan’s invasion was under the banner of Taliban and Islam. After the collapse of the Afghan government in 1992, Pakistan sent about 25,000 combined Pakistani soldiers and Pakistani jihadi combatants into Afghanistan, and this was in addition to al-Qaeda and other Arab terrorists actively functioning in Afghanistan. The ISI’s active duty officers were stationed in every Afghan ministry. “In the provinces, the ISI established about eight bases manned by active duty and retired ISI colonels and brigadiers.”¹³⁴ “According to Masood [the northern alliance leader], much of Pakistan’s 9th Division plus a heavy artillery unit and special forces, participated in the ... offensive.”¹³⁵ At first, Pakistani ISI officers inside Afghanistan

¹³². Ibid.

¹³³. Tomsen. (2011) p. 484

¹³⁴. Ibid. 541

¹³⁵. Ibid. 571

played the card of Islam and religion; when that started to fail, they then started “playing the ethnic card,”¹³⁶ to provoke Afghan Pashtuns against non-Pashtuns. Kunduz province became the Pakistani Army’s headquarter for their annual offensive against Masood during the 1990s. “It was the arms depot, the supply center, and the forward base for Pakistani generals and ISI intelligence officers to assemble the unholy alliance parts and attack the Northern Alliance.”¹³⁷ Masood “offered to provide information to the United States and the United Nations on the names of specific Pakistani generals stationed inside Afghanistan, the names of Pakistani officers killed in combat, and the locations where they were buried.”¹³⁸ Masood believed that the whole structure of the Taliban was based on the Pakistani Army and Arab terrorists. Stripping the two elements from the Taliban, there remains no Taliban.

Since 2002, the Pakistan Army started its fourth proxy war in Afghanistan, and “The ISI and its unholy alliance prepared their counterattacks across the Durand Line.”¹³⁹ At the time of the American invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, “the Taliban and al Qaeda had been driven from Afghanistan, but were back in their protected Pakistani sanctuaries, their leadership still mainly intact.”¹⁴⁰ ... Although countless Taliban and al-Qaeda associates and foot-soldiers died, there is no shortage of recruitment in Pakistan by ISI

because, al-Qaeda and the Taliban were part of the ISI’s unholy alliance. Even if the U.S. military had been able to trap and destroy bin Laden, al-Qaeda, and the Taliban inside Afghanistan, the Islamist infrastructure in Pakistan would have continued to churn out more Mullah Omars and many thousands of new Afghan Taliban, Pakistani, and foreign jihadi fanatics.¹⁴¹

¹³⁶. Ibid.

¹³⁷. Ibid. 604-605

¹³⁸. Ibid.571

¹³⁹. Ibid. 589

¹⁴⁰. Ibid. 588

¹⁴¹. Ibid. 589

Since the American invasion of Afghanistan, more than 1,000 American soldiers have been killed there; thousands of soldiers have suffered serious physical and mental injuries. According to a report by the New York Times, the US is spending ten billion dollars monthly, amounting to an annual record spending for Afghanistan of \$120 billion dollars a year.¹⁴² This figure is only the net cost on record. It excludes the money that the Afghan government is spending, the expenses by the international community, donor money pledged to help and rebuild, intelligence services covert spending and more. The conflict in Afghanistan is one of the longest wars the US has ever fought and this war still costs the US a great deal of blood and treasure. After the end of the Taliban regime and the new government of Hamid Karzai was installed, the Kabul government is still plagued by widespread insurgency. The insurgency began in 2002, but by 2006 insurgency operations rose by 400 percent and the number of deaths from these attacks rose by 800 percent.¹⁴³

In 2006, the number of suicide attacks increased 400 percent from 2005.

Taliban-planted improvised explosive-device incidents leaped from 783 to 1,677, and the number of Taliban armed attacks climbed from 1,558 to 4,542. In 2009, looking back at the Taliban's progress during the previous eight years, Colonel Sultan Imam, who was officially retired from the ISI but is now part of Hamid Gul's virtual ISI, predicted to a British reporter in Pakistan that the Taliban were destined for ultimate victory. 'I have worked with these people since the 1970s and I tell you they will never be defeated,' he said. 'My students are far ahead of me now. They are giving a lesson to the world. I am very proud of them.' He declared: 'You can never win the war in Afghanistan.'¹⁴⁴

Furthermore, in February 2009, the U.S Director of National Intelligence, Denis Blair, warned that "the primary threat from Europe-based extremists stems from al-

¹⁴². Thom Shanker, "Afghanistan War Report Cites Progress by Troops," *The New York Times*, (April 29, 2011)

¹⁴³. Jones. Pp. 7-40

¹⁴⁴. Tomsen. (2011) p.624

Qaeda and Sunni affiliates who return from training in Pakistan to conduct attacks in Europe or the United States.”¹⁴⁵

Why is there no success in sight in Afghanistan? Because the Pakistani ISI is actively working to destroy everything the United States and the Afghans are developing and sustaining. Pakistan’s cross border covert insurgent operations in Afghanistan are much larger than Iran’s and Syria’s interference in Iraq. Unlike the governing system in Afghanistan, the Iraqi government has not been as dysfunctional.

