

U.S. Military Intervention for Humanitarian Purposes:
Exception to Policy or an Emerging Norm?

William Barna II

Political Science Honors Thesis

Spring Semester 2012

Table of Contents

Introduction	p. 4
U.S. Foreign Policy during the Cold War	p.7
The Rise of Humanitarian Intervention	p. 9
Post-Cold War Intervention Models	p. 12
Foreign Policy Frameworks of the Post-Cold War Presidents	p. 20
Explanation of Variables	p. 25
Case Studies	p. 27
Case study I: Somalia	p. 29
_____ Historical Background	p. 29
_____ President George H.W. Bush Decides to Intervene	p. 30
_____ President Clinton Decides to Ramp up U.S. Involvement	p. 32
_____ UNOSOM II Suffers from Unforeseen Circumstances	p. 34
_____ Clinton Considers Policy Options in the Wake of Disaster	p. 35
_____ The Aftermath	p. 36
_____ Strategic Necessity	p. 38
_____ International Support	p. 38
_____ Public Support	p. 39
_____ Historical Analogy	p. 41
_____ Implications and Conclusions	p. 41
Case study II: Rwanda	p. 42
_____ Historical Background	p. 42
_____ UNAMIR Starts Off on the Wrong Foot	p. 46
_____ The Reaction of U.S. Foreign Policy Makers: Somalia Part Two	p. 47
_____ The Aftermath	p. 49
_____ Strategic Necessity	p. 49
_____ International Support	p. 50
_____ Public Support	p. 51
_____ Historical Analogy	p. 53
_____ Implications and Conclusions	p. 53

Case Study III: Libya	p. 54
_____Historical Background	p. 54
_____Strategic Necessity	p. 57
_____International Support	p. 58
_____Public Support	p. 59
_____Historical Analogy	p. 60
_____Implications and Conclusions	p. 61
Conclusion	p. 62
Bibliography	p. 67

INTRODUCTION

On March 19, 2011 the United States military began the NATO mission Operation Odyssey Dawn with the launch of one hundred and ten Tomahawk cruise missiles targeted at anti-aircraft sites in Libya. This was the beginning stage of U.S. involvement in support of rebels working to overthrow the dictator Moammar al-Qaddafi. This event stands as the most recent use of American military forces abroad for humanitarian purposes. Humanitarian interventions supported by the military are nothing new. Since President George H.W. Bush first ordered U.S. soldiers into Somalia in 1992, military interventions for humanitarian purposes have been on the rise. Since then, three subsequent presidential administrations have deployed military forces to support humanitarian endeavors. Rather than fighting a conventional war, military intervention marks a drastic departure from the Cold War strategy of containment which had lasted for over forty years, becoming obsolete only after the Soviet Union collapsed upon itself. Quite suddenly, the guidelines offered by containment disappeared without a replacement to function in the straightforward manner that containment had. Instead, controversy over when to use the military and for what purpose took the place of this grand strategy.

Today, terms such as “never again” and the “responsibility to protect” (R2P) have become commonplace. As a superpower, the United States uses its foreign policy to project its values of freedom and the spread of democracy throughout the world. Naturally, U.S. foreign policy reflects this ideal. However, in a world of limited resources, the U.S. cannot and certainly does not attempt to intervene militarily in every global conflict. The decision of whether or not to intervene is the result of a deliberate process involving variables which govern the use of U.S. assets. Without the strategy of containment, U.S. foreign policymakers have debated the use of the military on a case by case basis rather than having the ability to rely on one all-encompassing

grand strategy as a framework for decision making. This thesis will examine post-Cold War decisions to intervene militarily for humanitarian purposes. I argue that the U.S. decision to intervene in such situations can be explained by four variables: strategic interests, international support, domestic public support, and historical analogy.

To test this proposition, the thesis will examine the cases of Somalia, Rwanda, and Libya. In August 1992, President George H.W. Bush gave approval for the U.S. to support Operation Provide Relief in Somalia. The mission was backed by the United Nations and its aim was to halt an ongoing famine taking place due to rifts between rival clans during the state's civil war. Although numerous other states and non-governmental organizations (NGO's) were sending food to Somalia, the U.S. was the clear leader of the operation in this early example of military intervention. The follow on mission led by the U.S. known as Operation Restore Hope was initiated just before Bush left office and is well known within the U.S. because the operation was ended by President Clinton in May 1993 in the midst of a domestic uproar over the deaths of nineteen U.S. military personnel during the Battle of Mogadishu. Fear of a conflict similar to Vietnam remained in the minds of Americans and they directed their frustration towards the Clinton administration instead of the group responsible for the deaths.

Just under a year later in April 1994, President Juvénal Habyarimana of Rwanda was killed when his personal aircraft was shot down. This served as the spark which initiated the 1994 genocide of Rwandan Tutsis and their sympathizers. Hutu extremists murdered at least eight hundred thousand in the course of only one hundred days. Prior to the president's assassination, the global community recognized that ethnic tensions were high and the UN authorized the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) led by Canadian Lieutenant General Roméo Dallaire. However, the U.S. did not support this undertaking. In fact,

they lobbied against it as they refused to respond to, or even acknowledge the ongoing genocide until after it was too late. In the words of Samantha Power, U.S. foreign policy analysts maintained a *laissez faire* demeanor by acting as a mere bystander to the events of Rwanda, trying their best to exist in a sort of “twilight between knowing and not knowing” what was actually occurring in the state.¹

One of the most recent cases of a humanitarian issue leading to military intervention occurred in Libya. In February 2011, the Libyan people began a series of nonviolent protests against Muammar al-Qaddafi, the dictator of the state. These protests occurred in the wake of similar uprisings in neighboring Tunisia and Egypt, which remained peaceful and became known as the Arab Spring. Instead of relenting to the citizens who opposed him, Qaddafi turned to violence as he sought to quell the uprisings. Early on, the UN became involved, issuing economic sanctions against Qaddafi to voice concern over his actions. When these failed to produce positive results, the UN approved a no-fly-zone over Libya that was enforced by NATO and the U.S. This action signaled the beginning of the latest military intervention by the U.S.

In the first section of this paper, I will discuss U.S. foreign policy during the Cold War before discussing the rise of humanitarian intervention as a new norm, which is important because humanitarian issues have worked to create a recent need for U.S. intervention. My second section highlights the various foreign policies enacted by recent U.S. presidents for the purpose of informing the reader of where policy stood prior to a specific situation, in this case, my three case studies. After providing an understanding of this, I will segue into my third section with an explanation of my independent variables and why they were chosen along with the three case studies in this thesis. The fourth section consists of my individual case studies. These

¹ Samantha Power, *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*, (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 505.

include a historical background leading up to the humanitarian dilemma which then led to the need for U.S. military intervention. Each case study will conclude after the four independent variables have been explained for each respective case. The final section consists of a wrap up of the case studies with an analysis of the significance of each independent variable.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY DURING THE COLD WAR

Prior to the conclusion of World War II, the U.S. found itself in an ideological struggle with the U.S.S.R. As the war wound down, the inherent disparity between communist and capitalist values was magnified by both sides. These differences effectively took root and quickly matured into the Cold War. During this period, the U.S. and U.S.S.R held the status of polar powers in a bi-polar system which kept the world relatively stable. Both states held the stance of you are either with us or against us because of their opposing values, i.e. capitalism versus communism. Consequently, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed in 1949 with the U.S. as its foundation to protect Europe from the perceived threat of a Soviet invasion. To counteract this, the U.S.S.R. formed the Warsaw Pact in 1955 with its satellite states to defend against NATO aggression and provide a buffer to Russia, the core state of the U.S.S.R. Each member state of these treaties looked to their respective polar power for support. In turn, both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. used their influence to align the foreign policies of their allies with their own. This international environment was the status quo for over forty years.

As the Soviet Union collapsed to end the Cold War, the U.S. became the lone superpower in the world, possessing an unprecedented amount of influence both economically and militarily. Almost overnight, the nation which had always viewed itself as exceptional was thrust into a new position as a hegemon. A problem swiftly arose as U.S. foreign policy promptly became

outdated since the leading American adversary of over forty years had suddenly ceased to exist. The unrivaled power of the U.S. military became a near casualty with the loss of a coherent policy because the longstanding policy of containment had grown out of date without a cogent replacement on the horizon.² This policy had served as a guide for the use of the military during the Cold War but in the absence of a bi-polar system, it was increasingly difficult to justify the tax dollars required for maintaining such a massive force. All of this contributed to “disarray and confusion” regarding U.S. foreign policy after the Cold War, thanks to the elimination of the adversary which ironically had kept the world relatively stable.³ With the loss of this strategy, arose the joint loss of focus for foreign policy and guidance for the military as well. During the tenure of containment, the military fundamentally existed to counter the perceived threats of the Soviet Union. Without a strategy to govern its use, the military lacked a clear purpose. Unfortunately, as these case studies will show, the U.S. was slow to adopt a new strategy that could “command widespread popular and elite support” as containment had.⁴

Using the crises in Somalia in 1993, Rwanda in 1994, and Libya in 2011, this thesis will examine the independent variables governing military intervention for each case study with the purpose of predicting potential foreign policy decisions in future conflicts.

² Steven W. Hook and John Spanier, *American Foreign Policy since World War II* (Washington: CQ Press, 2010), 36.

³ David C. Hendrickson, “The Recovery of Internationalism: Stemming the Isolationist Impulse”, *Foreign Affairs* September/October (1994).

⁴ Richard Haass, *Intervention: The Use of American Military Force in the Post-Cold War World* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1999), 6.

THE RISE OF HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION

According to Carl Von Clausewitz, “under all circumstances war is to be regarded not as an independent thing, but as a political instrument”.⁵ Despite changes in war fighting throughout history, states maintain sizeable military forces for the purpose of solving problems which politics alone cannot. Strategies for accomplishing this have consistently evolved to meet this need whether it was to defeat Nazi Germany or to contain the ideology and influence of the Soviet Union. Since the end of the Cold War, the topic of humanitarian intervention has been on the rise as the risk of conventional armed conflict between major state actors has dwindled. This use of a state’s military is the focus of intense scholarly analysis as the issue of whether it is morally just for one nation to violate another’s sovereignty to prevent genocide is acceptable. Far from being an act of philanthropy, humanitarian intervention presents a complicated dilemma for any government.⁶ This is because more often than not, soldiers must be on the ground to stabilize the situation or at least ensure that aid is received by its intended recipients. The debate arises because any use of military force entails a certain level of risk, regardless of intentions or actions taken to mitigate that risk. It is for this reason that political leaders may be timid on the subject of committing their military to a humanitarian conflict. Domestically, the loss of a soldier’s life faces intense scrutiny. The effect of this is multiplied if the lost life is the result of serving the needs of another nation, not one’s own.

Michael Walzer describes the process of humanitarianism as a “gift that we have to give.”⁷ If this is true, then humanitarian intervention supported by military force or even the threat of it is a moral necessity whether or not a powerful state such as the U.S. takes action. U.S. foreign policymakers, in conjunction with the executive are charged with deciding which

⁵ Carl Von Clausewitz, *On War*, trans. Colonel J.J. Graham (New York: Barnes & Noble, 2004), 20.

⁶ Michael Walzer, “On Humanitarianism”, *Foreign Affairs* July/August (2011).

⁷ Ibid.

humanitarian causes warrant U.S. participation. Collectively, all states exist in a system of anarchy because the international system is devoid of a legislative body with the ability to compel a state to act. Due to this, the political opinions of powerful states (permanent members of the UN Security Council) in the international community determine which struggles are deemed “just” and merit intervention. The UN is the closest institution to fit this description although it cannot force its members to contribute. If any permanent members of the Security Council choose to ignore ongoing conflicts, the results could be tragic, as was the case in Rwanda. Additionally, if a resolution does get passed, members still have to underwrite the costs. If this fails to happen in a timely manner, as we will see in the Rwanda case study, the results could be catastrophic.

Walzer’s topic of humanitarianism directly segues into the idea of R2P because they complement each other. R2P is an initiative that applies to any capable state.⁸ It states that countries must do everything in their power to protect innocent people from unprovoked aggression, even if that means violating the sovereignty of another nation. A nation’s sovereignty has always been considered sacrosanct in international politics. Nations traditionally labor to curtail foreign influence within their borders but preventing genocide takes precedence over a political boundary. The phrase “never again,” which refers to preventing an event along the lines of the Holocaust from repeating, is intended as an appeal to humanity with the purpose of empowering individuals and their elected officials to prevent genocide. The renowned Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel has stated that this has not been the case though.⁹ Instead, this phrase is blindly spoken with its meaning warped, because acts of genocide continue to occur today as the world looks away.

⁸ UN, 2005 World Summit Outcome, Section 139.

⁹ Don Cheadle and John Prendergast, *Not on our Watch: The Mission to End Genocide in Darfur and Beyond* (2007), xii.

Michael Walzer explained humanitarian intervention in the context of morality, but the root of this as an emerging norm must also be discussed in order to understand why the U.S. conducts military interventions to support humanitarian undertakings. In her writing, political scientist Kathryn Sikkink writes that “research suggests that the origins of many international norms lie not in preexisting state interests but in strongly held principled ideas and the desire to convert others to those ideas”.¹⁰ But where does this begin? Sikkink found that historically, non-governmental organizations (NGO’s) act to persuade major state actors that a cause merits their attention by carefully basing their argument in facts to convince policy makers that something is wrong.¹¹ This alone, is not enough for establishing a norm. Progression to an accepted norm only occurs if an idea receives the attention and support necessary from both policymakers and constituents who have become attached to the cause. Perhaps the focus on human rights went mainstream thanks to the work of advocacy groups who aired the images of human suffering on national television.¹²

NGO’s began their effort on human rights by questioning the longstanding concepts of state sovereignty with regard to human rights abuses within a nation’s own borders. The previous norm ruled that sovereignty triumphed. In this case of human rights abuses, i.e. genocide for example, it was already established that states must act to prevent this whenever there is a known occurrence; this had been set in 1948 with the Genocide Convention. The UN’s “Universal Declaration of Human Rights” of December 10, 1948 called upon all UN members to “recognize the dignity and worth of the human person...”¹³ This measure was adopted at the end of World War II at a time when the world was well versed in the massacres which took place during the

¹⁰ Kathryn Sikkink, “Transnational Politics, International Relations Theory, and Human Rights”, *PS: Political Science and Politics*, September (1998), 518.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 519.

¹² *Ibid.*, 520.

¹³ United Nations, “Universal Declaration of Human Rights”, December (1948), Preamble.

Holocaust. Without sounding overly zealous, one could say that preventing genocide and other human rights abuses has become a moral crusade for preserving the lives of innocent people. It's not a stretch of the imagination to understand how in a period of about fifty years, citizens of liberal nations grew outraged at reports of mass murder around the world, and expected their governments to act in response.

We will see an outpouring of support to conduct an intervention in Somalia after Americans saw images of starving children on their television screens. In the U.S., and other liberal states, human rights are universal. Due in part to American exceptionalism, the U.S. public expects all other humans to be free of abuses and the majority of the time, U.S. foreign policy reflects this relatively new international norm as a result of the will of the people. The notion of R2P can be considered an extension of the norm of human rights which maintains much needed attention to keep state actors focused on preventing abuses.

POST-COLD WAR INTERVENTION MODELS

In terms of U.S. foreign policy, unipolarity meant there was no longer a large threat facing the nation in the 1990's. The non-state actors largely responsible for acts of terror had not yet established themselves as real threats because terrorism was at best, a tiny blip on the radar screen of foreign policy makers. State actors of the period such as North Korea, Iraq, and Iran posed no real threat to the U.S. but they were able to intimidate their own neighbors. Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1991 is an example of this. This set the stage for an international response led by the U.S. and its allies known as Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm (which also served as the historical analogy for intervening in Somalia), to curtail Iraq's aggression and protect Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, both allies of the U.S.

The 1991 Gulf war is a clear-cut example of when the U.S. intervened militarily for strategic reasons in the post-Cold War world. An ally of the U.S. faced a direct threat, therefore, the U.S. responded in kind after having mobilized domestic public support along with international support as well. In this instance, gaining that backing was not easy, as a debate in Congress ensued over whether economic sanctions were sufficient for getting Iraqi forces out of Kuwait rather using the 500,000 personnel military coalition for the same purpose.¹⁴ After this operation the U.S. no longer faced any credible threat from another state or entity of equal stature. Operation Desert Storm had a clear purpose; the goal of liberating Kuwait from Saddam Hussein's grasp. Purpose is an essential trait for gaining and maintaining popular support for military action. Had the ground invasion force moved to Baghdad after forcing Hussein's troops out of Kuwait, support probably would have quickly eroded.¹⁵

The altered international environment after the Cold War left the U.S. suffering from strategic drift as the Clinton administration came into office after the 1992 election defeat of George H.W. Bush. Domestically, foreign policy was driven out of the minds of the public who were faced with economic strife and social problems.¹⁶ They tired of having military personnel stationed abroad and wanted them redeployed to avoid "overseas entanglements" as they no longer recognized a global threat to their collective security.¹⁷ As a result, reduced military spending and overseas involvement presented themselves as feasible solutions to be implemented as long as U.S. allies carried their weight in international undertakings.

In lieu of containment, the Clinton administration was faced with four major alternatives for a new grand strategy to regulate U.S. foreign policy. They were neo-isolationism, selective

¹⁴ Hook and Spanier, 215.

¹⁵ Ibid., 216.

¹⁶ Barry Posen and Andrew Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy," *International Security* (Winter 1996/1997), 5.

¹⁷ Richard N. Haass, "Paradigm Lost", *Foreign Affairs* January/February (1995).

engagement, cooperative security, and primacy.¹⁸ Isolationism was a strategy which was well known by the U.S. during its short history and neo-isolationism was essentially a new offspring of this well-practiced theory. Throughout much of its history, the U.S. had followed the isolationist principles of Washington and with few exceptions (World War II being the most prominent); it had been content in doing so. Isolationism was largely based on the mantra of “live and let live”, which favors the sovereignty of states and can be successful as long as a relationship rooted in reciprocity exists between them.¹⁹ After World War II, this policy was rejected in favor of sustained international involvement.

Neo-isolationism is rooted in a realist view of international politics which focuses on power.²⁰ Since no state actors possessed the ability to pose an immediate threat to the U.S. after the fall of the U.S.S.R, U.S. foreign policy was expected to reflect this same notion, and concern itself with national defense, not problems outside its borders. By design, a neo-isolationist policy shuns any type of intervention abroad because it would inevitably create enemies since an intervention cannot be made without taking sides in a conflict.²¹ In effect, neo-isolationism would have left the U.S. with a “going it alone” philosophy detrimental for the welfare of U.S. allies and other states within the sphere of influence. In contrast to the goals of neo-isolationism, implementing this strategy would have made the U.S. less secure as disengagement would have opened the doors for other state or non-state actors to build oppositional influence on the world stage.²² The principle of U.S. exceptionalism is the spreading of American values which requires leadership on a global level, not isolation, which is incapable of facilitating the spread of U.S. values. Financially speaking, neo-isolationism would have saved anywhere from seventy to one

¹⁸ Posen and Ross, 5.

¹⁹ Hendrickson.

²⁰ Posen and Ross, 12.

²¹ Ibid., 14.

²² Ibid., 15.

hundred billion dollars per year in defense spending in 1990's dollars.²³ While this is no small sum, the cost of deliberately walking away from the international system would have been exponentially higher down the road, making this unfeasible. Using World War II as the "last war" in a historical analogy to explain military interventions that followed explains why U.S. foreign policy makers sought to steer clear of neo-isolationism. Because of this, neo-isolationism was not a viable option for a new grand strategy that could govern military interventions.

Selective engagement is a realist theory centered on the potential power conflicts between "great powers". It argues that the U.S. should focus on maintaining peace only between prominent states such as Russia and China, or the wealthy states of the European Union.²⁴ Selective engagement considers Eurasia and the Middle East/Southwest Asia to be the most deserving of U.S. attention because militarily and economically powerful states are located primarily in those areas.²⁵ Humanitarian disasters are only a concern for selective engagement if they run the risk of war between any of the powerful nations. For the purposes of this thesis, neither Rwanda nor Somalia would be suited to selective engagement because they didn't pose a threat to stability among the great powers. If Rwanda or Somalia were oil producing or industrial nations like Libya is, the potential risk posed by any conflict within may have made a military intervention more likely. Since neither of them fit this category, they would be left to their own problems under a policy of selective engagement.

The major weakness of selective engagement as a grand strategy lies with the fact that it assumes the U.S. will abandon its global leadership role and ignore the lesser conflicts of the world, leaving its current reputation behind in the process.²⁶ This strategy also fails to explain

²³ Posen and Ross, 16.

²⁴ Ibid., 17.

²⁵ Ibid., 20.

²⁶ Ibid., 22.

who would be responsible for determining which global problems were minor and which presented a legitimate threat to peace. This case by case analysis would be demanding and extremely time consuming to say the least. Unlike neo-isolationism, there would not be significant savings to be found from the defense department because a large military is crucial for maintaining the peace under selective engagement.²⁷ Additionally, this seems to encourage the U.S. to go looking for conflict to uphold stability. This would definitely be contrary to the viewpoint of neo-isolationists who were inclined to almost utterly ignore the plights of other states.

A third grand strategy option was cooperative security, an idea rooted in liberalism which operated using a combination of democratic peace theory and President Clinton's "Engagement and Enlargement" plan of 1996.²⁸ Cooperation comes into play with this strategy because it assumes that no great power can tolerate aggressive acts, so each state will be predisposed to join together to avoid conflict. Non-democratic governments are the only ones which are projected to be threats to peace in the international system. As applicable to the case studies of Rwanda and Somalia, this strategy required strong international institutions to play an avid role in maintaining this nonexistent peace. This expectation is comparable to that of the UN during the Rwandan genocide when Dallaire's peacekeeping force was expected to handle the declining situation even though resources for doing so were not provided by its UN members. The NATO-led intervention in Libya is a better example of cooperative security because a conflict developed with the dictator Muammar Qaddafi and NATO members acted swiftly in supporting Libyan rebels who opposed his rule, eventually resulting in the overthrow of Libya's dictatorship. The example given by Posen and Ross of "ethnic cleansing will beget ethnic cleansing" is used to

²⁷ Posen and Ross, 23.

²⁸ Ibid., 24.

demonstrate the necessity of cooperation between democratic states to attain the goals of this strategy.²⁹ Neglect translates to the spread of conflict if a state ignores its workload for maintaining peace.

The advantage of cooperative security rests on the belief that democratic states will join resources to make the concept of mutual peace a reality. In the interests of keeping international peace, conflict throughout the world, regardless of its potential impact would have to garner the full attention of the international community. As long as the major powers of the international system worked together, humanitarian problems around the world could potentially fade away with global support. A substantial drawback to cooperative security is the possibility of conflict fatigue setting in amongst the “good” states because of the potential of an unwavering and possibly overlapping demand on a state’s military and/or other resources.³⁰ More participation and intelligence sharing amongst a large group of allies would inevitably improve the efficiency of a joint response by either the UN or NATO. To keep the cooperative threat credible, one can infer that a substantial military force would be required to provide a timely response to aggression. It is also unlikely that every state would voluntarily look beyond its own interests for the greater good of its neighbors given that history does not support this ideal with any consistency.

The final strategy proposed for the post-Cold War era was primacy, a theory motivated jointly by power and peace. According to this, an excess of power ensures peace.³¹ Primacy requires the U.S. status as a unipolar power to be maintained indefinitely for this to be beneficial. A multi-polar system is considered unacceptable because equality between the U.S. and another

²⁹ Posen and Ross, 25.

³⁰ Ibid., 30.

³¹ Ibid., 32.

state, even if it's an ally, is unacceptable.³² The risks associated with primacy result from the tendency of neighboring states to attempt to reach or surpass the capabilities of the current hegemon. In order to preserve peace, the standing of the U.S. would have to be unrelenting so that the state can maintain economic, military, and political control over the other great powers for the purpose of preventing a potential challenger from toppling it.³³

The challenge which one state would face by even attempting to reach a similar status with regard to the U.S. would be quite high because of the simple expenditure of resources consumed during the process. Primacy was embraced by the first Bush administration as it sought to uphold the standing of the U.S. as the sole superpower after the Cold War just as it was immediately after World War II, when the U.S. was the only nation that emerged largely unscathed by foreign attacks.³⁴ Faith in international institutions is nonexistent when adhering to the theory of primacy because it is assumed that no institution has the power of creating or maintaining peace in a conflicted region.³⁵ As with selective engagement, local ethnic conflicts would not be sufficient for powerful states to concern themselves with. Efforts towards maintaining a preponderance of military strength would inevitably cause other states to band together in an effort to balance what they viewed as unchecked power. Imperial overstretch is another substantial risk with primacy because power begets power and a little bit more of it would always seem necessary for furthering or preserving the prosperity of the state.³⁶ The immeasurable expense of keeping ahead of every state would be staggering in a world of limited resources. Primacy would likely end in the financial implosion of the state pursuing it.

³² Posen and Ross 32.

³³ *Ibid.*, 32.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 35.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 40.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 43.

If the U.S. implemented primacy as its grand strategy, it would likely ignore smaller states with humanitarian issues such as Somalia and Rwanda because the conflicts seen within these states could not credibly threaten the national security of the U.S. Conversely, intervention in Libya would be considered necessary under primacy because Libya exports oil to a number of U.S. allies. If these exports suddenly ceased, a credible threat could exist due to the interruption of the global economy.

None of these potential strategies could have successfully governed the use of military intervention singlehandedly. For this reason, the post-Cold War administrations chose none of the above and settled on parts of each of these strategies to regulate their foreign policy decisions. In a theoretical sense, the grand strategy chosen by an administration (or mix) is the most responsible for how the U.S. views the strategic interests of any given opportunity for humanitarian intervention. If selective engagement is the basic grand strategy, a humanitarian disaster in Rwanda would not rise to the level of importance that would require US intervention unless it created a credible risk of war between powerful states. With primacy, however, almost anything that would challenge US leadership to include humanitarian disasters in far-flung places may necessitate U.S. military action in order to maintain the U.S. vision of international order. Cooperative security would suggest something similar to primacy, but for different reasons such as the international rule of law and especially the liberal notions of human rights that must be enforced globally by capable states.

As one can infer, different grand strategies may suggest very similar reactions to humanitarian disasters, therefore there must be other variables at play. The above grand strategies can help to define U.S. strategic interests in each of these cases, but explaining the decision (or not) to intervene requires that we look at strategic necessity, international support,

domestic public support, and historical analogy. With the above strategies serving as a foundation for each post-Cold War presidential administration, we should be able to build a complete picture of the decision-making process which includes not only the U.S. viewpoints but also those of U.S. allies as well.