ISI’s operations against the Afghan government have become common knowledge. Rajiv Chandrasekaran documents in his book that,

After the Taliban leadership relocated to Pakistan in late 2001, they were provided safe harbor by the ISI. They were allowed to meet and reorganize and even reestablish networks inside Afghanistan, but the Pakistani spies refrained from given them overt assistance. Although ISI officials regularly met with a handful of senior Talib mullahs, Taliban commanders had to raise their own capital from drug trafficking and foreign donations, and they had to acquire their own munitions, which wasn’t all that difficult in Pakistan. Dealers sold tons of ammonium nitrate to Taliban middlemen with the full knowledge of the ISI. But in mid-2009, as American surge forces began flooding into southern Afghanistan, the ISI adopted a far more hands-on strategy. Concerned that U.S. gains on the battlefield would hobble the Afghan insurgency, ISI spymasters began interacting with far more Taliban commanders, often providing them arms and intelligence via civilian intermediaries. According to one assessment, at least half of all insurgent commanders were working closely with ISI operative by the spring of 2011. The operative provided some of them with sophisticated explosives that were almost seven times more powerful than conventional bombs mixed from ammonium nitrate.¹⁴⁶

Taliban leader Mullah Omar, America’s most wanted man, and his Quetta Shura, have been protected by both Pervez Musharraf when he was in office, 2001-2008, and the ISI. “An order from Musharraf could land the entire Quetta Shura in jail; put Omar in

¹⁴⁵. Ibid. 626

¹⁴⁶. Chandrasekaran Rajiv, “Little America: The War within the War for Afghanistan,” Alfred A. Knopf (New York, 2012): Pp.291-292.

American custody...¹⁴⁷ Instead, the ISI has been the provider of logistical cooperation to ship arms, ammunition, and supplies from Pakistan to Afghanistan to proxy warriors who are fighting the American-led coalition in Afghanistan.

After the September 11, 2001 attacks, Pakistan President Pervez Musharraf gave the US access to its airports to operate from there. The Bush administration in return lifted three sets of sanctions imposed on Pakistan: the first, the military and economic sanctions which were imposed as a result of Pakistan clandestinely obtaining nuclear weapons capability in 1990; the second set of economic sanctions lifted by the US had been imposed on India and Pakistan for their 1998 nuclear tests; the third sanction lifted had been imposed on Pakistan when Musharraf overthrew the elected government of Pakistan in a coup of 1999. In addition, Musharraf asked Bush to help him in getting debt relief for Pakistan from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. These exceeded the aid packages provided by the Reagan administration during the 1980s.¹⁴⁸ In spite of all this, Pakistan's ISI has been spreading American hatred in the region and trained and sent insurgents across the border to Afghanistan.

After 9/11, Pakistan military dictator Musharraf gave the United States bases for military operations and full transit rights, but allowed only limited activity for CIA operations inside Pakistan. This was a skillful approach on the part of Pakistan because it neutralized any opposition towards Pakistan both by the White House and Congress and also kept the US media from reporting that Pakistan supported the Taliban insurgents in Afghanistan.

¹⁴⁷. Tomsen. (2011) p. 649

¹⁴⁸. Ibid. 591-92

Musharraf's statements that he was committed to help the US in the war against terrorism and Afghanistan were absolutely insincere, because in order to preserve military rule in Pakistan, the entire military structure in Pakistan continued its proxy war in Afghanistan and Kashmir.

Musharraf preserved the three-decade-old ISI-managed holy war infrastructure on the Frontier. The Taliban leadership returned to their old sanctuaries in Pakistan. Bin Laden crossed into Pakistan with his wives, children, and a long line of armed al-Qaeda fighters and disappeared from view. Musharraf and the ISI practiced plausible denial concerning bin Laden's whereabouts. They knew exactly where he was.¹⁴⁹

By the middle of 2010 Pakistan's generals had reason to believe that they once again had the Americans where they wanted them. The flow of unconditioned U.S. military and economic aid to Pakistan indirectly supported Pakistan's hegemonic aspirations in Afghanistan.¹⁵⁰

Pakistan sometimes expresses its concern to the United States that the US should not leave Afghanistan because Pakistan will be left with the problems in Afghanistan. In fact, "Pakistan's military wanted the United States to leave because it would give ISI a free hand to bring Afghanistan into Islamabad's sphere of influence."¹⁵¹ ISI is trying to use Kandahar, located in the south of Afghanistan, a city where all the revolutions have emanated throughout Afghan history. The Pakistani Army used Kandahar for its 1994 offensive in Afghanistan until 2000 and overran most of the country. Counting on their past success, Pakistani generals have been using Kandahar again for their offensive since 2002. "Taking back Kandahar was the necessary first step in Pakistan's latest proxy war in Afghanistan."¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹. Ibid. 592

¹⁵⁰. Ibid. 665

¹⁵¹. Ibid.

¹⁵². Ibid. 661

There are numerous reports by American soldiers fighting in Afghanistan that they have seen incidents of Pakistani intelligence and Frontier Corps personnel aiding the Taliban along the Afghan-Pakistan border. “Evidence that Pakistan’s army was supporting the increasingly virulent Taliban offensive inside Afghanistan proliferated during the second George W. Bush administration.”¹⁵³ In 2007, a U.S. air strike against insurgents on the Pakistani border killed eleven soldiers in Pakistan’s Frontier Corps who had joined Taliban fighters firing at American and Afghan troops from inside Pakistan. In 2007, a Pakistani Frontier Corps soldier shot and killed 82nd Airborne Division Major Larry Bauguess during a Pakistani-U.S.-Afghan trilateral meeting in the Khurram tribal agency in Pakistan that had been called to discuss military coordination. *The Washington Post*, in a report of April 2008, quoted a U.S soldier as saying, ““The Frontier Corps might as well be Taliban... They are active facilitators of infiltration.””¹⁵⁴ Pakistan’s Frontier Corps, the Post reporter wrote, ““is viewed as nearly an enemy force.””¹⁵⁵ In Helmand province, a month after this report, the “British commandos killed a Taliban commander who turned out to be a Pakistani military officer.”¹⁵⁶

The United States had invaded Afghanistan by military force on October 7, 2001, to oust what was the world’s most infamous regime, the Taliban regime. The regime had sponsored the terrorist organization al Qaeda and allowed it to operate training camps in the country for terrorists, some of whom participated in the 9/11 attacks on the US. The US planned to replace that regime with a democratically elected government that

¹⁵³. Ann Scott Tyson, “Border Complicates War in Afghanistan,” *The Washington Post*, April 04, 2008, <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2008-04-04/world/36862183_1_pakistani-military-checkpoint-taliban-positions-athar-abbas/2> (Accessed, April 24, 2013)

¹⁵⁴. Ibid.