FOREIGN POLICY FRAMEWORKS OF POST-COLD WAR PRESIDENTS

The Bush Administration 1989-1993

President George H.W. Bush was not interested in conducting military interventions to solve humanitarian dilemmas. Bush's *National Security Strategy of the United States: August 1991* discussed the retrenchment of the Soviet Union following its collapse. Bush acknowledged that the U.S. was the nation that others turned to when under distress but he also wrote that "we cannot be the world's policeman for solving the world's security problems."³⁷ Though the first President Bush saw the end of containment, abrupt change was not seen in his national security strategy, though he did acknowledge the changing global environment throughout. The focus of his approach remained on large state actors with heavy military capabilities.

Even though George H.W. Bush made the decision to intervene in Somalia soon after the Gulf War, he was not interested in conducting prolonged peacekeeping operations or for solving political Somalia's problems. Instead, Bush sought to provide a level of security sufficient for feeding Somalians before transferring responsibility to the UN. He left office with the U.S. focus remaining on larger state actors.

³⁷ George H.W. Bush, "National Security Strategy of the United States", August (1991).

The Clinton Administration 1993-2001

President Clinton chose to combine aspects of three of the grand strategies discussed earlier. This policy can be referred to as “selective but cooperative primacy”, a strategy unique to his administration that rejected neo-isolationism while at the same time also sought to fulfill the new broad national interest.³⁸ The grand strategy released by 1996 was titled “A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement”. The importance of global leadership was stressed throughout even though the president stated that the U.S. was not “the world’s policeman” and that the U.S. “cannot become involved in every problem”, a theme similar to his predecessor.³⁹ These statements reflect an increased indifference towards foreign affairs that Americans possessed in the early 1990’s. Primacy stands out in this document as Clinton calls for the leadership necessary to sustain major commitments abroad which are consistent with spreading U.S. values overseas.⁴⁰ Areas of interest for the U.S. are consistent with the ideals of primacy and selective engagement.⁴¹ Changes from previous policy are subtle; the Clinton administration included calls to strengthen the UN but did not present a plan for doing so. The case studies presented within this paper will demonstrate why this was a problem. The administration also wanted to increase engagement in multilateral action such as peace operations; ideas that sound noble on paper, but in reality, the intentions for providing additional support to the international community were not provided the resources to come to pass.

The statements which stand out most in the Clinton NSS concern peacekeeping operations, humanitarian intervention, and the deployment of military force. The key word which governs the use of almost all government action here is “selectively”. For example, the strategy

³⁸ Posen and Ross, 44.

³⁹ Bill Clinton, “A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement”, February (1996).

⁴⁰ Posen and Ross, 50.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 45.

states that peace operations are a tool to be used selectively. Again, the case studies will show just what “selectively” meant. In the preface, Clinton states that “We must use military force selectively, recognizing that its use may do no more than provide a window of opportunity for a society and diplomacy to work.”⁴² Additionally, the promotion of democracy will be guided by a selective approach with emphasis placed on different regions.⁴³ Regarding ethnic conflict, the U.S. will intervene only if it has a predetermined exit strategy. This is also the case with humanitarian intervention whose cases will be decided on a case by case basis to ensure they are compatible with and promote U.S. interests.

The end result of NSS 1996 was confusion because the numerous obligations that this contemporary grand strategy appeared to loosely commit itself to. Although it is perfectly clear that the document is presented as a compromise between three of the four proposed strategies, it is impractical to rely on a single policy that is incapable of reaching a decision and sticking to it. Perhaps Richard Haass said it best when he described Clinton’s foreign policy as “case-by-caseism” because no single policy was chosen.⁴⁴

The Bush Administration 2001-2009

During the presidential campaign of 2000, Condoleezza Rice, the foreign policy advisor for George W. Bush the candidate, published an article about what a Republican administration would do in the White House involving foreign policy decisions. Rice was quick to point out that future policy must be a “disciplined and consistent foreign policy that separates the important from the trivial.”⁴⁵ This was a direct reference to the perceived inconsistencies of Clinton’s

⁴² Clinton, NSS (1996).

⁴³ Posen and Ross, 45.

⁴⁴ Richard Haass, “Paradigm Lost.” *Foreign Affairs* January/February 1995.

⁴⁵ Condoleezza Rice, “Campaign 2000: Promoting the National Interest”, *Foreign Affairs* January/February (2000).

foreign policy. Rice also went on to criticize what she viewed as an overabundance of military deployments under Clinton. She claimed that deployments occurred an average of once every nine weeks in the midst of budget and personnel cuts to the military.⁴⁶ With regard to humanitarian intervention and the role of the military, Rice voiced skepticism over the U.S. intervening in humanitarian endeavors in the “absence of strategic concerns” over the often unknown political issues which caused humanitarian issues to begin with.⁴⁷ Overall, her ideas are substantiated by the notion that the U.S. military is not a global police force and should not be used as such.

George W. Bush campaigned with the above mentioned viewpoint all the way to the White House in 2001, but his opinion regarding the use of the military altered significantly after 9/11. Whether or not the international situation actually changed does not matter for the purpose of this thesis. What does matter is that Bush’s perception drastically changed after al-Qaeda’s attack on U.S. soil and Bush’s new national security strategy marked a drastic departure from previous administrations of both major political parties. *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America: September 2002* focused on U.S. primacy and the projection of democracy abroad through unilateralism and a reduced role of diplomacy. The military served as the backbone of this strategy; this was a vast transformation from Bush’s original intentions as a candidate.

As history clearly demonstrates, the George W. Bush White House wound up utilizing the U.S. military for two foreign wars which eventually turned into operations that were aimed at first facilitating and then attempting to maintain peace in Afghanistan beginning in 2001 and Iraq

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

in 2003. The Global War on Terror persisted through both of Bush's terms and into the administration of his successor.

The Obama Administration 2009-Present

President Obama took office at a time when a majority of the U.S. public had grown impatient with the length and high financial cost of the Global War on Terrorism. Many argued that the U.S. needed to focus more on domestic needs rather than those of other regions of the world especially because the U.S. was experiencing a recession. Then-Senator Obama penned an article while campaigning that stated his intentions for implementing “tough-minded diplomacy, backed by the whole range of instruments of American power-political, economic, and military...”⁴⁸ With this statement, Obama was moving away from the positions of the Bush Doctrine, and heading towards multilateralism in a push to reset international relations.

As president, “Obama has been progressive where possible but a pragmatist when necessary” as he has compromised when necessary while attempting to maintain his foreign policy conceptualization as much as possible.⁴⁹ A major tenet of his foreign policy vision involves the sharing of the global burden by liberal nations. With this effort, he has been successful as the Libya case study will reveal later on. In dealing with other heads of state, President Obama has proven himself capable of listening to their concerns while keeping the U.S. in a position of global leadership as the state is accustomed to.⁵⁰ With the evident decline of al-Qaeda, U.S. foreign policy is still a force to be reckoned with. This has been shown through

⁴⁸ Barack Obama, “Renewing American Leadership”, *Foreign Affairs* (July/August) 2007.

⁴⁹ Martin Indyk et. al, “Scoring Obama’s Foreign Policy: A Progressive Pragmatist Tries to Bend History”, *Foreign Affairs* (May/June) 2007.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

the cautious, but measured policy for dealing with the recent “Arab Spring” in Africa where the U.S. has encouraged the spread of democracy in states where dictatorships recently reigned.

EXPLANATION OF VARIABLES

Through the examination of U.S. involvement in Somalia, Rwanda, and Libya, this paper will research why U.S. foreign policy makers decide to conduct humanitarian interventions supported by the military in some cases and why they don't in others. Using four independent variables, I seek to explain why the dependent variable, specifically military intervention, either occurs or does not for each case. Through the use of these independent variables I hope to demonstrate a clear pattern in decisions leading up to military intervention. First, I will examine the strategic context behind each case study, researching whether military intervention would have enhanced national security for the U.S. or its allies. Examining the strategic context of each study is necessary because foreign policy options are weighed and decided upon in part, according to the perceived risk involved for the U.S. and its allies.

Second, international support will be used as an independent variable to explain military intervention. An example of this is whether military involvement received international support through either the UN or NATO before action was taken. Additionally, could the U.S. build support for military action through the attractiveness of U.S. ideals? The notion of R2P and recent intervention doctrine relate to this notion. It must be noted that the U.S. possesses significant influence in both NATO and the UN, both of which feature the U.S. as a founding member. As a result of this, member nations share common ideals. This may translate to unified action towards conflicts which the U.S. strongly supports. Conversely, the U.S. naturally

maintains the ability to persuade fellow member nations of these treaties that a conflict may not warrant action, dissuading them from acting.

Third, does domestic public opinion support deploying military forces for humanitarian purposes? The rationale behind using public opinion as an independent variable lies with the idea that without public approval, elected officials would not be sympathetic to using the U.S. military for humanitarian endeavors. Public approval, should, in theory translate to Congressional decisions that support opinion polls regarding major actions such as the use of the military. Elected officials (in this case the president) cannot overlook the will of their constituents if they wish to be re-elected and this is a politician's goal the majority of the time. In rare cases, a president may decide to conduct a military intervention in anticipation of public approval. In this case, policy success would drive public support while failure would cause an outcry against military intervention.

Finally, where does the given case study fit in with its historical analogy? Professor Darren C. Brunk seeks to explain successive foreign policy decisions by using the dilemmas or circumstances which preceded them. He writes that the function of this process is "to allow decision makers to draw what they perceive to be useful lessons and examples from history in order to identify the character of events in the present."⁵¹ Using this method, the 1991 Gulf War served as a pronounced foreign policy achievement for President George H.W. Bush. When the question of conducting a military intervention in Somalia in 1993 arose, his administration used their successful coalition from 1991 as an example for which path to take in Somalia. The use of historical analogy as an independent variable in this thesis explains the tendency of U.S. foreign policy makers to "fight the last war". As the George H.W. Bush example demonstrated, the

⁵¹ Brunk, Darren C. "Curing the Somalia Syndrome: Analogy, Foreign Policy Decision Making and the Rwandan Genocide", *Foreign Policy Analysis* (2008), 303.

historical analogy between the Gulf War and Somalia encouraged military intervention in Somalia in 1993.

CASE STUDIES

Both Somalia and Rwanda were chosen as case studies for this thesis because of their impact on U.S. foreign policy in the post-Cold War world. U.S. involvement in Somalia occurred just after the end of the Cold War and for the purposes of this paper, served as a test case to indicate how the U.S. would react in an instance of humanitarian need during subsequent crises, thus making Somalia the “last war” in a historical analogy with the genocide in Rwanda which is discussed in the second case study.

I will argue that the U.S. failed to respond to the 1994 genocide due to a loss of political clout, which in turn reduced the motivation for military intervention after the mission in Somalia didn't end as planned. UNOSOM II resulted in the deaths of forty-two American military personnel and a domestic uproar against intervening in the affairs of other states. This outcome was far from the original intentions of both Presidents Bush and Clinton. It's no surprise that President Clinton's administration chose not to acknowledge the pending genocide in Rwanda soon after as U.S. involvement in Somalia was coming to an end. The U.S. maintained this stance even though it had pledged to halt and work to prevent further acts of genocide as a member of the Genocide Convention of 1948.

The NATO-led intervention in Libya of 2011 was selected as the third case study of this thesis because it serves as the most recent model of military intervention by the U.S. (though it was a NATO mission with many participants). The international coalition that participated in events beginning with the no fly zone and culminating with the end of Qaddafi's tenure as

Libya's dictator serves as the evidence that the notion of R2P has become a social "norm" supported by the major powers. While this case study cannot be used for explaining every potential military intervention of the future on its own, the inclusion of the Libya case study here will shed light on the range of available policy options for future conflicts.

The first case study will be analyzed using four independent variables in an attempt to establish the triggers behind U.S. military intervention in Somalia. This was the first military intervention after the end of the Cold War and as such, the results of this served as a foundation for governing future military intervention when used as part of the historical analogy discussed by Brunk. Although the term R2P hadn't been coined yet, the inherent responsibilities of states were established during the events discussed in this case study. By assessing these variables as they relate to Somalia, I will lay the groundwork for the foreign policy decisions made during case study II. As the reader will infer following case study I, the lack of foreign policy attention in Rwanda was a direct consequence of the failure in Somalia. The first decision to intervene was made by the Bush administration; the second was the Clinton administration's decision to increase the military footprint there. The decision to withdrawal is inconsequential to the four independent variables as this thesis concerns intervention, not withdrawal, but its inclusion here coincides with the historical analogy variable of the second case study.

Case study II will analyze the 1994 genocide in Rwanda and explain U.S. inaction using the four independent variables. The fallout from the first case study plays a major role in the second because of the historical analogy between these two situations that were in fact, quite different. Through the examination of these case studies, the method of decision-making for future military interventions will become evident and permit the reader to plausibly predict how the U.S. will react to future crises abroad. Although the backgrounds of the first and second case

studies differ, the use of the same four independent variables equally explains the dependent variable, or the result this thesis is working to explain.