¹⁵⁵. Ibid.

¹⁵⁶. Tomsen. (2011) pp. 624-625

represents all Afghans and then support that government internationally. It has been more than ten years and the US is still fighting pockets of domestic terrorists, the Taliban and international terrorists along the Afghan border area - the al Qaeda – who are crossing over the border from Pakistan. Pakistan is the formidable enemy for Afghanistan and “the most acute threat to a stable, peaceful, and neutral Afghanistan will continue to come from Pakistan, even though nearly all of Afghanistan’s other neighbors also support their own Afghan proxies.”¹⁵⁷ American pressure “would not convince Pakistan to suppress the jihadi bases in Pakistan spawning Islamic terrorism in the world. These were essential tools to maintain the military’s grip on domestic Pakistan politics and to pursue its geostrategic goals in the region and globally.”¹⁵⁸

“Increased levels of U.S. aid to Pakistan, high-level visits, and subdued warnings will not convince Pakistan’s army to stop assisting the Afghan Taliban or to close down Taliban sanctuaries on Pakistan’s territory.”¹⁵⁹

It is almost impossible for a country like Afghanistan, which is torn apart by three decades of warfare, to defend itself against a neighbor or rather an enemy that is much stronger and much larger and is supporting and officially encouraging tens of thousands of well-trained, well-armed insurgent to cross the border and create chaos, instability and endeavor to overthrow the fragile Afghan government. This is the main reason why Afghanistan has not been able yet to create a peaceful and stable country.

Pakistan’s proxy war in Afghanistan could not be defeated with 130,000 foreign troops, or even half a million foreign troops. The Taliban insurgency could only be defeated if Pakistan clamped down on the Taliban’s Quetta Shura,

¹⁵⁷. Tomsen. (2000)

¹⁵⁸. Tomsen. (2011) P.665-666

¹⁵⁹. Ibid. 683

Gulbuddin Hekmatyar's bases in northeastern Pakistan, and the Haqqani and Anwar al-Haq terrorist networks.¹⁶⁰

¹⁶⁰. Ibid. 620

Chapter 8

Analysis

Until now, it seems that scholarly literature has devoted little attention to theories regarding the role of external factors in a troubled state. When we look at the writing of leading scholars, we find that they discuss the issue of nonfunctioning states more broadly, and they consider the problems and setbacks of the nonfunctioning states to be only internal. These scholars barely consider outside forces, mainly the power politics in the international system, a fundamental element. In other words, based on the writings of scholars, it sounds as if some alien species had occupied nonfunctioning states and their issues are irrelevant in the international system.

If we go back to the case of Somalia, the country is well known, not only for being a collapsed state, but also highly dangerous piracy emanates from its territory. However, international criticism has never related Somali piracy to external forces. In fact, Somali piracy has been engineered by outside elements in Somalia. An article published in *The Economist* about Somali piracy states, “The pirates are increasingly sophisticated, handsomely bankrolled ... in Dubai and elsewhere.”¹⁶¹ In Dubai and elsewhere implies that piracy is traced back to the transnational mafia stationed in Dubai and other countries and is remotely planning and controlling Somali piracy. To do this, the mafia involved will do anything to corrupt the Somali governing system: from bribing government officials to kidnapping those who do not abide by their demands, and the mafia would even kill those who intend to prevent their piracy. If *the Economist* reporter

¹⁶¹. “Somalia: the World’s Most Utterly Failed State; The spread of piracy just draws attention to the growing chaos on Somalia’s land.” *The Economist*, (2008) From the print edition. <<http://www.economist.com/node/12342212>> (Accessed, April 3, 2013)

can trace the whereabouts of the Somali piracy organization, the intelligence services in Dubai must absolutely know about this fact and so do the UN and other countries. Dubai bears full responsibility to do its part to prevent piracy. And as far as the UN is concerned, a 2008 UN¹⁶² report indicates that Somalia received only \$14m from the UN budget for development programs. But, in that year, \$100m was paid in ransom to pirates. If one hundred million dollars were spent annually to protect Somalia from its neighbors and external interference, Somalia would become a peaceful, developing and eventually a prosperous country. Nevertheless, foreign governments who could do so act incompetently in dealing with such cases and then blame and categorize these cases as failures. In her book *the Tenth Parallel*, Griswold writes that a Special Force commander told her, “that some of his [Special Force] soldiers had traveled along with the CIA operative to Somalia, and had been disturbed by their naiveté in dealing with the warlords.”¹⁶³ Furthermore, capable foreign governments have not made any effort “trying to end Somalia's woes. Diplomats charged with trying to do so are frustrated and depressed.”¹⁶⁴ In Somalia, the formidable problem is external interference, not advising officials through diplomats. It is estimated that about one million Somalis or 14% of the Somali population live abroad and send \$750m¹⁶⁵ to \$1billion¹⁶⁶ to their families in Somalia annually. If capable governments were to empower the Somali nation to block any foreign interference instead of sending diplomats whose overtures do not succeed, they could make a difference in the life of the failed Somali nation.

¹⁶². Somalia: the World's Most Utterly Failed State.

¹⁶³. Griswold. p137

¹⁶⁴. Somalia: the World's Most Utterly Failed State.