Case study III will analyze the events which began with UN demands for a ceasefire and the eventual calls for a no-fly zone over the state further progressing into the NATO mission Operation Odyssey Dawn. This mainly consisted of air strikes to support Libyan rebels seeking to overthrow the ruling regime. The four independent variables already listed will be applied to this case study to evaluate why the U.S. decided to participate in the joint intervention in spite of domestic political turmoil and a lack of public support over the fiscal responsibilities of the U.S.

CASE STUDY I: SOMALIA

Historical Background

During the Cold War, Somalia played a part in the competition between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Under the dictator General Siad Barre, Somalia was aligned with the Soviet Union while the neighboring Ethiopia was allied with the U.S. In a switch that can only make sense in the context of the Cold War, both states switched allegiances, making the ruthless Barre a friend of the U.S.⁵² In 1977, Barre initiated a war against Ethiopia, which led to the cessation of Western aid for his state and forced him to become progressively repressive to maintain control over rival clans.⁵³ After his supporters turned on him and riots ensued, Barre was forced to flee Somalia in January 1991. Ethnic tensions between clans caused war between rival warlords who were now competing for control of the state in the absence of Barre.⁵⁴

⁵² Hook and Spanier, 223.

⁵³ U.S. Army Center for Military History, "United States Army in Somalia, 1992-1994."

⁵⁴ Ibid.

Ethnic and regional tensions would not be the only issues to plague the state as a drought followed.⁵⁵ In addition to fighting for control of Somalia, these rival clans now fought over dwindling food supplies. As a result, thousands of innocent Somali's suffered from a preventable famine. Support from international organizations was almost immediate but these NGO's could not succeed in a region which lacked any security. They were forced by rival clans to pay for protection which was never provided. For the most part, their donated food supplies never reached their intended recipients regardless of who was paid. The same clans wound up stealing the food and either distributed these supplies amongst their own or sold them for profit to increase their power. Farmers were prevented from planting; livestock was also slaughtered to aggravate the disaster.⁵⁶ Either way, suffering continued. Due to extensive media coverage, Americans were able to view images of starving children from the safety of their homes.⁵⁷ Probably owing to the U.S. tendency to fight the last war, President George H.W. Bush decided that the U.S. must act to prevent the ongoing famine. This was likely due to the overwhelming success of the U.S. /UN sponsored Operation Desert Storm which had ended in 1991 and for which the U.S. still enjoyed international support.

President George H.W. Bush Decides to Intervene

Referring back to the Gulf War, the UN had passed Resolution 688 in April 1991 which stated that any UN member guilty of repressing its own people created "urgent humanitarian needs" and in turn comprised a threat to international security.⁵⁸ Although Article 2 of the UN Charter (which governed intervention) was unclear, this new resolution clearly compelled UN

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Hook and Spanier, 223.

⁵⁷ U.S. Army Center for Military History, "United States Army in Somalia, 1992-1994."

⁵⁸ John R. Bolton, "Wrong Turn in Somalia." *Foreign Affairs* January/February (1994).

members to act in order to preserve security. In 1992, after a lack of success in negotiating a ceasefire between rival Somali clans, it was decided that a 500 personnel battalion from Pakistan would deploy to Somalia by October 1992. As with other attempts to subdue the conflict, the unit never made it out of Mogadishu airport because they were immediately attacked.⁵⁹ Aideed was already the head warlord in the state at the time and he had opposed the intervention of UN peacekeepers, especially into the city in which he enjoyed the most support.

Prior to the Pakistani battalion's deployment, Resolution 751 had been passed. This authorized immediate humanitarian relief operations under the guise of United Nations Operations in Somalia (UNOSOM). However, the peacekeepers were not equipped to prevent the large supplies of food from continuing to fall into the control of the warlords. As an attempt to overcome the hostility, the UN peacekeepers were forced to hire locals for technical support, which were armed escorts who drove their own vehicles with mounted heavy weapons.⁶⁰ After this method went askew, Operation Provide Relief was commenced in August 1992 with the U.S. in the lead.

Operation Provide Relief's mission was to airdrop food and medical supplies into Somali cities in the hopes of circumventing the looting which had plagued humanitarian efforts thus far. Unfortunately, this became the latest in the string of attempts to provide respite against the now ongoing famine. The lame-duck administration of President Bush drew up a plan to be commanded by the U.S. that would distribute badly needed food supplies.

Bush's plan called for an international force of up to 30,000 troops under U.S. control to secure key areas of Somalia's infrastructure in order to allow for the safe delivery of enough

⁵⁹ Bolton (1994).

⁶⁰ U.S. Army Center for Military History.

food to avert the famine.⁶¹ Operation Restore Hope was envisioned as a short term (3-4 month) operation which would subsequently be turned over to a much smaller UN contingent before a complete withdrawal after a successful intervention.⁶² The hope here was that after minor intervention by a UN approved force, Somalia would have gained the ability to correct its own ethnic problems. With support from his own constituents and the UN, Bush laid out a clear framework stating his intentions for the mission which was approved under Resolution 794 on December 3, 1992.⁶³ In a letter to the UN secretary-general, Bush wrote,

I want to emphasize that the mission of the coalition is limited and specific: to create security conditions which will permit the feeding of the starving Somali people and allow the transfer of this security function to the UN peacekeeping force. Objectives can, and should, be met in the near term. As soon as they are, the coalition force will depart from Somalia, transferring its security function to your UN peacekeeping force.⁶⁴

These proposed intentions appear to clearly set the stage for limited U.S. involvement. By December 9th, the first elements of Operation Restore Hope reached Somalia. During that same day, the UN secretary general informed the Bush administration that he wanted the troops on the ground to not only provide humanitarian relief, but also disarm the Somali clans, diffuse landmines located within the state, and set up an administration which would begin forming a police force.⁶⁵ Without a doubt, if the U.S. had agreed with this ambitious plan, the original timeline for handing off the mission as well as the resources required to implement this would have dramatically increased U.S. obligations. As friction between the U.S. and UN mounted over whether or not to engage in nation-building, critical assistance for starving Somali's poured in and the mission was going as planned as the Bush administration was leaving office.

⁶¹ Bolton (1994).

⁶² Hook and Spanier, 223.

⁶³ Bolton (1994).

⁶⁴ George H.W. Bush, qtd. in Bolton, (1994).

⁶⁵ Bolton (1994).

President Clinton Elects to Ramp up U.S. Involvement

As President Clinton came into office, American soldiers were in the process of being replaced by UN counterparts from other nations. While Somalia remained a contested area, the issue over U.S. forces leaving continued to be pressed by the Clinton administration.⁶⁶ By February, one month before the handoff was scheduled to occur, violence between rival clans spiked. This made several U.S. officials contemplate sending in a larger contingent of forces to augment UNOSOM.⁶⁷ It appears that this smaller military intervention was on its way to becoming a much larger venture with a foray into nation-building. With U.S. support, the UN passed two additional resolutions; the first, Resolution 814, was passed in March and left eight thousand U.S. logistics personnel on the ground to continue humanitarian efforts and established a quick reaction force (QRF) of one thousand soldiers. This QRF consisted of special operations forces which regularly patrolled Mogadishu and other hostile areas. Madeleine Albright, the U.S. representative to the UN specified that UNOSOM II's mission was to take a state embroiled in violence and transform it into a "...proud, functioning and viable member of the community of nations."⁶⁸ The date of the U.S./UN handover to UNOSOM II was pushed back to May 4th.⁶⁹

Mere weeks after the passing of Resolution 814, General Aideed's forces made their presence known in several attacks throughout Mogadishu that killed 23 Pakistani soldiers and injured many more. Quite unexpectedly, the original humanitarian effort had to be replaced with military action against Aideed's militia. Resolution 837 officially sanctioned the arrest of Aideed and was passed on June 6th; making the military intervention official.⁷⁰ The Clinton administration was fully on board with this but didn't ask Congress for approval. Not

⁶⁶ Bolton (1994).

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Bolton (1994).

surprisingly, opposition in Congress began to grow as politicians like Senator Robert Byrd, a Democrat, called for a withdrawal of U.S. forces because the original timeline of the Bush administration had already been exceeded.⁷¹ On August 27th, 1993 Secretary of Defense Les Aspin released Clinton's intentions stating, "President Clinton has given us clear direction to stay the course with other nations to help Somalia" even as taking casualties became a normal occurrence and bipartisan opposition increased.⁷² As we will see, Aspin's statement became the theme of the operation from that point on.

UNOSOM II Suffers from Unforeseen Circumstances

Part of "staying the course" required the passing of yet another UN resolution on September 22, 1993. This newest, number 865 was passed to lengthen the UN stay into 1995 so that the UN peacekeeping force, augmented by the necessary military personnel, could accomplish their mission of preventing Aideed from remaining in power and establishing a new, nonviolent state. Just three days later a U.S. Black Hawk helicopter was shot down by militiaman loyal to Aideed, causing three American deaths. As if this wasn't enough, an even more severe setback was about to transpire which would quickly erode Clinton's domestic support for any continued operations in Somalia.

Task Force Ranger, part of the QRF authorized by Resolution 814, had the assignment of conducting numerous raids throughout Mogadishu which they accomplished through quick insertion by helicopter. As always, they were tasked with the goal of finding Aideed. By October 3rd, 1993 they had six successful missions under their belts but their seventh would lead to defeat. After intelligence suggested a tangible chance of catching two of Aideed's lieutenants,

⁷¹ Bolton (1994).

⁷² Ibid.

Task Force Ranger planned a raid in a market in Mogadishu as an attempt to cripple Aideed's rule.⁷³ The mission faced a series of setbacks almost immediately when a soldier fell out of a helicopter and had to be evacuated from the area. This single event set off a chain reaction which led to two Black Hawks getting shot down. The mission quickly went from what should have been a successful raid to a rescue mission. During the hectic rescue to follow, the task force lost 16 soldiers with another 57 wounded while the American unit sent in as reinforcement lost 2 and suffered 22 wounded.⁷⁴

While the severity of this situation is understood by viewing the numbers, it was more complicated in actuality, as one of the wounded helicopter pilots became a prisoner of war and videos were aired of his capture. A second controversial video clip aired by the media showed one of the dead Army Rangers being drug through the streets of Mogadishu by Aideed's militia to the acclaim of onlookers.⁷⁵ The humanitarian operation which became a military intervention had now been transformed into an incident with a level of severity which neither the Bush administration which began Operation Restore Hope nor the Clinton administration which continued it had anticipated.

President Clinton Considers Policy Options in the Wake of Disaster

President Clinton's immediate reaction was to order more troops there to quell the violence and reinforce the military personnel already there to allow U.S. personnel to be evacuated. He also convened a cabinet meeting to debate the best policy option for dealing with the crisis in Somalia. Support for UNOSOM II within the U.S. became virtually nonexistent as Senator Bob Dole was quoted as saying "If we had a vote today, we'd be out today" but even in

⁷³ U.S. Army Center for Military History.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Samantha Powers, "Bystanders to Genocide." *Atlantic Monthly* September (2001).

opposition the senator admitted there were complications to this, namely the fact that the U.S. had a soldier captured and U.S. forces served as the “backbone” to the entire UN operation.⁷⁶ A complete and urgent withdrawal from the ground would have endangered U.S. allies also serving in the state. The pressure was on for a decision to be made by Congress, because legislators were receiving a slew of angry phone calls from constituents who had no tolerance for the video clips released from Somalia or for an American soldier being held hostage.⁷⁷

The Aftermath

In the end, President Clinton had the timetable for the complete turnover of the UNOSOM II mission moved to a much earlier date than Resolution 865 had called for, March 31, 1994. This was exactly one year after the original U.S. withdrawal had been planned for. Consequently, within six months of the Battle of Mogadishu (as it became known), U.S. forces withdrew from Somalia. This action served as evidence that stabilizing a crisis in Africa was no longer viewed favorably for maintaining security for either the U.S. or companion members of the UN who had participated in the mission.⁷⁸ “Staying the course” had proven unacceptable with both the American public and lawmakers. The Clinton administration was forced to act upon this. Looking back on these events, it is necessary to ask what went wrong in order to understand future policy concerning the genocide in Rwanda. Through the use of the variables laid forth in the introduction, the situation in Somalia will be analyzed in order to determine why the Bush and Clinton administrations supported subsequent UN resolutions that governed the situation on the ground in Somalia.

⁷⁶ Bob Dole, qtd. in Thomas L. Friedman, “The Somalia Mission; Clinton Reviews Policy in Somalia as Unease Grows.” *New York Times*, October 6, 1993.

⁷⁷ Friedman (1993).

⁷⁸ Samantha Power (2001).

On May 3, 1994, President Clinton signed Presidential Decision Directive 25 (PDD-25), which was proposed as a comprehensive framework to allow the Clinton administration to make “disciplined and coherent choices about which peace operations to support.”⁷⁹ The purpose of PDD-25 was to limit both the participation of U.S. forces in UN peacekeeping operations while keeping costs down. The timing of this directive was no accident; a UN peacekeeping force had already been deployed in Rwanda under the command of Lieutenant General Roméo Dallaire. As a way to limit U.S. involvement, the administration elaborately stated that there were sixteen total factors to be considered before the U.S. would vote in the Security Council to support peacekeeping activities or militarily intervene in peacekeeping operations. Some of these factors included “advancing U.S. interests” and preventing the “gross violation of human rights.”⁸⁰ No single factor had precedence over the others. Instead, each factor was to be weighed equally before a recommendation was made to the president.