¹⁶⁵. Griswold. p154

¹⁶⁶. Hesse J. Brian, “Introduction: the myth of ‘Somalia’”, *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 3, (July 2010). P. 249

In Somalia, the system failure is caused by external interference and aggression, but the governments of other states as well as political pundits and mainstream journalists portray Somalia as an incompetent failed nation that harbors terrorism. However, mainstream media contributes to shaping public opinion which distorts the truth. In October of 2008, *The Economist*¹⁶⁷ published an article about Somalia which represented the country as, “The world's most utterly failed state.” Inappropriate words further deteriorate the perception and political tools to encourage those involved to do something positive about it. In the field of journalism, *The Economist* is considered a prominent England-based magazine. It has readers not only in England, but around the world. Words have meanings and those meanings change perceptions. Somalia was a British colony and *The Economist* should be a media to encourage politicians to help Somalia and not portray the country as hopeless.



The case of Yemen resembles that of Somalia. Although Yemen is not in as depressed a state as Somalia, the nation is troubled, especially with the challenges of non-state actors and terrorists. The international media and political pundits constantly talk about terrorism in Yemen, and Yemen is indeed becoming a breeding ground for terrorists. The governing system in Yemen is falling short and failing to competently defend itself against outside forces which have been flooding into Yemen, especially from neighboring countries. *The Economist* writes about Yemen claiming that, “Many

¹⁶⁷. Somalia: the World's Most Utterly Failed State.

Saudi Islamists have fled across their southern border into Yemen to escape tighter controls at home. An influx of experienced insurgents back from Iraq, where al-Qaeda has been hard hit, has pepped up the movement [in Yemen].”¹⁶⁸ In addition, in an interview in *The Washington Post*, Yemen’s foreign minister, Abu Bakr al-Qirbi, estimates that about “1,000-1,500 al-Qaeda and like-minded fighters”¹⁶⁹ have entered Yemen. And al-Qaeda is spreading everywhere in dirt-poor Yemen. By definition, al-Qaeda is a non-state actor. An organization that has no designated place finds safe havens in states that have no capable internal government. Hence, al-Qaeda further contributes to the instability and chaos of the state. These terrorists and criminals, under the name of Islam, can damage the social system of Yemen very easily. If 1,000 al-Qaeda operatives each hurt one civilian in Yemen daily, there would be 1,000 civilians harmed a day and within a week Yemen will turn to chaos and the domestic governing system would fail to function.

The British, the Saudi Arabian and the Egyptian governments are exclusively responsible, among other countries, for the failure of the Yemeni state. Blocking external interference in Yemen, especially from its neighbors, would enable Yemen to function as a nation without being used by non-state actors. Its internal conflicts would be resolved if external forces were not allowed to choose one side over the other.



¹⁶⁸. “Yemen. Jangling nerves. Resurgent terrorist groups are just a symptom of broader troubles,” *The Economist*, (2008) From the print edition <<http://www.economist.com/node/12342204>> (Accessed April 6, 2013)

¹⁶⁹. Ibid.

The United States has not been at war in Somalia and Yemen yet, but it is currently at war in Afghanistan. It is necessary to evaluate how the United States entered the Afghanistan war after 9/11.

After September 11, 2001, Afghanistan became a model of security intervention and humanitarian aid. After 23 years of conflict and civil wars, the international community helped the Afghans to create a new government. However, Afghanistan still remains insecure and in chaos after twelve years, threatening the lives of Afghan civilians as well foreigners. The US is losing both treasure and blood without any substantial progress in that country. The Taliban, trained and equipped mostly by ISI – the Pakistani intelligence service – since 1989, are emerging as potent proxy warriors, destroying the lives of civilians and shaking confidence in the newly emerging government in Kabul.

It is obvious now that the US and the international community, trying to change the situation in Afghanistan, approached the country after 9/11 based on the flawed concept of an internally “failed state.” (Afghanistan was on the top-ten list of failed states both before and after 9/11.) The main reason for the setbacks in the endeavor of the international community and the US in Afghanistan seems to be that resources were not put together to absolutely minimize or block external interference. To the contrary, the US in particular, started fighting a different kind of war in Afghanistan, not with a strategic goal of combatting external negative interference.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan had destroyed the entire governing structure of Afghanistan, and after the Soviet withdrawal, external forces found Afghanistan vulnerable to exploitation for various reasons. After the 9/11 incident, the US needed to mainly focus on blocking external interference in Afghanistan, especially by Pakistan and

Iran. The U.S. government had all the intelligence reports. Afghanistan would have flourished as a successful nation much faster than expected. Instead, the way the Bush Administration approached the Afghan conflict make it look like the US was going to war with another world superpower. The Bush approach to the Afghan conflict can best be explained by the theory according to Hobbes who states, “So that in the nature of man, we find three principal causes of quarrel. First, competition; second, diffidence; thirdly, glory. The first maketh men invade for gain; the second, for safety; and the third, for reputation.”¹⁷⁰ These three war assumptions were first made by the famous ancient thinker Thucydides; however, the analysis by Hobbes emphasizes that war virtually is the nature of man demonstrating his power. Hobbes made assumptions about human nature by adding that people, in general, are all egoistic, “controlled by an *animus dominandi* comprising the three passions mentioned above, which puts them eternally at odds with one another.”¹⁷¹

Taking Hobbes’ theory into consideration, the US did not focus its resources on blocking external interference in Afghanistan. In the very first speech of President George W. Bush to a joint session of Congress on September 21, 2001, just before the beginning of the conflict he stated:

Americans are asking, ‘How will we fight and win this war?’ We will direct every resource at our command – every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence and every necessary weapon of war – to the disruption and to the defeat of the global terror network. Now, this war will not be like the war against Iraq a decade ago, with the decisive liberation of territory and a swift conclusion. It will not look like the air war above Kosovo two years ago, where no ground troops were used and not a single American was lost in combat. Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. Americans should

¹⁷⁰. Doyne Dawson, “The Origins of War: Biological and Anthropological Theories,” *History and Theory*, vol. 35, No. 1 (Feb., 1996): p. 1-28 –p 1-2

¹⁷¹. *Ibid.* p. 3

not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign unlike any other we have ever seen. It may include a dramatic strike visible on TV and covert operations, secret even in success.¹⁷²

These poetic, powerful, personal words actually are in accordance with Hobbes: safety, gain, and reputation. The main strategy was not focused on blocking external interference in Afghanistan and blocking ISI trained proxies fighting under the name of Afghans.

In addition, the US military and intelligence agents committed serious blunders in Afghanistan, such as the following:

While the Taliban's highest-ranking mullahs were settling down in Quetta, American aircraft dropped hundreds of thousands of leaflets with photos of Omar, Razak and other leading Taliban figures into populated area of Kandahar Province. The leaflets announced the \$10 million bounty on Omar's head – a million times the average weekly income of Afghans. The photo of Omar on the leaflets, however, was of another man, Malawi Hafizullah. Hafizullah was a minor Taliban figure. He had two eyes. Omar only had one. 'The CIA are blind and stupid,' Hafizullah huffed to a British journalist who managed to find him. 'I'm afraid to leave the house,' he said. 'If I do, soldiers or villagers will tear me to pieces so they can get the money.'¹⁷³

Peter Tomsen documents another case of the US intelligence blunder:

Many, if not most, of the CIA and U.S. military stipends went to the warlords who had been responsible for the 1992-1996 civil war and anarchy in Afghanistan after Najib fell. Popular revulsion against them had fueled the Taliban's rise to power. The warlords were most hated by the general Afghan population than the Taliban. They exploited their U.S. payments to reclaim their personal fiefdoms. Most had little education. Some were non-literate or, like Gul Agha Sherzai and Abdul Rashid Dostum, barely literate. They were not interested in Afghanistan's future, only their own.¹⁷⁴

And Tomsen further states:

¹⁷². George W. Bush. President Bush's Address on Terrorism before a Joint Meeting of Congress, speech transcript: *the New York Times*, (September 21, 2001).
at <<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/21/us/nation-challenged-president-bush-s-address-terrorism-before-joint-meeting.html>>

¹⁷³. Tomsen. (2011) P.613

¹⁷⁴. Ibid. P.597

Defense Secretary Rumsfeld protested at an October 16, 2001, National Security Council meeting that the Pentagon was being forced to follow the CIA's lead in Afghanistan. 'This is the CIA's strategy,' he objected. 'They developed the strategy. We're just executing the strategy.'¹⁷⁵

In his speech to Congress, President Bush stated: "The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war. And we know that God is not neutral between them."¹⁷⁶ He believed that God was definitely on the side of the US, which would mean that all the killing since then is justified – it is God's plan. Apparently this is not the case, because it did not work that way. The US is failing in Afghanistan because the US failed to focus on how to block the Pakistani ISI who trains the Haqqani and other Taliban leadership.

The campaign in Afghanistan was not properly focused. This can also be explained by another theory of war. Anthropologists attribute their war theory to individuals and seek to determine the difference between primitive wars and modern wars.

Anthropologists found that primitive warfare was not only very different from the warfare practiced by civilized societies, but also that primitive warfare was considered a different institution from the modern one. Primitive warfare did not involve political and economic motives, but obviously modern warfare does. This theory became very popular by 1942, when another anthropologist, Quincy Wright, took this theory to a higher level and came up with some statistics. Wright, in *A Study of War*, states that even at a primitive stage of warfare, only four percent of primitive people fought for self-defense; by contrast, fifty-nine percent of primitive people made warfare for social reasons, including revenge and prestige, and about thirty-seven percent of warfare was for

¹⁷⁵. Ibid. P.596

¹⁷⁶. George W. Bush (2001)

economic or political reasons.¹⁷⁷ It is absolutely legitimate to assume that most modern wars are certainly caused by the latter two mentioned reasons. Anthropologists would assess the US conflict in Afghanistan by using President Bush's famous speech to Congress. His powerful words resonate revenge, prestige, politics and self-defense, not an intention to block external interference in Afghanistan:

Tonight we are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom. Our grief has turned to anger and anger to resolution. Whether we bring enemies to justice or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done... This is not, however, just America's fight. And what is at stake is not just America's freedom. This is the world's fight, this is civilization's fight, this is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom.¹⁷⁸

The attribution of war to individuals is based on a sociobiological thesis which is different from other perspectives. In 1932, "Sigmund Freud wrote to Albert Einstein that war is rooted in a 'death instinct,' a 'lust for aggression and destruction,' arising from 'a good biological basis.'"¹⁷⁹ In other words, nationalistic superiority, ambition and egotism of one's military strength further fuels these competitive passions. It seems though, if Freud would now write another letter to Einstein, he would describe the US conflict in Afghanistan by taking excerpts from the text of President Bush's speech to Congress:

And tonight a few miles from a damaged Pentagon, I have a message to our military: be ready, I have called the armed forces to alert and there is a reason. The hour is coming when America will act and you will make us proud. I will not forget the wound to our country and those who inflicted it. I will not yield. I will not rest. I will not relent in waging this struggle...¹⁸⁰

It is clear that the US began the Afghanistan conflict with a flawed concept and strategy. Almost no failed state has emerged successfully through intervention. Policy

¹⁷⁷. Doyne. p. 1-28

¹⁷⁸. George W. Bush (2001)

¹⁷⁹. Doyne. P.1-28

¹⁸⁰. George W. Bush (2001)

makers involved in cases like Afghanistan have failed to analyze the problems caused by external actors. This is a huge problem to be reconsidered and adjusted.

Chapter 9

Conclusion

This thesis demonstrates that external causes are the fundamental factors in creating failures in the governing system of a state, and politicians, policymakers, political pundits and mainstream media need to focus on these external factors.