David Obey, a Democratic Congressman, claimed that PDD-25 was purposely restrictive to satisfy an American yearning for “zero degree of involvement, and zero degree of risk, and zero degree of pain and confusion.”⁸¹ Richard Clarke, the former head of Clinton’s National Security Council and the architect of PDD-25 contends that the goal of the directive was to save peacekeeping operations, which had become domestically unpopular after the debacle in Somalia.⁸² Interestingly, the subject of the morally correct decision or the right thing to do was not mentioned in the factors listed by the directive, but domestic and Congressional support was deemed a necessary element to allow UN missions to succeed. Intrinsic U.S. values also went

⁷⁹ White House, PDD-25.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Power, 342 (2007).

⁸² Ibid.

without mention. The significance of these factors and their impact will be demonstrated in Case study II.

Strategic Context

Any threat, either direct or indirect towards the U.S. from General Aideed was virtually nonexistent considering the U.S. mainland (including Pearl Harbor) has been attacked just three times in the nation's history and Aideed's militia did not have the ability to threaten the lone superpower. Judging the perceived threat towards U.S. allies is not as clear cut though. President Bush originally ordered the mission to avert mass starvation. After learning how and why the situation escalated from there, one can understand why the Clinton administration took the steps that it did to inhibit the power of General Aideed. Without a doubt, both administrations could not have desired another dictator in the region who threatened the welfare of innocent people.

While I have stated there was no direct military threat to the U.S., the failure of a state in a fragile region certainly had the potential to become a viable threat if left unattended. In this situation, an enemy of the U.S. (such as al-Qaeda though the group wasn't a threat at the time) which possessed the resources to involve itself in Somalia, could have filled the void had the U.S. not intervened. The effect of this would have been adverse to U.S. security.

In terms of strategy, the U.S. simply did not adequately do its homework to learn of the political climate in place at the time. Once U.S. personnel were deployed to Somalia, they became immersed in a conflict to which they were not welcome or completely informed upon. This created a security dilemma once American lives were lost. President Clinton was faced with the decision to increase military involvement or leave altogether.

International Support

The media must not be overlooked in the debate over international support for the actions taken by both the Bush and Clinton administrations in Somalia. As in the U.S., the media had the ability to quickly spread the news of mass starvation to U.S. allies which created sympathy and calls for action. Although the U.S. was clearly in charge of this UN mission, the operation would not have occurred had the UN not approved the action. The UN secretary general specifically requested that the U.S. take the lead in Somalia. This may have been because the U.S. had the resources necessary for conducting the operation, but also because the universal values of the U.S. were able to attract both its own allies and other UN members to share the responsibility for protecting innocent Somalians.

Under both administrations, this was an example of liberal internationalism, which entails the use of the UN as a legitimate means of projecting U.S. power and/or values abroad. Undermining the clout of a dictator ill-disposed towards his own citizens is in the interests of most democracies. Contributing states included Canada, Egypt, France, Germany, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. The combination of these states in the coalition is evidence of international support simply because of the different regions of the world represented. The Security Council voted to support Operation Restore Hope; this verifies that the intervention had both international support and legitimacy.

Public Support

The images of undue suffering and violence broadcast over the television screens of millions of Americans played a chief part in determining U.S. foreign policy pertaining to the crisis in Somalia. This is supported by public opinion polling conducted during different phases

of U.S. involvement. In December 1992, a poll conducted by NBC News found that 74% of respondents favored the use of military personnel for protecting the relief supplies being sent to Somalia.⁸³ Remember, this was only during the initial deployment under the Bush administration. After the Battle of Mogadishu, this information varied greatly with 62% of Americans polled expressing the idea that the U.S. did the right thing by sending troops to Somalia in 1992.⁸⁴ Some of these same people wanted an immediate withdrawal as soon as the U.S. recovered its prisoner of war as 61% wanted “troops withdrawn quickly” and only 33% supported keeping the military in Somalia until the situation could be stabilized.⁸⁵ Moreover, the consensus was split regarding whether more troops should be sent to stabilize the situation and protect those that were already there. Americans had the most concern for the U.S. prisoner of war with 96% stating that getting the soldier back was the priority of the U.S. government.⁸⁶ These were just a handful of poll results obtained from credible sources like CBS, Time, and the New York Times which reached similar conclusions during the same phases of U.S. involvement in Somalia.

While reviewing the results of these various polls it is evident that Americans are generous with their support in terms of both manpower and resources for humanitarian efforts. Even when the situation in Somalia worsened and the U.S. military was brought in with increasing numbers, public opinion appeared to support this endeavor. The turning point came as soon as the first American lives were lost. At that moment, public support quickly eroded. The effects of this severely limited the available policy options of President Clinton. Using this

⁸³ NBC News, “Somalia.” December 15, 1992. *Polling the Nations*. Accessed February 28, 2012.

⁸⁴ CBS News/New York Times Poll, “Somalia.” December 7, 1993. *Polling the Nations*. Accessed February 28, 2012.

⁸⁵ CBS News/New York Times Poll, “Somalia.” December 7, 1993. *Polling the Nations*. Accessed February 28, 2012.

⁸⁶ Time/CNN Poll, “Somalia.” October 8, 1993. *Polling the Nations*. Accessed February 28, 2012.

polling data, I have come to the conclusion that in the case of Somalia, Americans supported military intervention until it witnessed its soldiers harmed. The role of the media obviously plays a large part here because the majority of constituents only knew of what went on from news outlets. Without the images of dead American soldiers, President Clinton's foreign policy regarding Somalia after the Battle of Mogadishu may have differed greatly.

Historical Analogy

As was briefly mentioned earlier, the decision to intervene in Somalia was influenced by the recent success of *Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm* in 1991. The memory of the recently successful use of America's post-Cold War military was fresh in the minds of politicians, the public, and foreign policy makers, who in turn supported the deployment of military forces to Somalia. Without *Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm* to precede Somalia, a different decision may have been made in the uncertainty of the post-Cold War.

Implications and Conclusions

This intent of this thesis is to establish a framework for determining when the U.S. will intervene, not to hypothesize when or why the U.S. decides to withdraw. However, the withdrawal of U.S. military and peacekeeping forces directly correlated to the decision to disregard the genocide in Rwanda even as it was in its planning stages, before the Battle of Mogadishu occurred but after domestic support for intervention in Somalia had dwindled. A foreign policy doctrine for peacekeeping operations was written during the military intervention in Somalia to govern subsequent involvement. It is for this reason only that the withdrawal is mentioned in the Somalia case study. To summarize case study I, there was little to no strategic

necessity on the part of the U.S., but the intervention had international and domestic support, at least in the beginning. Historically, looking back on the “last war” only encouraged the decision for a military intervention in Somalia. Only after publicly taking casualties did the U.S. public call for withdrawal; this left policy makers scrambling for a new course of action that would please the public. The retreat from Somalia led to indecisiveness over which option to choose during the next conflict to arise.

CASE STUDY II: RWANDA

Historical Background

Prior to the cessation of U.S. involvement in Somalia, the UN was already considering deploying a peacekeeping force in Rwanda because of ethnic conflict between the nation’s two main ethnic groups, the Hutu and Tutsi. The nation of Rwanda had a long history of ethnic division, dating from Belgian colonization at the turn of the 20th century. As part of Belgian “divide and conquer” tactics, the ethnic groups of Hutu and Tutsi were emphasized based on the appearance of Rwandans. Hutus were generally short and possessed dark skin while Tutsis were taller and had lighter skin.⁸⁷ Tutsis were the minority and made up only about fifteen percent of the population. They were the aristocracy in Rwanda during Belgian colonialism because the Belgians considered them to be more “European” than the Hutus. While Hutus primarily worked as farmers, Tutsis had the good fortune to occupy positions comparable to that of a feudal lord, supervising the Hutus. This system was enforced through the issuance of identification cards which were stamped with one’s ethnicity. This scheme allowed Belgian colonists to rule over

⁸⁷ Roméo Dallaire, *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*, (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2005), 47.

both groups conveniently without the need for a large occupying force.⁸⁸ Naturally, the Tutsis grew accustomed to ruling over their brethren but by 1962, when Rwanda gained independence, discontent by the Hutus gave rise to the slaughter of countless Tutsi as they were driven from the state by Rwanda's president, Gregoire Kayibanda.⁸⁹ Supplementary violence targeted towards the Tutsi resulted in a mass emigration of Tutsi refugees to bordering states such as Uganda. In spite of this, Rwanda's situation remained one of continuous ethnic conflict.

By the 1970's Major General Juvénal Habyarimana, a prominent military chieftain, staged a victorious coup d'état over President Kayibanda to begin his reign.⁹⁰ Though Habyarimana's regime initially had the effect of stabilizing Rwanda, the practice of targeted oppression towards the remaining Tutsis continued under a policy known as "establishing ethnic and regional balance."⁹¹ This led opposition forces to form the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) in order to wage war against the Rwandan Armed Forces (RAF) which served Habyarimana.⁹² RPF forces planned a surprise invasion of Rwanda from Uganda in 1990 which failed. However, this was merely the beginning of a protracted civil war between both groups which quickly gained international attention. Even though the Belgians no longer ruled Rwanda, another European government supported Habyarimana's regime. Despite UN attention to Rwanda, France (a member of the Security Council), supported Habyarimana with financing and equipment up to, and during the genocide which occurred only three years later in 1994. The international community began to call for peace talks between both sides but all that actually took place were "on again, off again" peace talks in Arusha, Tanzania.⁹³

⁸⁸ Dallaire, 47.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 47.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 47.

⁹¹ United Nations, "UNAMIR: Rwanda Background." Accessed 16 March 2012.

⁹² Dallaire, 47.

⁹³ Ibid., 48.

The Arusha Accords were eventually signed as an agreement between both sides on August 4, 1993, but the ceasefire proved to be short lived because Hutu extremists were unwilling to compromise and make peace with the Tutsi. Instead, they sought to “eradicate Tutsis rather than cede power” to them.⁹⁴ The terms of the Arusha Accords were for Hutu and Tutsi to share power and demilitarize and eventually have peace.⁹⁵ Prior to this, the UN Assistance Mission in Rwanda (UNAMIR) led by the Canadian Lieutenant General Roméo Dallaire was authorized by UN Security Council Resolution 872 to supervise the negotiations. As the commander of UN forces, Dallaire was tasked with maintaining peace between Hutu extremists and RPF forces by securing Kigali, the capital, and establishing a demilitarized zone.⁹⁶ By April 1994, the fighting had resumed so the UN passed a subsequent resolution (912) on April 21, 1994 to authorize Dallaire’s peacekeepers to broker a ceasefire. This act proved to be too little, too late. Because of a severe lack of cultural awareness, Dallaire and his staff did not fathom the depth of the conflict and didn’t foresee the mass murder of 800,000 Tutsi and sympathetic Hutu.

On April 6, 1994, General Dallaire was at his headquarters in Kigali when he learned that the jet (given to Habyarimana by François Mitterrand, the president of France) carrying President Habyarimana and Burundian president Cyprien Ntaryamira was shot down outside the Kigali airport.⁹⁷ The group responsible for shooting down the jet remains unknown today, but the assassination was the pretext for the Hutu militia imposing the equivalent of martial law throughout the state. Hutu militia leaders of the Interahamwe immediately blamed the Tutsis and their supporters. Radio Mille Collines, the Hutu radio station used for propaganda, broadcast a

⁹⁴ Power, (2001).

⁹⁵ Power, 336 (2007).

⁹⁶ United Nations, “UNAMIR: Mandate.” Accessed March 20, 2012.

⁹⁷ Power, 329 (2007).

call for all Hutu to eradicate the Inyenzi, or “cockroaches” responsible for Habyarimana’s death.⁹⁸ Roadblocks were set up where militia violently searched passersby while checking ethnicity.

As retribution for Habyarimana’s death, the Interahamwe quickly captured and murdered Rwanda’s Prime Minister, Agathe Uwilingiyimana while she took refuge in the supposed safety of a UN compound.⁹⁹ Taking a page from the Somalian playbook, the militia rounded up and killed ten Belgian peacekeepers that were posted as security outside Uwilingiyimana’s home. They hoped it would prompt the withdrawal of Belgian peacekeepers, similar to the U.S. exit from Somalia only one year earlier.¹⁰⁰ Their plan was accurate and an international uproar ensued. By April 8th, General Dallaire sent a report to the UN that the Interahamwe were targeting their victims by ethnicity.¹⁰¹ This was clear evidence of genocide, which the U.S. and all members of the UN had a responsibility for preventing. Though R2P did not yet exist by name, the concept of protecting people regardless of where they resided had already been introduced and implemented in Somalia. One hundred days later, at least 800,000 had been killed while the U.S. and the UN watched. The entire planning process of the genocide went entirely overlooked by the Security Council and other outside powers that had the resources to thwart this. The fact that 561,000 machetes were imported in the months leading up to the genocide without a problem speaks of the ignorance with which both the U.S. and UN viewed the ongoing ethnic conflict in Rwanda.

⁹⁸ Power, 330 (2007).

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 332.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 333.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 349.

UNAMIR Starts off on the Wrong Foot

Prior to the withdrawal from Somalia, the Clinton administration had backed UN peacekeeping in Rwanda by voting for Resolution 872. President Clinton envisioned a limited peacekeeping operation as U.S. officials had grown impatient with the high cost of peacekeeping operations. Many wished the UN would exercise more discretion when choosing where to intervene. As with case study I, U.S. foreign policymakers kept the “last war” in mind. This time, rather than looking back to the successful coalition against Hussein, Somalia was the most recent example of peace keeping. Not only did this outlook affect U.S. decision making, the administration also ensured that the UN would reflect a similar mindset for dealing with the newest conflict. As commander, Dallaire initially felt that a UN force of around five thousand would be sufficient for completing his mission of demilitarization and peacekeeping.¹⁰² But before he could officially request the brigade sized force, Dallaire’s superiors at the UN instructed him to not even mention the need for a high numbered force.

The U.S. was simply unwilling to send more of its soldiers abroad in the wake of Somalia. Not only did UNAMIR begin without the necessary personnel, there was a critical equipment shortage in the “shoestring” operation.¹⁰³ Dallaire requested three hundred vehicles and received just eighty that were usable, and medical supplies were also sparse.¹⁰⁴ Dallaire received no support from senior officials. When he asked about obtaining more supplies, he was told “this is not NATO”.¹⁰⁵ Peacekeeping operations had begun to get expensive and no state was willing to bear the costs associated with them, especially the U.S. In fact, PDD-25, (which was not even released at the time), had financial obligations listed as one of the sixteen factors which

¹⁰² Haass, 172 (1999).

¹⁰³ Power, 342 (2007).

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 343.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 343.

would govern future intervention. After the killing started, Dallaire grasped the urgency of the situation and ignored his previous instructions, requesting the five thousand person force anyway, but to no avail.¹⁰⁶ In lieu of the necessary materials for accomplishing his mission, Dallaire and his limited number of personnel ran themselves ragged trying to save the lives around them.

The Reaction of U.S. Foreign Policy Makers: Somalia Part Two

On April 7, 1994 the U.S. decided to withdraw all Americans from Rwanda. Two days later, the U.S. ambassador and two hundred fifty Americans were evacuated from Kigali with the Secretary of State Warren Christopher commenting that “the ambassador was in the last car.”¹⁰⁷ Clear evidence of bi-partisan support for evacuating Rwanda can be found in Republican Senate minority leader Bob Dole stating “I don’t think we have any national interest there, the Americans are out, and as far as I’m concerned, in Rwanda, that ought to be the end of it.”¹⁰⁸

With the U.S. taking the lead, other UN nations evacuated their citizens as well, leaving Rwandans to get slaughtered right in front of them even as they shouted, “do not abandon us!”¹⁰⁹ Ironically, though Dallaire couldn’t get his peacekeeping force augmented, over one thousand soldiers from UN members were sent to Kigali airport to protect their evacuees. Even that amount would have allowed Dallaire to conduct raids on the Interahamwe and at least disarm them to prevent further bloodshed but he was again denied what he needed.¹¹⁰ In total, four thousand non-Rwandans were rescued; during the same period 20,000 Rwandans were massacred. President Clinton personally congratulated the U.S. State Department on a “job well

¹⁰⁶ Power, 350. (2007).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 352.

¹⁰⁸ Bob Dole qtd. in Power, 352 (2007).

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 353.

¹¹⁰ Power, 353. (2007).

done” after the Americans reached safety.¹¹¹ All the while, Dallaire was on the ground, demanding that he receive the resources to enable anything resembling success. After he put the pieces together and realized what he was facing, he told UN headquarters to “give me the means and I can do more” but he was ignored again.¹¹² By this time, the U.S. State Department had sent a diplomatic cable arguing for the opposite. Its main points are listed here.

“Our opposition to retaining a UNAMIR presence in Rwanda is firm. It is based on our conviction that the Security Council has an obligation to ensure that peacekeeping operations are viable, that they are capable of fulfilling their mandates, and that UN peacekeeping personnel are not placed or retained, knowingly, in an untenable situation.”¹¹³ This is a clear rejection of the need for a U.S. presence in Rwanda.

Not only did the U.S. push for a complete withdrawal, they also blamed those getting slaughtered for the violence on the ground. Instead of admitting that they had knowledge of the genocide, U.S. officials preferred to pretend these were casualties of a civil war. In his writing on international relations theory, Robert Jervis wrote that a common lesson learned from failed policies is to “avoid policies that have failed in the immediate past.”¹¹⁴ Without delving into the actual conflict in Rwanda, U.S. foreign policy makers and politicians made a conscious decision to just observe the surface tensions in the state and ignore what caused them. This allowed policy makers in the Clinton administration to compare Somalia with Rwanda, even though they differed strongly in many respects.

¹¹¹ Power, 353 (2007).

¹¹² Dallaire, qtd. in Power, 366 (2007).

¹¹³ Department of State, “Talking Points for UNAMIR Withdrawal”, April 15, 1994.

¹¹⁴ Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 275.

The Aftermath

By blocking any action in the UN to prevent the genocide, the U.S. acted as an enabler for the entire ordeal. U.S. indecision cannot be blamed on a lack of knowledge even though President Clinton personally stated in his famous apology at Kigali airport that "...all over the world, there were people like me sitting in offices, day after day after day, who did not fully appreciate the depth and speed with which you were engulfed by this unimaginable terror."¹¹⁵ The problem was, the information and the warning signs were there, but they were ignored by both major political parties in the wake of the crisis and ensuing embarrassment from UNOSOM. Even the so-called experts on Rwanda appeared baffled. Providing global leadership as the lone superpower and doing the right thing for people in need was ignored over fiscal concerns and fear over a possible domestic backlash. Analyzing U.S. foreign policy decisions regarding Rwanda in 1994 with the four independent variables will enable one to hypothesize future foreign policy decisions regarding U.S. military intervention, especially after the overt failure of U.S. foreign policy in this case.

Strategic Necessity

Direct threats to either the U.S. or any of its allies from this state at war with itself simply could not pose a reasonable risk to U.S. security. If the potential risk of failed states is considered, perhaps this could have warranted military intervention for the benefit of collective security, but this is unlikely because adversaries of the U.S. were not looking to provide support in Rwanda if the U.S. did not. Therefore, the risk of someone else filling a niche was not present.

Examining UN concerns, the U.S. was vehemently opposed to them from the outset so even though states allied with the U.S. expressed concern over the imminent situation, they were

¹¹⁵ Clinton, qtd. in Power, 386 (2007).

opposed by the U.S. at every step. PDD-25 may not have been officially released until May 3, 1994 but U.S. officials were anxious to apply it beforehand anyway. Once released, this document, whose purpose was ironically to “save peacekeeping operations”, was compellingly used to sway allies away from intervention because the U.S. would not support it.¹¹⁶ The concept of national security risks towards either the U.S. or its allies was simply not present. Instead, intervention would have served a moral imperative. What is clear is that U.S. officials did everything in their power to prevent the escalation of involvement in Rwanda even as they had previously advocated an opposing course of action for Somalia.

International Support

Other states sought to intervene in Rwanda, but the U.S. was doing its best to induce them to stay out of Rwanda at least until both ethnic groups resolved their own conflict. Hindsight reveals that U.S. officials could not have been more wrong in their assessment in deciding which path to take regarding intervention. The U.S. actively worked to block action in the Security Council which could have prevented such a dire loss of life. General Roméo Dallaire worked feverously to get the resources and personnel necessary for mission success for UNAMIR but he was ignored by the UN largely because of U.S. inattention. Rwanda serves as the rare instance that the U.S. blocked the UN from doing something it wished to do. More frequently, the UN attempts to prevent the U.S. from acting without Security Council approval. In this case, disregarding U.S. wishes would have produced positive results.

The extreme efforts of the U.S. to curtail UN involvement cannot be overlooked. The state department went so far as to admit that “acts of genocide may have occurred” but outright

¹¹⁶ Richard Clarke, qtd. in Power (2001).

refused to categorize the situation as a full-blown genocide.¹¹⁷ Embarrassing enough, an internal memo featuring instructions on what State Department personnel were permitted to say about the genocide was leaked to the press.¹¹⁸ The memo was an attempt at making a play on words to avoid invoking the rules of the UN Genocide Convention. Had that happened, the U.S. would have been legally obligated to intervene although an argument can be made that this was the case anyway, regardless of what verbiage U.S. officials used.

Public Support

Without a doubt, U.S. politicians from President Clinton down to members of Congress sought to avoid a domestic uproar from their constituents at all costs because of the similarities they saw with Somalia. A poll conducted by Time/CNN on May 16, 1994 asked the question, “in your view, should the United States do more to reduce the violence in the African nation of Rwanda, or don’t you feel this way?”¹¹⁹ Fifty-one percent of respondents didn’t want the U.S. to do more about the violence while only thirty-four percent felt the U.S. should do more.¹²⁰ This poll was conducted just over a month after the *New York Times* featured a front page article on claims by the Red Cross that over eight thousand Rwandans were dead in Kigali and that bodies were stacked “in the houses, in the streets, everywhere.”¹²¹ Other prominent newspapers reported similar stories about Rwanda that all spoke of mass death. By April 16, 1994, the *New York Times* reported another story about the carnage in Rwanda. This time, the deaths of twelve hundred men, women, and children who had sought protection in a church were recounted.¹²²

¹¹⁷ Christine Shelly, qtd. in Power (2001).

¹¹⁸ Power, (2001).

¹¹⁹ Time/CNN. “Rwanda.” May 16, 1994. *Polling the Nations*. Accessed on March 28, 2012.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Power, 356 (2007).

¹²² Ibid., 357.

The American public was at least somewhat aware that genocide was in progress in Rwanda because of growing media coverage and yet, as the above poll from Time/CNN suggests, a majority of the U.S. public remained generally indifferent to this.

By April 19, 1994 Human Rights Watch estimated the casualties at one hundred thousand. This was quickly followed by a Red Cross calculation of “perhaps as many as 300,000” deaths and yet fifty-one percent of Americans did not want the U.S. entangled in what they viewed as a second Somalia.¹²³ The entities named above which were reporting on the situation in Rwanda were certainly credible enough to maintain a mass following; this is additional evidence that the public had the information available to make an informed decision.

On August 8, 1994, Time/CNN conducted a subsequent poll, this time posing the question, “do you worry that U.S. military forces might become too involved in local issues and disputes in Rwanda-as some feel occurred in Somalia?”¹²⁴ Again, a majority (54%) were against intervention while 38% supported doing something in the state.¹²⁵ Only during the following year did polling suggest a change in the opinion of the U.S. electorate. This time, a poll was performed by the *Program on International Policy Attitudes*. On April 27, 1995 this group searched for the percentage of people who favored U.S. troops as UN peacekeepers in Rwanda.¹²⁶ Eighty-six percent of people polled responded yes to this (although the difference of the poll agencies can also partly explain this increase).¹²⁷ Perhaps guilt played a part in this because, by a year later, the world knew that at least eight hundred thousand had lost their lives

¹²³ Ibid., 357.

¹²⁴ Time/CNN, “Rwanda.” August 8, 1994. *Polling the Nations*. Accessed on March 28, 2012.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Program on International Policy Attitudes. “Rwanda.” April 27, 1995. *Polling the Nations*. Accessed on March 28, 2012.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

in the genocide. Unfortunately for history, the inaction of the Clinton administration was consistent with the majority opinion of the time.

Historical Analogy

Data from research polls during the period of the Rwandan genocide makes it apparent that the U.S. public was unwilling to commit the resources necessary or risk American lives to act against the aggressors in Rwanda. Summing up the consensus of a widely held opinion of the U.S. public at the time, Darren C. Brunk wrote "...Somalia cast a haunting shadow over future peacekeeping missions."¹²⁸ Robert Jervis noted a similar flaw in the supposed lessons learned by both the public and policy makers. He wrote that while previous events are full of "valuable information", many of these are learned without "careful attention to details of causation, making them "superficial and overgeneralized."¹²⁹ This piece of international relations theory is reinforced by the U.S. fear of a second Somalia and the inaction that followed. While weighing possible policy options for Rwanda, the Clinton administration was in the midst of sorting out the crisis in Somalia. The pending historical analogy in this case study was a negative one. As a result, this contributed to the decision to not intervene in Rwanda.

Implications and Conclusions

What does the future hold for U.S. military intervention? In this second case study, we've seen what appeared to be the demise of peacekeeping operations over intolerance for the failure of previous foreign policy. Even the news of a pending genocide that resulted in over eight hundred thousand preventable deaths was not adequate for creating a call for action amongst

¹²⁸ Brunk, 302.

¹²⁹ Jervis, 281.

policy makers, the American public, or even the Clinton administration. A key idea to take from this study is the notion of R2P. Although the term R2P had not yet been devised, the poll that revealed eighty-six percent favoring a UN peacekeeping operation supported by U.S. troops a year after the genocide suggests a rise in the importance for protecting innocent lives. This is really where the norm of R2P arose even though the world stood by in this instance. Seventeen years would pass before R2P was actually put into practice. Out of the four independent variables, only international support was satisfied in this case study. The lack of intervention in this situation does not mean that this variable isn't applicable to the U.S. decision-making process. Instead, this is an indication that international support is a contributing factor to intervention and the presence of this support does not necessarily equate to intervention on its own, especially when the other independent variables in this case study opposed involvement.