By evaluating the cases of Somalia, Yemen and Afghanistan, this thesis demonstrates that external factors indeed create not only failed states, but also are the current sources of instability and chaos in the world. External interference and aggression lead failed states to become breeding grounds for criminals and, under the banner of Islam, a launching pad for global jihad. In addition, failed states are plagued by poverty and unemployment, diseases and human rights violations.

This thesis demonstrates that the current concept of the causes of failed states is flawed. Flawed political perceptions about a state's international relations shape policymakers' belief and attitude towards the state. The hypothesis is valid that politics based on a wrong perception lead to disastrous consequences and policy failure as demonstrated in the cases of Afghanistan and Somalia. This paper tests the concept of the causes of failed states and examines whether the generally accepted concept of failed states applies across the board to all nonfunctioning states around the globe. We see that it even does not apply to the case of Somalia. The so-called failed states need to be empowered to defend themselves against external interference. And the United States is in a good position to empower them, because the US has shown this capability in South Korea against North Korea and in Taiwan against China, among other states.

Scholars put Afghanistan on the top-ten list of the so called “Failed States.” Did the US approach Afghanistan as a non-functioning state destroyed by external interference? No, it does not seem that way. The United States seems to have a vague, black and white concept of Afghanistan as a territory not as a nation, and this was the fundamental problem that made the US fail after twelve years in spite of the heavy sacrifice of lives and treasure. Will the US approach Yemen and Somalia exactly like it approached Afghanistan? Yes, it absolutely seems so. No politician, political pundit or journalist discusses external interference in the domestic affairs of a non-functioning or failing state. The focus is always on the internal failure of a failed state and therefore, policymakers will certainly approach it that way.

This thesis argues that the causes of failed states must be revisited. Since 9/11, innumerable scholars have focused their attention on Afghanistan by writing about it as a failed state. They talk about Yemen as failed state and describe Somalia as a collapsed state.

Socially and politically unstable and lawless situations in a state make it easier for external terrorist movements to exploit the situation by operating within the state and recruiting from a large pool of unemployed and desperate people such as in Yemen, or as we saw in the case of Afghanistan. Dominant countries have been turning a blind eye to threatening failures of states, like in the case of Afghanistan before 9/11. If security threats prevail in a region and spread around the world emanating from a nonfunctioning territory, then politically, economically, and militarily powerful countries should feel compelled to counter the threats by leading efforts to transform the conditions in nonfunctioning states. It is important to understand that the general concept of failed

states which is ignoring of external factors has resulted in policy failures. What were assumed to be panaceas have not been working, particularly in Afghanistan, Yemen and Somalia. Favorite choices of policymakers are usually limited to include spending more money, the conventional strategies of military intervention, humanitarian aid, targeting terrorists, and establishing a democratic state with a free market economy. In spite of the billions of dollars spent to fix and prevent the enduring problems of non-functioning states, the problems only seem to be growing worse. There must be an answer to the question of why these efforts are not successful.

There should be great concerns that state failures cause an increasingly serious threat around the world, especially to the national security and national interest of the West. Terror is not breeding in militarily and economically powerful states, but in weak and nonfunctioning states or failed states. Terrorism can pose a great threat to the human race as a whole because terrorism has become a “brand name” and anyone who has a grievance may become a terrorist, like the underwear bomber Abdulmutallab from Nigeria, who unsuccessfully tried to bring down Northwest Flight 253 over Detroit on Christmas Day 2009 with a bomb in his underwear.

As previously demonstrated, external interference in failed states creates conditions under which international security deteriorates. External interference also causes failed states to become breeding grounds for instability and murder as well as a reservoir for exporting terrorism globally. This causes many citizens to flee to neighboring countries, creating serious refugee problems. This outcome is troubling to the world order and endangers world peace. Therefore, external interference in failed states should become a pressing issue to be dealt with policywise by all those who work

in this area. Consequently, helping weak and dysfunctional states to prevent substantial external interference should assume absolute urgency.

In order to be a successful world superpower, the United States, cannot afford to make any further political blunders, especially in Afghanistan. The United States initiated two wars after 9/11, and in both wars, it has not been able to demonstrate practical strategies for achieving expected goal. The US became trapped in Afghanistan, the main problem being external interference as well as ineptness in domestic rivalry. Rajiv Chandrasekaran describes the domestic rivalry in his book as follows:

This was not the issue of grand strategy. Even if Karzai hadn't been a loose cannon and Pakistan hadn't provided sanctuary to Taliban commanders and the White House hadn't blanched at the hundred-billion-dollar annual tab, Obama's vast increase of American troops and reconstruction dollars would still have amounted to a missed opportunity in Afghanistan. The reason wasn't to be found in Kabul or Islamabad. It was in Washington: The American bureaucracy had become the America's worst enemy.¹⁸¹

Our generals and diplomats were too ambitious and arrogant. Our uniformed and civilian bureaucracies were rife with internal rivalries and go-it-alone agendas. Our development experts were inept. Our leaders were distracted.

Afghanistan was Larry Nicholson and Kael Weston's war. It was Dick Schott and Ken Dahl's war. It wasn't Obama's war, and it wasn't America's war.

For years, we dwelled on the limitations of the Afghans. We should have focused on ours.¹⁸²

¹⁸¹. Chandrasekaran Rajiv, "Little America: The War within the War for Afghanistan," Alfred A. Knopf New York, 2012. Pp. 328-329.