CASE STUDY 3: LIBYA

Historical Background

Seventeen years after the Rwandan genocide, the U.S. was close to becoming engaged in Libya after uprisings against the dictator Muammar al-Qaddafi turned violent. Qaddafi had taken control of Libya's government in a coup in 1969 and had been its ruler ever since. Prior to this, he had been an officer in the Libyan army. Throughout his rule, Qaddafi never appeared to make a solid decision on where he stood as a leader. In the past, he had supported terrorist groups working against Western powers. He had also implemented weapons of mass destruction programs that he decided to willingly turn over to UN authorities in 2003 after the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Whatever his actual reasons for this were, Qaddafi probably toned down his rhetoric as he aged in an attempt to preserve his power. In recent years, Qaddafi had implemented somewhat

democratic programs in his government for the economic benefit of Libyans that included sharing more of Libya's oil profits with the masses. Nevertheless, by early 2011, a peaceful protest against his rule had begun in Benghazi (Western Libya) after nearby democratic uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia. Instead of responding peacefully, Qaddafi chose to respond with violence in lieu of negotiation.¹³⁰ Largely a result of his handling of the situation, the protests spread outwards from Benghazi and in turn, the number of dead protestors increased along with the adverse attention regarding Qaddafi.¹³¹

As an early warning to the Qaddafi regime, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1970 on February 26, 2011 which communicated the Security Council members' concern over Qaddafi's actions and placed an arms embargo on the state while calling for an immediate ceasefire.¹³² Another attempt to prevent the brutality of Qaddafi's regime against Libya's protestors was made when the UN passed Resolution 1973 on March 17, 2011. This legislation again criticized the Libyan government for its shortcomings in condemning its own people over a peaceful protest. The vote of approval was ten in favor and none against (5 members abstained including the Russian Federation and China).¹³³ The council authorized member states "to take all necessary measures to protect civilians under threat of attack..."¹³⁴ During this time, international contempt grew towards Qaddafi until the UN requested that NATO begin reconnaissance around Libya. This included moving U.S. naval ships closer to the Mediterranean Sea while U.S. drones were positioned to monitor the situation on the ground.¹³⁵ Still, Qaddafi did not diminish his violent efforts aimed at preserving his government. NATO agreed to enforce

¹³⁰ NATO, "NATO and Libya", October (2011).

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ United Nations, "Security Council Approves No-Fly Zone." March 17, 2011.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ NATO, "NATO and Libya", October (2011).

resolution 1973 on March 22, 2011 by first stating they would enforce the arms embargo and afterwards agreeing to carry out the no-fly zone. By March 31, NATO was in charge of Operation Unified Protector, a mission with three goals: enforcing the arms embargo, the no-fly zone, and protecting civilians.¹³⁶

From the beginning, the U.S. was involved in seeking a solution to Qaddafi's violence. Although the U.S. had resumed diplomatic relations with Libya after the WMD were turned over in 2004, the Obama administration was swift in condemning Qaddafi's violence. While the international community favored U.S. leadership in Operation Odyssey Dawn, the U.S. was embroiled in two simultaneous wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. In addition, the nation was in the midst of an economic recession and Americans were well versed with the high costs of peacekeeping operations, especially as NATO was clearly endeavoring to expand its mandate, demanding that Libya's ruler step down in the face of the protests.¹³⁷ To Americans, this sounded like the beginning of a long and expensive commitment to Libya.

As Qaddafi threatened to "cleanse Libya house by house" of the citizens he labeled "rats", NATO and the U.S. went to work and destroyed Libya's air defense system in less than seventy-two hours.¹³⁸ NATO's air campaign operated from March 31, 2011 until October 31, 2011 to support Libyan rebels fighting the ground campaign in the attempt to overthrow Qaddafi, who had been in hiding. During Operation Unified Protector, the U.S. expended over two hundred twenty Tomahawk missiles at a cost of 1.4 million each to support the rebel advance on Tripoli, Libya's capital and seat of government. By October 31, 2011, thanks in part to the efforts of fourteen NATO members and four additional states, the Libyan National Transitional

¹³⁶ Ivo H. Daalder and James G. Stavridis, "NATO's Victory in Libya: The Right Way to Run an Intervention", *Foreign Affairs* March/April (2012), 3.

¹³⁷ Jon Western and Joshua S. Goldstein, "Humanitarianism Comes of Age: Lessons from Somalia to Libya", *Foreign Affairs* November/December (2011), 48.

¹³⁸ Daalder and Stavridis, 3.

Council assumed control of Libya's government and Qaddafi was killed in an attack.¹³⁹ On October 31, Operation Unified Protector was concluded at a cost of 1.1 billion dollars for the U.S. effort and is estimated to have saved tens of thousands of lives.¹⁴⁰

Strategic Necessity

Just as with the previous case studies, Qaddafi's regime was incapable of mounting a direct strategic threat to the U.S. In this case, European access to Libya's oil exports were at risk. While the U.S. is not an importer of Libyan oil, states such as Spain, Italy, and France are dependent because of their close proximity across the Mediterranean Sea. The possibility of oil exports to Europe terminating was unacceptable and detrimental to the already fragile economic situations of the states mentioned.

Enhancing this intervention was the fact that allies were willing to contribute to the effort. The U.S. successfully set the goals of the intervention and our allies in NATO and the UN willingly shared the responsibility during the entire operation but only after non-military means were exhausted. Although released after the intervention had already been authorized, the "Presidential Study Directive on Mass Atrocities" released by the Obama administration put into print that preventing genocide and mass cruelties was a "core national security interest" and also a moral imperative as well.¹⁴¹ The reasons behind this claim are that allowing these acts to happen erodes regional stability and the U.S. reputation. This new directive promises to establish an "Atrocities Prevention Board" which would debate policy options for issues like genocide and be responsible for training in prevention and coordination between government services.¹⁴² This

¹³⁹ Daalder and Stavridis, 3-4.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 3.

¹⁴¹ White House, PSD-10.

¹⁴² Ibid.

board is intended to serve as a tool for senior policymakers to quickly and efficiently offer foreign policy options in future conflicts.

International Support

The question of international support regarding the military intervention in Libya is a resounding yes. The international support here may have been so prevalent because of Qaddafi himself. From the beginning of the uprisings, Qaddafi's intent was clear. He would use as much violence to "cleanse Libya house by house" as he deemed necessary to restore his own position.¹⁴³ Stewart Patrick referred to him as "a villain straight from central casting", a character mold that was actually shared by other UN members and Libya's own neighbors.¹⁴⁴ These international attitudes towards Qaddafi helped instigate support for the intervention. After witnessing nonviolent protests recently in Tunisia and Egypt, the UN responded promptly to place sanctions on Qaddafi and his regime. Normally, this international body is not known for acting swiftly but it did in this case because it had the support to do so.

Even though the vote for establishing the no-fly-zone over Libya was technically unanimous, Germany, China, and Russia all abstained from the UN vote for differing reasons.¹⁴⁵ Russia and China's abstention was assumed here even before the vote because both have less than stellar human rights records. Both of these states tend to oppose military intervention or at least abstain from voting because they do not approve of the violation of sovereignty over human rights abuses. They also do not want to participate in establishing a precedent towards this end. But in this case, they held no interest in preserving Qaddafi's rule. Germany's decision was

¹⁴³ Daalder and Stavridis, 3.

¹⁴⁴ Patrick, "Libya and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention: How Qaddafi's Fall Vindicated Obama and RtoP." *Foreign Affairs* August 26, 2011.

¹⁴⁵ United Nations, "Security Council Approves No-Fly Zone." March 17, 2011.

based on the fact that they wished for a more peaceful resolution to the situation on the ground in Libya.¹⁴⁶ The international support present for military intervention both validated and firmly confirmed that R2P is here to stay.

Public Support

Public support varied during Operations Odyssey Dawn and Unified Protector. When President Obama first authorized the U.S. intervention in Libya in March 2011 (which committed no ground troops throughout the operation), public support was at forty-three percent.¹⁴⁷ A Quinnipiac University poll on March 30, 2011 posed the question, “how concerned are you that the military mission in Libya will lead to the U.S. getting embroiled in a long term military conflict there?” Seventy-four percent were “very” apprehensive about this.¹⁴⁸ As the intervention dragged on in the minds of Americans, support fell to twenty-four percent.¹⁴⁹

Much of the debate over public support was rooted in the economic situation of the U.S. during the intervention. Sharply along party lines, an additional poll conducted on November 3, 2011 asked whether the U.S. “did the right thing” by using the military in Libya. Forty-three percent of Republicans answered yes while fifty-one percent of Democrats agreed with the opposing party.¹⁵⁰ Independents were just about evenly split on the matter as well with forty-six percent in favor and forty-four percent opposed.¹⁵¹

An interesting side note to the opposition over the U.S. financial responsibilities in Libya is the somewhat “low” cost of 1.1 billion dollars. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have a

¹⁴⁶ United Nations, “Security Council Approves No-Fly Zone.” March 17, 2011.

¹⁴⁷ Stewart Patrick, “Libya and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention”.

¹⁴⁸ Quinnipiac University Poll, March 30, 2011. “Libya.” *Polling the Nations*. Accessed on April 5, 2012.

¹⁴⁹ Stewart Patrick, “Libya and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention.

¹⁵⁰ Quinnipiac University Poll, November 3, 2011. “Libya.” *Polling the Nations*. Accessed on April 5, 2012.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

rolling bill of approximately five hundred billion and one trillion dollars so comparatively speaking, the intervention of Libya was much more cost effective.¹⁵² Conflict fatigue is another explanation for the unwillingness of a majority to support the intervention in Libya. By this point, it had been almost ten years since the U.S. deployed to Afghanistan and eight since going into Iraq.

Historical Analogy

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq serve as the historical analogy for the Libya case study even though neither falls under the classification of a military intervention for humanitarian purposes. Roughly speaking, both conflicts were begun due to concerns over states which harbored terrorism. In some sense, they have evolved into nation-building and eventually may become legitimate peace-keeping operations themselves. For the purpose of this thesis, they are conflicts which were both nearing a decade long, and with which the U.S. public had become tired of. The costs associated with fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan were high but appeared higher still to the average American suffering through the “Great Recession”. As a result of this, there would be no support of a “boots on the ground” style of military intervention.

This lack of support may actually have helped the Obama administration stick to the strategy it outlined and prevented the U.S. from getting further entangled in Libya’s domestic political environment. Due to the lack of public support, the means to intervene further were simply not available. U.S. policymakers did not want to risk the possibility of getting as deeply involved in Libya as they had in Iraq and Afghanistan any more than the public did.

¹⁵² Jessica Rettig, “End of NATO’s Libya Intervention Means Financial Relief for Allies.” *U.S. News & World Report*, October 31, 2011. Accessed on April 6, 2012.

Implications and Conclusions

Libya stands as a successful example of a military intervention that supported a humanitarian crisis. This does not mean that this model can or should be replicated in future situations. As the independent variables have demonstrated, this case was unique from the perspective of Gaddafi and the Libyans in the state who openly opposed his rule. The main point to take from this is the legitimatization of, and further establishment of R2P as a global norm. In a rare instance, the UN responded quickly (with a willing coalition of support) after reports of violence in a state which was geographically conducive to military intervention.¹⁵³ The speed of the response alone is a significant reason for the NATO/UN success in Libya.

Yes, the intervention was successful. But, the current situation on the ground in Libya is not very promising. Today, Libya's new government struggles to maintain peace and order among rival factions in the state. While the UN has worked to provide basic services to include food, water, and medicine, these efforts have been interrupted by the conflict there.¹⁵⁴ Additionally, a report by the UN recently criticized Libya's Transitional National Council, the interim government, for not doing enough to quell the violence.¹⁵⁵ While the actual intervention went according to the plan that was approved by the UN and implemented jointly by the U.S. and NATO, the current situation there is unstable.

The possibility of a subsequent intervention featuring an aftermath of violence and competing factions may discourage the chance of Libya's ever being standing as a model for future interventions. It is for this reason that the application of R2P "will remain selective and

¹⁵³ Michael O'Hanlon, "Libya and the Obama Doctrine: How the United States Won Ugly," *Foreign Affairs* August 31, 2011. Accessed on April 29, 2012.

¹⁵⁴ Rami Al-Shaheibi, "Libya Tribal Clashes: Situation Tense in Country's South," *Huffington Post*, February 27, 2012. Accessed on April 29, 2012.

¹⁵⁵ New York Times, "Libya- Revolution and Aftermath," *New York Times*, April 3, 2012. Accessed on April 29, 2012.

highly contingent on the political context.”¹⁵⁶ This is not to predict that the U.S. will ignore future atrocities. Instead, the intent is to point out the uniqueness of each case and the importance of not lumping humanitarian issues together without thoroughly investigating them from a three hundred sixty degree perspective.

CONCLUSION

As we’ve seen with the three case studies in this thesis, the decision to militarily intervene for humanitarian purposes is complicated as it involves the use of a grand strategy (or a mix) chosen by a presidential administration that helps to regulate and guide the foreign policy decisions of each executive. Additionally, the four independent variables listed: strategic necessity, international support, public support, and historical analogy all work together in varying degrees of importance depending on the situation, to influence the choice of whether to intervene. The three case studies in this thesis have highlighted the diverse events and variables that make up the final outcome of U.S. foreign policy-makers. Although these decisions aren’t always straightforward, they have constantly evolved to meet the needs of each humanitarian crisis since the end of the Cold War.

The notion of R2P is a prominent example of the evolution of norms in foreign policy decision-making which appears to be taking hold in the international system. Beginning with the U.S. intervention in Somalia in 1993, we’ve seen how the four independent variables influenced the ultimate decision to intervene. Although intervention was not made out of strategic necessity, the U.S. had both domestic and international support. The historical analogy of the 1991 Gulf War that preceded this suggested that both Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton could achieve their goals by intervening against General Aideed’s regime. With three out of four

¹⁵⁶ Patrick, (2011).

variables reaching a “yes” conclusion, President Bush initiated the intervention and President Clinton ramped up U.S. involvement soon after reaching a similar conclusion.

When the UN requested support from the Clinton administration for UNAMIR in Rwanda in 1994, the administration considered the same independent variables as in Somalia. This time, in the aftermath of the embarrassing debacle in Somalia, the public did not support intervention in Rwanda because many envisioned this humanitarian crisis to be the same as Somalia with a similar ending. Just as in Somalia, conducting the intervention was not of strategic importance to the U.S. The historical analogy for this case study suggested that the U.S. not intervene in this humanitarian situation. This had no effect on international support as pressure from the UN remained present, but due to a lack of domestic popularity, the Clinton administration chose not to participate. In addition, they also tried their best to halt UN efforts because this humanitarian crisis did not satisfy the guidelines of PDD-25. This directive served as a supplement to the Clinton administration’s grand strategy for dealing with humanitarian crises.

With this unique case study, we’ve recognized the significance of a lack of domestic support combined with a negative historical analogy. Though hindsight exposed this U.S. failure in dealing with this humanitarian crisis, the inaction of the U.S. in 1994 led to widespread regret from President Clinton and the U.S. public from not acting to prevent the planned genocide of 800,000 Rwandans. In addition, we’ve also grasped the emergence of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), and its moral and liberal importance among Western nations.

In the third case study, the Obama administration also considered the same variables that his predecessors used in deciding whether to militarily intervene in Libya to support the uprising against Qaddafi. Contrary to the first two case studies, the argument could be made that

intervening was of strategic importance to the U.S. because of its impact on the nation's allies. As with the other two studies, international support was prevalent as the UN and NATO sought to disable Qaddafi's repressive regime in order to prevent it from harming its own people. Once again though, domestic support was lacking, this time because the U.S. was involved in simultaneous wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The U.S. was also suffering through high employment and other economic strife due to a recession. The historical analogy also suggested that the Obama administration should not intervene in Libya. This can effectively be connected with the variable of domestic support for this case. As the U.S. was already fighting two other wars, the expense of another military conflict was heavily criticized as the public expressed concern that the U.S. could get bogged down in another foreign conflict. Part of what makes this case study distinctive from the first two is the fact that without domestic support, the president intervened anyway.

As we've already seen the emergence of R2P with the Rwanda case study, this latest intervention suggests that this notion has emerged as a norm. This is supported by the release of Presidential Study Directive 10 which the Obama administration implemented to create an institution for preventing global atrocities.¹⁵⁷ In this directive, the administration states that mass slaughter is detrimental to the security of the U.S. and a failure to respond to crises of this nature only damages the U.S. reputation.¹⁵⁸ Many have professed this directive to be a part of the "Obama Doctrine" but this remains to be seen. What is known is that Samantha Power, a leading expert on genocide, served as an influence for this directive as she currently serves on the President's National Security Council. As it was mentioned in the case study, the intervention in Libya was unique and should not be blindly applied to future situations despite its initial success.

¹⁵⁷ White House, PSD-10.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

In order to evaluate the importance of the independent variables for each case study, they are listed in the table below.

	Independent Variables				
State	Strategic Interest	International Support	Domestic Support	Historical Analogy	Did the U.S. Intervene?
Somalia	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rwanda	N	Y	N	N	N
Libya	Y	Y	N	N	Y

It is apparent that the U.S. had international support each time it decided to intervene. However, this does not necessarily mean that this variable trumps the others. Instead, these findings suggest that international support is weighed heavily in the decision to intervene. Again, this is part of what makes Libya a unique study. The presence of strategic interest in the Libya case seems to be a prominent factor in the Obama administration intervening without domestic support. Using this chart sheds light on Clinton's decision to not intervene in Rwanda even though it was the morally correct course to take. Overall, one can effectively understand the varying importance of these four variables after they have been applied to each case study.

While I have suggested that Libya is not a perfect model for future military intervention, the use of the historical analogy for each case demonstrates that Libya will, at the very least be used in this way to guide U.S. intervention in a future conflict. In addition, PSD-10 is an established guideline for future intervention but one wonders where this could be used next. The genocide currently occurring in Syria may very well be the next humanitarian conflict that the U.S. becomes involved in.

During remarks made at the Holocaust Memorial Museum on April 23, 2012 President Obama spoke of his Atrocities Prevention Board to support universal human rights.¹⁵⁹ Obama stated that “national sovereignty is never a license to slaughter your people.”¹⁶⁰ With his new agency for responding to genocide and mass atrocities, the president authorized economic sanctions against the regime of Syria’s ruler, Bashar al-Assad. The UN similarly authorized the deployment of three hundred peacekeepers to Syria to monitor a brokered ceasefire that was supposed to take effect on April 12, 2012.¹⁶¹

By briefly applying the independent variables used in my case studies, we can attempt to predict whether the U.S. will militarily intervene in Syria. This state does not pose a strategic risk to the U.S., so the first variable results in a “no” response. Domestic support is likely to be negative as well since the economic situation of the U.S. has not significantly improved since the most recent intervention. Although the U.S. has reduced its footprint in Iraq and Afghanistan, there will still be heavy reluctance to conduct another intervention. International support is complicated because NATO has expressed no interest in participating as the group did in Libya. China and Russia complicate the situation because they are opposed to intervention in Syria although they do support the UN monitors currently deployed in the state.¹⁶² The historical analysis suggests a positive with the success of the Libya operation but I predict that the operation will not progress into a full intervention due to Chinese and Russian opposition.

¹⁵⁹ Barack Obama, “Remarks by the President at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum,” April 23, 2012. (Accessed on April 29, 2012).

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Holly Yan, “Can UN monitors help forge peace in Syria?” *CNN*, May 1, 2012. (Accessed on May 1, 2012).

¹⁶² Ibid.

Bibliography

- Al-Shaheibi, Rami. "Libya Tribal Clashes: Situation Tense in Country's South." *Huffington Post*, February 27, 2012. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/27/libya-tribal-clashes-n_1304485.html?view=print&comm_ref=false (Accessed on April 29, 2012).
- Bolton, John. "Wrong Turn in Somalia." *Foreign Affairs*, January/February (1994).
- Brunk, Darren C. "Curing the Somalia Syndrome: Analogy, Foreign Policy Decision Making, and the Rwandan Genocide." *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 301-320. (2008).
- CBS News/New York Times Poll. "Somalia." December 7, 1993. *Polling the Nations*. (Accessed on February 28, 2012).
- Cheadle, Don and John Prendergast. *Not on Our Watch: The Mission to End Genocide in Darfur and Beyond*: 2007.
- Dallaire, Roméo. *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2005.
- Daalder, Ivo H. and James G. Stavridis. "NATO's Victory in Libya: The Right Way to Run an Intervention." *Foreign Affairs* March/April (2012), 2-7.
- Friedman, Thomas L. "The Somalia Mission: Clinton Reviews Policy in Somalia as Unease Grows." *New York Times*, October 6, 1993. (Accessed on November 14, 2011).
- Gaddis, John Lewis. "Containment: It's past and Future." *International Security*, spring (1981).
- Haass, Richard. *Intervention: The Use of American Military Force in the Post-Cold War World*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1999.
- Haass, Richard. "Paradigm Lost." *Foreign Affairs*, January/February (1995).
- Hendrickson, David C. "The Recovery of Internationalism: Stemming the Isolationist Impulse." *Foreign Affairs*, September/October (1994).
- Hook, Steven W. and John Spanier. *American Foreign Policy since World War II: 18th Edition*. Washington: CQ Press, 2010.
- Indyk, Martin, et. Al. "Scoring Obama's Foreign Policy: A Progressive Pragmatist Tries to Bend History." *Foreign Affairs*, May/June (2011).
- Jervis, Robert. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1976.

- National Security Council. "NSC 68: United States Objectives and Programs for National Security." <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsc-hst/nsc-68.htm> (Accessed on December 7, 2011).
- NATO. "NATO and Libya." http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_71652.htm (Accessed on April 4, 2012).
- NBC News. "Somalia." December 15, 1992. *Polling the Nations*. (Accessed on February 28, 2012).
- New York Times, "Libya-Revolution and Aftermath." *New York Times*, April 3, 2012. (Accessed on April 29, 2012).
<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/libya/index.html>
- Obama, Barack. "Remarks by the President at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum." April 23, 2012. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/04/23/remarks-president-united-states-holocaust-memorial-museum> (Accessed on April 29, 2012).
- Obama, Barack. "Renewing American Leadership." *Foreign Affairs*, July/August (2007).
- O'Hanlon, Michael. "Libya and the Obama Doctrine: How the U.S. Won Ugly." *Foreign Affairs* August 31, 2011.
- Patrick, Stewart. "A New Lease on Humanitarianism: How Operation Odyssey Dawn Will Revive RtoP." *Foreign Affairs*, March 24, 2011.
- Patrick, Stewart. "Libya and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention: How Qaddafi's Fall Vindicated Obama and R2P." *Foreign Affairs*, August 26, 2011.
- PBS. "100 Days of Slaughter: A Chronology of U.S. /UN Actions." <http://www.pbs.org/wgbf/pages/frontline/shows/evil/> (Accessed on January 5, 2012.)
- Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy." *International Security*, Vol. 21, winter (1996/97).
- Power, Samantha. *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide* New York: HarperCollins, 2007.
- Power, Samantha. "Bystanders to Genocide: Why the United States Let the Rwandan Tragedy Happen." *Atlantic Monthly* Vol. 288: 84-108. (2001).
- Program on International Policy Attitudes. "Rwanda." April 27, 1995. *Polling the Nations*. (Accessed on March 28, 2012).
- Quinnipiac University. "Libya." March 30, 2011. *Polling the Nations*. (Accessed on April 5, 2012).

- Quinnipiac University. "Libya." July 14, 2011. *Polling the Nations*. (Accessed on April 5, 2012).
- Quinnipiac University. "Libya." November 3, 2011. *Polling the Nations*. (Accessed on April 5, 2012).
- Rettig, Jessica. "End of NATO's Libya Mission Means Financial Relief for Allies." *U.S. News & World Report*, October 31, 2011. http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2011/10/31/end-of-natos-libya-intervention-means-financial-relief-for-allies_print.html (Accessed on April 3, 2012).
- Rice, Condoleezza. "Campaign 2000: Promoting the National Interest." *Foreign Affairs* January/February (2000).
- Shanker, Thom and Eric Schmitt. "Seeing Limits to 'New' Kind of War in Libya." *New York Times*. October 21, 2011. (Accessed on April 3, 2012).
- Time/CNN Poll. "Rwanda." May 16, 1994. *Polling the Nations*. (Accessed on March 28, 2012).
- Time/CNN Poll. "Rwanda." August 8, 1994. *Polling the Nations*. (Accessed on March 28, 2012).
- Time/CNN Poll. "Somalia." October 8, 1993. *Polling the Nations*. (Accessed on February 28, 2012).
- United Nations. "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide." <http://www.un.org/millennium/law/iv-1.htm> (Accessed on December 15, 2011).
- United Nations. "Security Council Approves 'No-Fly Zone' Over Libya." <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10200.doc.htm> (Accessed on April 5, 2012).
- United Nations, "UNAMIR: Rwanda Background." <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unamirFT.htm> (Accessed March 16, 2012).
- United Nations, "Universal Declaration of Human Rights." December 10, 1948. <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/> (Accessed on April 19, 2012).
- U.S. Army Center for Military History. "United States Army in Somalia, 1992-1994." <http://www.history.amry.mil/brochures/Somalia/Somalia.htm> (Accessed on January 7, 2012).
- U.S. Department of State. "Talking Points for UNAMIR Withdrawal." April 15, 1994. <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB53/rw041594.pdf> (Accessed on March 24, 2012).

- Von Clausewitz, Carl. *On War*. Trans. Colonel J.J. Graham. New York: Barnes & Noble, 2004.
- Walzer, Michael. "On Humanitarianism: Is Helping Others Charity, or Duty, or Both?" *Foreign Affairs*, July/August (2011).
- Western, John and Joshua S. Goldstein. "Humanitarianism Comes of Age: Lessons from Somalia to Libya." *Foreign Affairs* November/December (2011), 48-73.
- White House. "National Security Strategy of the United States." August (1991).
<http://www.fas.org/man/docs/918015-nss.htm> (Accessed on April 8, 2012).
- White House. "A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement." February (1996).
<http://www.fas.org/spp/military/docops/national/1996stra.htm> (Accessed on November 16, 2011).
- White House. "Clinton Administration Policy on Reforming Peace Operations." (PDD-25) May (1994). <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd/pdd-25.pdf> (Accessed on December 7, 2011).
- White House. "Presidential Study Directive on Mass Atrocities." (PSD-10) August 4, 2011.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/08/04/presidential-study-directive-mass-atrocities> (Accessed on April 20, 2012).
- Yan, Holly. "Can UN monitors help forge peace in Syria?" CNN, May 1, 2012.
<http://www.cnn.com/2012/05/01/world/meast/syria-un-monitors/index.html?iref=allsearch> (Accessed on May 1, 2012).