¹⁸².Ibid. pp. 331-332

Policy Recommendations for US in Afghanistan

The United States government needs to help the Afghans and their government with the following five policies:

- The US should keep its established military bases in Afghanistan: Since 2001, the US, more than any other country in the world, lost blood and treasure in Afghanistan. Abandoning or totally withdrawing from Afghanistan after 2014 would not be a practical policy for American leadership. Afghanistan is located in the center of regional powers. At this stage, Afghanistan is weak and could easily be exploited by external interferers. If the US abandons Afghanistan heavy external interference may again create the same conditions as existed in the country before 9/11. The Afghans need the US in Afghanistan, and so does the US for its national security.
- Restrain Pakistan. Pakistan, especially its ISI, is the main source of instability in Afghanistan. The US can restrain this. The US provides Pakistan with billions of dollars of economic and military aid and in return, the US can pressure Pakistan to change its activities in Afghanistan. The US can convince Pakistan that its strategies in Afghanistan did not work in the past and will not work in the future especially if the US continues to help the Afghans.
- A strong enforcement of the judicial system: The US needs to force the Afghan government to aggressively enforce its laws on everyone,

especially on the jihadists who are unpopular because they are disregarding the laws.

- Education institutions: the US should help the Afghans to develop their higher education system. Good education in Afghanistan can open people's perspective to embrace democracy, give women their rights and accept solutions by settling differences of opinion rather than by open conflict.
- Let the Hanafi school of thought prevail: The people in Afghanistan are religious. It is very difficult to convince them to embrace democracy and give up their strict religious views. The Hanafi school of thought is more liberal and can properly fit into the system of democracy. By contrast, the Wahhabi school of thought is very extreme and is not the indigenous religion in Afghanistan. It is being exported to Afghanistan from Saudi Arabia and Pakistan and imposed on many Afghans. The Afghan government should be helped to let the liberal Hanafi school of thought prevail and discourage the Wahhabi school of thought.

Bibliography

Abrahms Max, "What Terrorists Really Want Terrorist Motives and Counterterrorism Strategy," *International Security*, Vol. 32, No. 4, (2008, spring): pp.78-105.

Albert Micah, "Yemen: Life on the Edge," *World Policy Journal*, Vol. 26. No. 3 (fall, 2009): pp. 72-80.

Ann Scott Tyson, "Border Complicates War in Afghanistan," *The Washington Post*, (April 04, 2008).
<http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2008-04-04/world/36862183_1_pakistani-military-checkpoint-taliban-positions-athar-abbas/2> (accessed, April 24, 2013)

Boaz, Atzili, "When Good Fences Make Bad Neighbors Fixed Borders, State Weakness, and International Conflict." *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 3, (2006/07, winter): pp.139-173.

Britannica Concise Electronic Encyclopedia; Yemen; at:
<<http://www.answers.com/topic/yemen>> (accessed April 4, 2013)

Brooks Ehrenreich, Rosa, "Failed States, or the State as Failure?," *The University of Chicago Law Review*, Vol. 72, No. 4, (2005, autumn): pp. 1159-1196.

Call T. Charles, "The Fallacy of the 'Failed State'," *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 8, (2008): pp. 1491-1507.

Chandrasekaran Rajiv, "Little America: The War within the War for Afghanistan," Alfred A. Knopf New York, 2012.

Chau C. Donovan, "The fourth point: An examination of the influence of Kenyan Somalis in Somalia," *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 3, (July 2010): pp.279-312.

Chege Michael, "Sierra Leone: The State that Came Back from The Dead." *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 3, (2002, summer): 147-160.

CIA – The World Factbook.

Crocker A. Chester, "Engaging Failing States," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 82, No. 5 (Sep.-Oct., 2003): pp. 32-44.

Doyne Dawson, "The Origins of War: Biological and Anthropological Theories," *History and Theory*, vol. 35, No. 1 (Feb., 1996): pp. 1-28.

Frantz Douglas, "Pakistan Ended Aid to Taliban Only Hesitantly," *New York Times*, (December 8, 2001):
<<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/08/international/asia/08STAN.html?pagewanted=2> >
(accessed April 20, 2013)

Foreign Policy Magazine, "The Failed States Index," *Foreign Policy*, No. 149. (Jul. – Aug., 2005): pp. 56-65. (accessed Dec.15, 2012)

Foreign Policy Magazine, "Failed States Index," *Foreign Policy Magazine*. (2012)
<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/failed_states_index_2012_interactive> (accessed April 1, 2013).

Galster R. Steven, "Rivalry and Reconciliation in Afghanistan: What Prospects for the Accords?," *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 4, (October 1998): pp. 1505-1541.

George W. Bush, "President Bush's Address on Terrorism before a Joint Meeting of Congress," speech transcript: *The New York Times*, (September 21, 2001).
<<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/21/us/nation-challenged-president-bush-s-address-terrorism-before-joint-meeting.html>>

Gerges A. Fawaz, "The Kennedy Administration and the Egyptian-Saudi Conflict in Yemen: Co-Opting Arab Nationalism," *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 2, (Spring 1995): p. 292-93.

Gordon R. Michael, "Kerry Arrives in China Seeking Help on North Korea," *The New York Times*, (April 13, 2013):
<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/14/world/asia/kerry-in-china-seeking-help-on-north-korea.html?hp&_r=0> (accessed April 20, 2013)

Griswold Eliza, "The Tenth Parallel: Dispatches from the Fault Line Between Christianity and Islam," 1st ed. (Library of Congress-in-Publication Data, 2010).

Helman B. Gerald. Ratner R. Steven, "Saving Failed States," *Foreign Policy*, (June 21, 2010)
<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/06/21/saving_failed_states?page=full>

Heritage History. Online. 2013. Mahdist Wars (a.k.a Soudan Campaign) 1883 to 1898
<http://www.heritage-history.com/www/heritage.php?Dir=wars&FileName=wars_soudan.php>
(accessed March 28, 2013)

Hesse J. Brian, "Introduction: the myth of "Somalia,"" *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 3, (July 2010): pp.247-259.

Hesse J. Brian, "Where Somalia Works," *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 3, (July 2010): pp.343-362.

Human Rights Watch, "Stolen Children: Abduction and Recruitment in Northern Uganda," Vol.15, No.7 New York, (2003)

International Labor Organization. (ILO) "Good Practices and Lessons Learned on Child and Adolescent Domestic Labor in Central America and the Dominican Republic: A gender perspective", ILO, San Jose, (2005).

International Labor Office. (ILO), "The End of Child Labor: Within reach – Global report on the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work", *International Labor Conference 95th Session, Report I(B), ILO, Geneva.* (2006).

International Labor Office. (ILO), "Global Employment Trends for Youth August 2010: Special issue on the impact of the global economic crisis on youth," *International Labor Organization*, Geneva, (2010).

International Labor Office. (ILO), "Global Employment Trends January 2013: Recovering from a second Jobs dip" *Geneva*, (2013)
<http://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/global-employment-trends/2013/WCMS_202326/lang--en/index.htm>

Jones, G. Seth, "The Rise of Afghanistan's Insurgency: State Failure and Jihad," *International Security*, Vol. 32, No. 4, (Spring 2008): pp. 7-40.

Kalinovsky Artemy, "Old politics, new diplomacy: the Geneva accords and the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan," *Cold War History*, Vol.8, No.3, (2008, august): pp. 381-404.

King Gary and Zeng Langche, "Improving Forecasts of State Failure," *World Politics*, Vol. 53, no. 4, (2001, July): 623-658.

Kinzer Stephen, "Break Up Afghanistan? Why Not?," *The NY Times*, Dec. 1. 2001
<<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/01/arts/break-up-afghanistan-why-not.html>>
(accessed, Feb. 28.2013)

Kydd H. Andrew. Walter F. Barbara, "The Strategies of Terrorism," *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 1, (2006, summer): pp. 49-80.

Menkhaus Ken, "State in Somalia: Second Thoughts," *Review of African Political Review*, Vol. 30, No. 97, (Sep., 2003): pp. 405-422.

Pape A. Robert, "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism," *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 3, (2003, August): pp. 343-361.

Piazza A. James, "Incubators of Terror: Do Failed States and Failing States Promote Transnational Terrorism?," *International Studies Quarterly*, No. 52 (2008): pp. 469-488

- Ray Takeyh, Gvosdev, K. NiKolas, "Do Terrorists Networks Need a Home?," *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 3, (2002, summer): pp. 97-108.
- Reyner S. Anthony, "Somalia: The Problem of Independence," *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (1960, summer): pp. 247-255.
- Robert, I. Rotberg, "The New Nature of Nation-State Failure," *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 3, (2002, summer): pp. 85-96.
- Schmitt Eric, "Somalia's First Lesson For Military Is Caution," *The NY Times*. (March 05, 1995):
<<http://www.nytimes.com/1995/03/05/world/somalia-s-first-lesson-for-military-is-caution.html>> (Accessed: March 6, 2013)
- Smith J. Paul, "Climate Change, Weak States and the 'war on Terrorism' in South and Southeast Asia," *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 29, No. 2, (2007): pp. 264-84.
- Stephen van Evera, "Defense and the Causes of War," *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 4, (Spring, 1998).
- Strauss Julius, "Camp Where They Hanged Abdul Haq," *Daily Telegraph*, (December 6, 2001).
<<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/1364518/Camp-where-they-hanged-Abdul-Haq.html>> (accessed April 20, 2013)
- Swagman F. Charles, "Tribe and Politics: An Example from Highland Yemen," *Journal of Anthropological Research*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (1988, autumn): 251-261.
- The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia,(Online), Sixth Edition, Copyright 2011, Columbia University Press.
<<http://www.answers.com/topic/afghanistan>> (accessed April 4, 2013)
- The Economist*, "Somalia: the World's Most Utterly Failed State; The spread of piracy just draws attention to the growing chaos on Somalia's land," (2008) from the print edition.
<<http://www.economist.com/node/12342212>> (accessed, April 3, 2013)
- The Economist*, "Yemen. Jangling nerves. Resurgent terrorist groups are just a symptom of broader troubles," (2008), from the print edition
<<http://www.economist.com/node/12342204>> (accessed April 6, 2013)
- The Rediff Interview*/Former ISI chief Hamid Gul, (February 12, 2004)
<<http://www.rediff.com/news/2004/feb/12inter.htm>> (Accessed April 20, 2013)
- Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, Steve Smith, "International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity," (Oxford New York: Oxford University Press, 2007)

Thom Shanker, "Afghanistan War Report Cites Progress by Troops," *The New York Times*, (April 29, 2011).

Tomsen Peter, "A Chance for Peace in Afghanistan: The Taliban's Days are Numbered," *Foreign Affairs*, (Jan., Feb. 2000).

Tomsen Peter, "The Wars of Afghanistan: Messianic Terrorism, Tribal Conflicts, And the Failures of Great Powers," *Public Affairs*, 2011.

UN Charters, Articles 1, 2, and 76

<<http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter1.shtml>>

UNDP, "National Human Development Report. Security with a Human Face: Challenges and Responsibilities," (2004).

<http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/hdi/> (accessed March 4, 2013)

UNICEF. "Innocenti Insight. Birth Registration and Armed Conflict" *Innocenti Research Centre*, (2007)

<[http://www.unicef.org/protection/birth_registration_and_armed_conflict\(1\).pdf](http://www.unicef.org/protection/birth_registration_and_armed_conflict(1).pdf)> (accessed March 12, 2013)

UNICEF, "The 'Rights' Start to Life: A statistical analysis of birth registration", *Strategic Information Section, Division of Policy and Planning*, New York, (2004)

UNICEF, "United Nations Children's Fund: Progress for Children: A report card on child protection," no. 8, New York, (2009)

World Bank. "World Development Report 2006: Equity and development", *World Bank, Washington, D.C.* (2005).

Yoo, John, "Fixing Failed States," *California Law Review*, Vol. 99, No. 95, (2011, spring): pp.95-150.